



^{*}CITY**FUTUREs**

**The Bonnyrigg *Living Communities*
Baseline Survey**

Judith Stubbs, Bill Randolph and Bruce Judd

July 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This material was produced with funding from the NSW Department of Housing. AHURI also gratefully acknowledges the financial and other support it has received from the Commonwealth, State and Territory governments, without which this work would not have been possible.

DISCLAIMER

AHURI Ltd is an independent, non-political body which has supported this project as part of its programme of research into housing and urban development, which it hopes will be of value to policy-makers, researchers, industry and communities. The opinions in this publication reflect the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of AHURI Ltd, its Board or its funding organisations. No responsibility is accepted by AHURI Ltd or its Board or its funders for the accuracy or omission of any statement, opinion, advice or information in this publication.

RESEARCH ASSISTANCE

Assistance with data entry, tabulation and analysis was provided by Tim Storer, Thomas Storer and James Storer. Survey logistics and field management was provided by Jacquelin Capell.

City Futures Research Centre
Faculty of the Built Environment
University of New South Wales
Sydney
NSW 2052
Tel: 02 9385 7777

Judith Stubbs and Associates
2C McCauley St
Thirroul NSW 2515
Tele: 02 6842 6233

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	11
1. INTRODUCTION	14
1.1 Background to Study	14
1.2 Context of the Bonnyrigg Redevelopment	15
1.3 Characteristics of the Bonnyrigg Estate	17
1.3.1 <i>Composition and Layout</i>	17
1.3.2 <i>Demographic Overview</i>	19
2. METHODOLOGY	20
2.1 Aims and Objectives of the Study	20
2.2 Design of Methodology	20
2.3 Development of Survey Instrument (Questionnaire)	21
2.4 Selection of Sample for Maxi Surveys	23
2.5 Recruitment and Training	24
2.6 Analysis	24
2.6.1 <i>Basic Frequencies and Cross-Tabulations</i>	24
2.6.2 <i>Other Comparative Data</i>	25
3. BONNYRIGG SURVEY FINDINGS	26
3.1 Total Respondents	26
3.2 Profile of Respondents	26
3.2.1 <i>Mini and Maxi Survey Respondents</i>	26
3.2.2 <i>Housing Tenure</i>	26
3.2.3 <i>Housing Type</i>	27
3.2.4 <i>Length of Time in Bonnyrigg</i>	27
3.2.5 <i>Gender</i>	27
3.2.6 <i>Age Profile</i>	28
3.2.7 <i>Family Structure</i>	28
3.2.8 <i>Family Nearby</i>	29
3.2.9 <i>Main Source of Income</i>	29
3.2.10 <i>Country of Birth and Language</i>	30
3.2.11 <i>Indigenous Respondents</i>	30
3.3 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg	30
3.3.1 <i>Positive and Negative Aspects</i>	31
3.3.2 <i>Overall Feelings About Bonnyrigg</i>	32
3.4 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg	32
3.4.1 <i>Knowledge of the Redevelopment</i>	32
3.4.2 <i>General Support for the Redevelopment</i>	32
3.4.2 <i>Overall Form of the Redevelopment</i>	33
3.4.3 <i>Preferred Tenure Mix Post-Renewal</i>	34
3.5 Housing and Locational Choice	34
3.5.1 <i>Locational Preference Prior to Announcement of Redevelopment</i>	34
3.5.2 <i>Locational Preference Post-Announcement of Redevelopment</i>	35
3.5.3 <i>Type of Housing Preferred Post-Redevelopment</i>	37
3.5.4 <i>Community Housing Options</i>	37
3.6 Improvement to Home at Own Cost	38
3.7 Special Needs	38
3.8 Pets	38
3.9 Involuntary Acquisition of Private Dwelling	38
3.10 Community Participation	39
3.10.1 <i>Anticipation of Opportunity to Participate</i>	39

3.10.2	<i>Desire to be Involved in Redevelopment</i>	40
3.11	Impacts of the Redevelopment	40
3.11.1	<i>Impacts So Far</i>	40
3.11.2	<i>Future Impacts</i>	41
3.12	Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services	41
3.13	Degree of 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood/s	41
3.14	Buckner Scale of 'Social Cohesion'	42
3.14.1	<i>Sense of Community</i>	42
3.14.2	<i>Attraction to Neighbourhood</i>	46
3.14.3	<i>Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood</i>	48
3.15	Safety	52
3.16	Volunteering	52
3.17	Attendance at Place of Worship	53
4.	COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF BUCKNER SCALE QUESTIONS FOR BONNYRIGG AND GWS	54
4.1	Sense of Community	54
4.1.1	<i>'I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood'</i>	54
4.1.2	<i>'The friendships and associations I have with other people in my neighbourhood mean a lot to me'</i>	54
4.1.3	<i>'Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community'</i>	54
4.2	Attraction to Neighbourhood	55
4.2.1	<i>'Overall I am very attracted to living in this neighbourhood'</i>	55
4.2.2	<i>'Given the opportunity I would like to move out of this suburb'</i>	55
4.2.3	<i>'I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years'</i>	56
4.3	Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood	57
4.3.1	<i>'I visit my neighbours in their homes'</i>	57
4.3.2	<i>'I believe my neighbours would help me in an emergency'</i>	58
4.3.3	<i>'I borrow things from my neighbours'</i>	58
4.3.4	<i>'I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood'</i>	59
4.3.5	<i>'I rarely invite people in my neighbourhood to my house to visit'</i>	60
4.3.6	<i>'I regularly stop and chat with people in my neighbourhood'</i>	61
5.	SELECTED CROSS-TABULATIONS	62
6.	PRIVATE AND SOCIAL HOUSING TENURE	63
6.1	Respondent Profile	63
6.2	Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg	64
6.3	Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg	64
6.4	Housing and Locational Choice	65
6.5	Community Participation	65
6.6	Impacts of the Redevelopment	66
6.7	Degree of 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood/s	66
6.7.1	<i>Sense of Community</i>	66
6.7.2	<i>Attraction to Neighbourhood</i>	67
6.7.3	<i>Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood</i>	68
6.8	Safety	68
6.9	Volunteering	69
6.10	Attendance at Place of Worship	69
7.	HOUSING TYPE	70
7.1	Background	70
7.2	Respondents Profile	70
7.3	Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg	70
7.4	Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg	71
7.5	Housing and Locational Choice	72
7.6	Community Housing Options	73
4		

7.7 Improvement to Home at Own Cost	73
7.8 Special Needs	73
7.9 Community Participation	74
7.10 Impacts of Redevelopment	75
7.11 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services	75
7.12 Degree of 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood/s	75
7.12.1 <i>Sense of Community</i>	75
7.12.2 <i>Attraction to Neighbourhood</i>	77
7.12.3 <i>Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood</i>	77
7.13 Safety	80
7.14 Volunteering and Attendance at Place of Worship	81
 8. ESTATE HALF (TARLIGTON & BUNKER PARADES)	 82
8.1 Profile of Respondents	82
8.2 Attitude of Life in Bonnyrigg	84
8.3 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg	84
8.4 Housing and Locational Choice	85
8.5 Community Housing Options	85
8.6 Improvement to Home at Own Cost	85
8.7 Special Needs	85
8.8 Community Participation	85
8.9 Impacts of the Redevelopment	85
8.10 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services	86
8.11 Degree of 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood/s	86
8.11.1 <i>Sense of Community</i>	86
8.11.2 <i>Attraction to Neighbourhood</i>	86
8.11.3 <i>Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood</i>	86
8.12 Safety	87
8.13 Volunteering	87
8.14 Attendance at Place of Worship	87
 9. TOWNHOUSES & COTTAGES IN HALVES OF ESTATE	 88
9.1 Respondent Profile	89
9.2 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg	91
9.3 Attitude to Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg	93
9.4 Housing and Locational Choice	93
9.5 Community Housing Options	93
9.6 Improvement to Home at Own Cost	94
9.7 Special Needs	94
9.8 Pets	94
9.9 Community Participation	95
9.10 Impacts of the Redevelopment	96
9.11 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services	99
9.12 Degree of 'Social Cohesion; in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood/s	100
9.12.1 <i>Sense of Community</i>	100
9.12.2 <i>Attraction to Neighbourhood</i>	103
9.12.3 <i>Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood</i>	105
9.13 Safety	110
9.14 Volunteering	111
9.15 Attendance at Local Place of Worship	111
 10. AUSTALIAN AND OVERSEAS BORN	 112
10.1 Background	112
10.2 Respondent Profile	112
10.3 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg	113
10.4 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg	114
10.5 Housing and Locational Choice	115
10.6 Improvement to Home at Own Cost	116

10.7 Community Participation	116
10.8 Impacts of the Redevelopment	116
10.9 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services	117
10.10 Degree of 'Social and Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood/s	118
10.10.1 Sense of Community	118
10.10.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood	119
10.10.3 Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood	120
10.11 Safety	121
10.12 Volunteering & Attendance at Place of Worship	121
 11. GENDER OF RESPONDENTS	 122
11.1 Respondent Profile	122
11.2 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg	122
11.3 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg	122
11.4 Housing and Locational Choice	122
11.5 Community Participation	123
11.6 Impacts of the Redevelopment	123
11.7 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services	123
11.8 'Social and Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood	124
11.8.1 Sense of Community	124
11.8.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood	124
11.8.3 Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood	124
11.9 Safety	124
11.10 Volunteering	124
11.11 Attendance at Place of Worship	124
 12. LENGTH OF TIME IN BONNYRIGG	 125
12.1 Respondent Profile	125
12.2 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg	126
12.3 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg	127
12.4 Housing and Locational Choice	128
12.5 Community Housing Options	128
12.6 Improvement to Home at Own Cost	129
12.7 Special Needs	129
12.8 Community Participation	129
12.9 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services	129
12.10 Degree of 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood/s	129
12.10.1 Sense of Community	129
12.10.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood	129
12.10.3 Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood	129
 13. AGE OF RESPONDENTS	 133
13.1 Respondent Profile	133
13.2 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg	134
13.3 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg	135
13.4 Housing and Locational Choice	136
13.5 Community Participation	136
13.6 Impacts of the Redevelopment	136
13.7 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services	136
13.8 Degree of 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood/s	137
13.8.1 Sense of Community	138
13.8.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood	138
13.8.3 Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood	138
13.9 Safety	138
13.10 Volunteering & Attendance at Place of Worship	138

14. DISCUSSION	139
14.1 Methodological Issues	139
14.2 Support for the Redevelopment and its Relationship to Views on Bonnyrigg and Understanding of Renewal	140
14.3 Preferred Directions for the Redevelopment	143
14.4 Preference to Remain in Bonnyrigg Pre- and Post- Renewal	145
14.5 Current and Anticipated Impacts	145
14.6 Social Cohesion	146
CONCLUSION	151

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1: Bonnyrigg Study Area and Precincts
Figure 2: Housing Tenure
Figure 3: Length of Time in Bonnyrigg
Figure 4: Gender
Figure 5: Age
Figure 6: Language
Figure 7: Overall Feelings About Living in Bonnyrigg
Figure 8: Attitude Towards Redevelopment
Figure 9: Preferred Form of Redevelopment
Figure 10: Preferred Tenure Mix
Figure 11: Locational Preference Pre-Announcement
Figure 12: Locational Preference Post-Announcement
Figure 13: Preferred Dwelling Type Post-Redevelopment
Figure 14: Attitude Towards Dwelling Acquisition
Figure 15: Anticipation of Opportunity to Participate
Figure 16: 'I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood'
Figure 17: 'The friendships and associations I have with other people in my neighbourhood mean a lot to me'
Figure 18: 'I think I agree with most people in my neighbourhood about what is important in life'
Figure 19: 'I feel loyal to the people in my neighbourhood'
Figure 20: 'I like to think of myself as similar to the people who live in this neighbourhood'
Figure 21: 'A strong feeling of friendliness exists in this neighbourhood'
Figure 22: 'Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community'
Figure 23: 'Overall I am very attracted to living in this neighbourhood'
Figure 24: 'Given the opportunity, I would like to move out of this neighbourhood'
Figure 25: 'I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years'
Figure 26: 'I visit my neighbours in their homes'
Figure 27: 'If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something I'd think of it as something "we" were doing rather than something "they" were doing'
Figure 28: 'If I needed advice I could go to someone in neighbourhood'
Figure 29: 'I believe my neighbours would help me in an emergency'
Figure 30: 'I borrow things from my neighbours'
Figure 31: 'I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood'
Figure 32: 'I rarely invite people in my neighbourhood to my house to visit'
Figure 33: 'I regularly stop and chat with people in my neighbourhood'
Figure 34: 'Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community'
Figure 35: 'Overall I am very attracted to living in this neighbourhood'
Figure 36: 'Given the opportunity I would like to move out of this suburb'
Figure 37: 'I plan to remain resident of this neighbourhood for a no. years'
Figure 38: 'I visit my neighbours in their homes'
Figure 39: 'I borrow things from my neighbours'
Figure 40: 'I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood'.
Figure 41: 'I rarely invite people in my neighbourhood to my house to visit'
Figure 42: 'I regularly stop and chat with people in my neighbourhood'
Figure 43A: How long have you lived in the Bonnyrigg area
Figure 43B: Do you support the redevelopment
Figure 44 'I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood'

Figure 45: Housing Type Distributions

Figure 46: Percentage of Respondents saying 'drugs' were negative

Figure 47: Support of Redevelopment

Figure 48: Preferred housing type post-redevelopment

Figure 49: Have opportunity to have say over what happens in future

Figure 50: 'Opportunity to get better home' as positive

Figure 51: 'I feel loyal to the people in my neighbourhood'

Figure 52: 'A strong feeling of friendliness exists in this society'

Figure 53: ' "We" vs. "they" '

Figure 54: 'If needed advice could go to neighbour'

Figure 55: 'I would be willing to work with others on something to improve neighbourhood'

Figure 56: 'When I'm alone at home during the night I feel safe'

Figure 57: 'I feel safe walking around my neighbourhood during the night'

Figure 58: Distribution of Public Households

Figure 59: Housing Type

Figure 60: No. of children

Figure 61: Housing Cluster Distribution

Figure 62: Age

Figure 63: Country of Birth

Figure 64: % of respondents reporting 'bad people' as negative

Figure 65: Support for redevelopment of the Bonnyrigg Estate

Figure 66: % of respondents having pets that require a backyard

Figure 67: Do you think you will have an opportunity to have a say over what happens to your area in the future?

Figure 68: Percentage of respondents saying that there was a current impact who said that this impact was more positive

Figure 69: Positive current impacts

Figure 70: Negative current impacts

Figure 71: Do you think future impact will be more positive or negative?

Figure 72: Negative future impacts

Figure 73: Satisfaction with standard of housing and services provided

Figure 74: I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood

Figure 75: I think I agree with most people in my neighbourhood about what is important in life

Figure 76: I feel loyal to the people in my neighbourhood

Figure 77: I like to think of myself as similar to the people who live in this neighbourhood

Figure 78: Overall I am very attracted to living in this neighbourhood

Figure 79: Given the opportunity, I would like to move out of this neighbourhood

Figure 80: I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years

Figure 81: If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something I'd think of it as something 'we' were doing rather than something they' were doing

Figure 82: If I needed advice about something I could go to someone in my neighbourhood

Figure 83: I believe my neighbours would help me in an emergency

Figure 84: I borrow things from my neighbours

Figure 85: I rarely invite people in my neighbourhood to my house to visit

Figure 86: I regularly stop and chat with people in neighbourhood

Figure 87: Do you think you will have the opportunity to have a say over what happens to your area in the future?

Figure 89: Length of time living in Bonnyrigg area

Figure 90: Reported 'positive aspects of life in Bonnyrigg area' found to have statistical significance between the two groups

Figure 91: Reported 'negative aspects of life in Bonnyrigg area' found to have statistical significance between the two groups

Figure 92: Desire form of redevelopment

Figure 93: Before the redevelopment was announced, did you want to stay in Bonnyrigg?

Figure 94: If house demolished during redevelopment, would you prefer to stay in Bonnyrigg or move to another area?

Figure 95: Satisfaction with current housing and services

Figure 96: 'I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood'

Figure 97: 'Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community'

Figure 98: 'I am very attracted to living in this neighbourhood'

Figure 99: 'I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years'

Figure 100: 'I rarely invite people in my neighbourhood to my house to visit'

Figure 101: % of Persons aged 55 and over by Years in Bonnyrigg

Figure 102: % of Persons less than 40 years by Years in Bonnyrigg

Figure 103: % of Persons with Children living with them by Years in Bonnyrigg

Figure 104: Breakdown of Estate Half by Years in Bonnyrigg

Figure 105: Estate Totally Redeveloped or Demolished by Years lived in Bonnyrigg

Figure 106: % Persons who had Intended to stay in Bonnyrigg for longer than 10 years prior to the Announcement of the Redevelopment

Figure 107: Agree with Statement "The friendships and associations I have with other people in my neighbourhood mean a lot to me"

Figure 108: Agree with Statement "I think I agree with most people in my neighbourhood about what is important in life"

Figure 109: Agree with Statement "I feel loyal to the people in my neighbourhood"

Figure 110: Agree with Statement "Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community"

Figure 111: Agree with Statement "Given the opportunity, I would like to move out of this neighbourhood"

Figure 112: Agree with Statement "I visit neighbours in their homes"

Figure 113: Housing Type by Public/Private and Age

Figure 114: Estate Half by Age

Figure 115: Housing Type by Age

Figure 116: Main source of income 'Pension or Benefits' by Age

Figure 117: Has Special Needs when finding housing by Age

Figure 118: Happy with Home by Age

Figure 119: Agree with Statement "I think I agree with most people in my neighbourhood about what is important in life" by Age

Figure 120: Agree with Statement "Overall I am attracted to living in this neighbourhood" by Age

Figure 121: Agree with Statement "I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood" by Age

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report sets out the findings of a household survey conducted in the Bonnyrigg *Living Communities* area between April and June 2005. The study was commissioned by the NSW Department of Housing to inform its planning for the Bonnyrigg estate. It forms a part of the Department's consultation strategy following the announcement of the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg by the NSW Minister for Housing, the Hon. Carl Scully, in December 2004.

The study finds that residents are generally very positive about life in Bonnyrigg, have a strong attachment to their community, and intend to remain long-term residents of their area. More than three-quarters of respondents felt 'positive' or 'very positive' about life in Bonnyrigg, whilst certain groups within the community are even more positive, notably those born in NES countries, and those older than 40 or who have lived longest in the area. They value Bonnyrigg's location close to services, shops, religious and cultural institutions and networks, and other attributes of the neighbourhood. They also value the sense of community and friendships that Bonnyrigg offers. The issue of '*good neighbours*' or '*neighbours who are more like family*' also came up frequently in respondents' comments about their future neighbourhood. The desire to retain such neighbours was expressed frequently.

Almost 80% of residents had intended to remain resident of Bonnyrigg in the long-term *prior* to the announcement of the redevelopment. However, they are less certain since the redevelopment has been announced, with more people now saying that they will reserve their view about whether they stay until the details of the redevelopment are finalised. Nonetheless, almost 70% still 'definitely' or 'probably' want to remain in Bonnyrigg post-redevelopment.

There was generally little difference between the various groups within the community in terms of feelings about the area, and intention to stay (for example those in cottages versus townhouses, or private versus public housing). This provides an indication that those in private housing as well as newer migrant groups have settled well in the area, and that it provides them with an environment in which they are generally happy to remain. It also indicates that townhouse areas are less problematic than in some other estates, physically and socially.

The study also found that the Bonnyrigg community rated their neighbourhood as having a higher level of 'social cohesion' on the Buckner-scale than those in previous surveys of Greater Western Sydney (GWS). Bonnyrigg respondents were particularly positive about indicators related to 'attraction to neighbourhood' compared with respondents from GWS. They were significantly more likely to report that they were '*attracted to living in their neighbourhood*', and that they '*planned to remain residents of their neighbourhood*'. In terms of Buckner's 'sense of community', Bonnyrigg respondents were equally or slightly more likely to report positively on most of these indicators, including the importance of '*neighbourhood friendships and associations*', and feelings of '*belonging*'. In terms of the 'interaction with neighbourhood' aspect of 'social cohesion', responses from GWS and Bonnyrigg were relatively similar.

These positive findings are also related to the strong sense of attachment that many cultural groups have with the Bonnyrigg area. In fact, there appears to be considerable benefits from the clustering of different cultural groups within the estate. People from the same cultural or language group provide mutual support, whilst friendships with English speaking neighbours was also reported as having positive impacts. It was common for respondents to report that they assisted or received assistance from others in their neighbourhood in gaining access to official services that their lack of English would otherwise deny them. As well as providing a conduit to mainstream activities, it was reported to reduce social isolation for many

overseas born residents. The survey found that 60% of respondents had close family living in or near Bonnyrigg. This was enhanced by the presence of a range of cultural and religious organisations close to the estate, particularly the various places of worship surrounding the estate. Those born overseas were twice as likely to report that they attended a place of worship near Bonnyrigg than those born in Australia. The degree of social mix afforded by the area's cultural diversity and the level of positive interaction between residents found in the study indicates that in many ways Bonnyrigg is a unique estate.

Despite the strongly positive findings about their attachment and attraction to Bonnyrigg, the study also finds the Bonnyrigg community relatively optimistic about the potential for an improved physical and social environment, with 65% of respondents generally supporting the renewal of their area. However, it is important to note that this support was heavily qualified by resident expectations and what they understood would happen in the redevelopment. Residents appear to have understood the Department's message that everyone who wants to remain in Bonnyrigg will have the choice to do so, and that there are expected to be significant physical and social improvements arising from the renewal. Residents have also understood that there will be more private housing in the area, but that a majority of public housing (in absolute terms) will be replaced or retained in Bonnyrigg. However, a considerable degree of uncertainty still surrounds issues of density, how the different housing tenures will be configured, and the types of choices that public tenants will actually have. Reservations expressed by respondents generally related to these types of factors. As such, whilst there was often optimism about the future, this was generally accompanied by comments that indicated that support for the redevelopment was dependent upon *'being sure I can come back'*, *'that I can keep my garden (or have a similar one)'*, *'that I get a better house'* or *'definitely don't have to live in a flat'*. Meeting the current expectations of residents, dealing with issues of density, housing configuration, and accommodating all who want to return, are likely to be key challenges for the renewal.

The relatively positive feelings evident in Bonnyrigg about renewal activities are perhaps not surprising given findings in urban renewal literature that *any* activity in an area which has experienced physical or social neglect is likely to be well regarded by residents, and that 'participation alone' can lead to many of the desired outcomes irrespective of other renewal strategies implemented. The added benefit of an active Intensive Tenancy Management (ITM) presence in Bonnyrigg is also important in building confidence that 'something positive' is happening on the estate. Finally, the consultation process that has been in place for the past 6 months also means that residents are relatively well-informed about the redevelopment. They are generally optimistic about the potential to be involved in the redevelopment in the future, though just over one third believed that they would have 'little or no opportunity' to have a say over what happens in the redevelopment. Overall, the current attitude among many in this community provides an excellent basis from which to build participatory approaches to estate renewal. Again, maintaining the confidence of the community throughout the planning phase will be a significant challenge. It will be equally important to have an open and transparent *process*, and provide the *outcomes* that the community hope for and expect.

Planning for *which* areas will be redeveloped, upgraded and/or variously reconfigured requires far more detailed input than this survey can currently provide. The survey findings do not, for example, provide a rationale for automatically redeveloping all townhouse areas and upgrading all cottage areas. In fact, a majority of residents favour a more gradual, partial or selective renewal rather than substantial demolition. This indicates a need for detailed and sophisticated planning at the small area (street or precinct) level. How such planning is to be accommodated in the PPP process may present significant challenges for the project.

In terms of public-private mix, residents appeared to have limited concern with more abstract notions of 'social mix', but very practical concerns that there is sufficient social housing to provide for the substantial majority who wish to remain in the neighbourhood. There were some perceived benefits of introducing a higher component of private housing. However, only 20% of respondents agreed that social housing should be reduced to 30% or less. Around 80% of respondents preferred at a 50-50 mix of private and public housing, whilst 44% were generally satisfied with a similar arrangement to the present mix (90% public housing), or did not consider increased private mix to be an issue. Some concerns were also expressed about the *nature* of the community that will emerge if there is a majority of private housing, including comments that social housing tenants could become '*outsiders in their own area*', or '*looked down on*' by the private home owners. Much will rely upon the sensitivity with which the estate is planned and configured, for example, the clustering versus dispersal of social housing, or housing allocated to different groups (e.g. older people with a common language). Such planning is probably one of the greatest challenges for the success of the redevelopment, and requires detailed, sensitive and creative design, with extensive and ongoing community involvement.

In terms of type of housing, the strong preference for detached housing continued to be evident among respondents. Close to 80% of social housing respondents would choose a freestanding house with a private backyard if they had a choice post-redevelopment. Only 3% would select a flat or unit, and about 10% would choose a villa. Over 70% of respondents had dependent children living with them, though not always young children. Around 45% reported that they had pets that needed a back yard. The survey findings indicate that there may be strong resistance among a majority of residents to moving into high density living, and that this is likely to be a significant issue if there is to be community acceptance of redevelopment plans. Such tradeoffs between the desire to stay in Bonnyrigg, the volume of stock required, and the need to increase densities are inevitable in such PPP models of estate renewal.

Finally, Community Housing is not yet a tenure with which the vast majority of respondents have any familiarity. There appeared to be some concerns about relative housing security, rental costs and management, which influenced the extent to which respondents felt they could commit themselves to community housing at this time. A further factor is the relatively high level of satisfaction with their housing among public tenants, and the reasonable level of satisfaction with Departmental services. Again, the ITM also appears to have played a role in encouraging a positive image of the Department among tenants and others in the community.

As far as future impacts are concerned, a majority report that there have already been impacts from the redevelopment, with a majority of these experiencing these negatively. The main impacts noted were increased family stress, or fears about the future, including loss of home, neighbours or location. There are considerable opportunities to mitigate real and perceived impacts of the redevelopment in the immediate and longer-term, provided adequate consideration of social and economic impacts are factored into the Masterplanning phase, and policies and procedures are developed and implemented in close consultation with the community, and monitored as to their effectiveness as mitigative measures.

The challenges of the Bonnyrigg redevelopment are considerable. However, the survey findings indicate a sound foundation on which to build future collaboration with private and social housing residents in Bonnyrigg, and a degree of optimism in an improved future. Much is likely to depend upon the extent to which the community can be involved in shaping the future direction of their area, as well as managing and accommodating the differences that are already evident between the needs and aspirations of individual households and planning for the renewal of Bonnyrigg.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to Study

This report sets out the findings of a household survey conducted in the Bonnyrigg *Living Communities* area between April and June 2005. The study was commissioned by the NSW Department of Housing to inform its planning for Bonnyrigg estate. It forms a part of the Department's consultation strategy following the announcement of the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg by the NSW Minister for Housing, the Hon. Carl Scully, in December 2004. The survey was carried out by UNSW/UWS AHURI Research Centre in association with Judith Stubbs & Associates, under the auspices of the University of NSW, and in accordance with the *Aims and Scope of Services* outlined in the Department's *Project Brief for Consultants*.

The study provides a timely opportunity for both private and public housing residents in Bonnyrigg to put forward their views and aspirations about their community in general, and the future redevelopment of their area in particular. A further advantage of conducting the survey at this time is that it can provide both geographically and temporally comparative data. In the first instance, it allows for comparisons between Bonnyrigg and other estates undergoing a similar renewal or redevelopment process. In terms of temporal comparisons, the survey provides an opportunity to undertake a longitudinal study of the effects of estate renewal on Bonnyrigg; for example, on any changes in the perceptions and life experiences of residents as their community changes, or they are relocated to other areas (changes in what may be termed 'social cohesion').

Given nature of the survey instrument and the large sample size achieved, the study provides findings that have a high level of confidence. It was able to reach residents who have not participated in other forums and workshops conducted by the Department over the past six months, as well as those who *have* attended some or all of the other consultation opportunities. In this way, the survey provides valuable data from a wide and representative cross-section of Bonnyrigg residents.

However, it is not intended that the survey provide detailed information on each individual household and their particular needs and wishes at this stage. Such detailed information will be gathered by the Department as part of more detailed planning, relocation and allocations processes as the redevelopment or renewal progresses.

It is also not intended that the survey form the basis of definitive decisions about individual streets or small areas. There are two principal limitations in this regard. First, even though the 'maxi' survey with its more detailed questions was asked of a random sample across different population groups in the estate, some streets did not yield enough respondents to provide statistically significant findings at this level. More importantly, the survey was conducted at a time when there was still uncertainty surrounding a number key planning decisions for the estate. It could be that residents' views change when a detailed Masterplan is released for exhibition and comment, for example.

Nonetheless, statistical significance was achieved for a range of key variables, including discreet demographic and geographic 'communities' or 'populations' within the study area. Statistically significant cross-tabulations are reported, as well as trends that are relevant to estate planning which may have a lower level of confidence. These often provide clear guidance about the way that certain areas or groups may react to the redevelopment, and the broad strategies that may be most appropriate for different areas or social groups that make up the Bonnyrigg area. The

sample obtained is therefore large and diverse enough to provide a sound foundation for initial estate planning.

As such, the survey provides a comprehensive 'snap shot' of an area facing significant change, and provides valuable data on that community. However, far more detailed and ongoing follow up work will be required as the details of estate renewal or redevelopment emerge, and the Bonnyrigg community (or different groups within it) are presented with more detailed plans for their homes and area.

1.2 Context of the Bonnyrigg Redevelopment

Bonnyrigg is the first public housing estate where the Department of Housing's new *Living Communities* program is being rolled out. There are three core elements to the *Living Communities* program. These are:

- Community building activities, including strengthening existing community networks, and supporting the activities of the community and NGOs in the area;
- Improving community services and life opportunities, including improving programs related to community safety, employment and education, children, families and young people, health and community support, and estate amenity including rubbish removal and graffiti removal; and
- Improving housing and open space areas, including improvement of estate layout, closure of walkways, upgrades to some housing and replacement of other stock depending on condition and configuration; and increasing private mix.

It is also likely that there will be increased density overall within the Bonnyrigg *Living Communities* area, with the existing 927 homes increasing to around 2000. In the process, it is proposed that the existing 828 social housing dwellings would be reduced to around 600, with the balance (228 homes) replaced offsite. The current public-private mix would change from the existing 89% social housing to around 30%, with possible transfer of management of a significant proportion of stock to a community housing organisation (existing or created for that purpose).

At this stage, it is thought that increased dwelling numbers will be achieved through more efficient use of under-utilised public open space, redevelopment (demolition) and/or consolidation of selected housing, total or partial redevelopment of selected small areas or precincts, and development of higher density accommodation in areas where this is permissible under the Fairfield Local Environmental Plan (near Bonnyrigg Plaza). The redevelopment is expected to take up to 10 years, commencing in 2006. The extent of redevelopment has therefore not been decided.

The Department is placing considerable emphasis on a 'partnership' approach to its *Living Communities* program in Bonnyrigg. This includes engaging the local community in a range of ongoing consultations, and the development of advisory bodies, including the Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group, made up of local residents, government agencies and NGOs working in the local area. The Department also aims to improve social infrastructure and programs through working with a range of local agencies and building on existing services and networks.

A key part of its strategy for Bonnyrigg will be the development of a Public-Private Partnership (PPP), and the engagement of a private sector partner to undertake most aspects of the redevelopment, including development of a Masterplan and preparatory studies, demolition and rebuild and/or upgrade of housing, and estate reconfiguration and infrastructure development. It is possible that the private partner may ultimately be responsible for ensuring that a range of social objectives are also

met, including development of improved services and facilities, place management, and management of social housing (e.g. in conjunction with a community housing provider).

The exact form that the PPP will take has not been determined at this stage. At the time of writing, various consortia have responded to an initial Expression of Interest put out by the Department, who will select a shortlist to prepare a full response to the project brief. It is expected that the private sector partner will be selected in March 2006, and Masterplanning for the estate will commence in the second half of 2006.

As such, the Bonnyrigg *Living Communities* program aims to incorporate a range of 'community renewal' and 'urban renewal' strategies,¹ with an emphasis on the interrelationship between the physical and social renewal of the estate.² However, achieving a balance between the two is likely to prove a considerable challenge if experiences in other estates currently undergoing such a transition are considered.³

Like the redevelopment other housing estates in NSW and other Australian states, there are a range of imperatives driving the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg. As well as the Department's social objectives noted above, there are increasing financial or asset based imperatives to redevelop large public housing estates. At the same time, social housing communities have increasing expectations that they be consulted on estate renewal, and have the opportunity to participate in renewal activities as real 'partners', and approach that is also reviewed favourably in urban renewal literature.⁴ Social housing providers and residents may have widely differing perceptions of the estate, and its strengths and weaknesses, and varying definitions of problems and effective solutions. The redevelopment of substantial sections of an estate like Bonnyrigg, with a large diverse, and what appears to a relatively cohesive community (or communities), thus provides substantial challenges to achieve a balance between social and physical renewal, as well as negotiating a path between the differing views among residents, as well as the various stakeholders, that will inevitably emerge, and are already evident in the survey results.

¹ Wood, Randolph & Judd (2002) for example draw a distinction between 'Urban Renewal' which they maintain has been used to describe primarily asset-based or physical renewal activities, and 'Community Renewal' which they note has generally been used to refer to social and economic community development activities. A further distinction has been made by Jacobs, Arthurson & Randolph (2004) who maintain that 'renewal' tends to refer to more physically oriented strategies, while 'regeneration' more commonly refers to a wider set of practices and includes practices such as community participation and community development.

² The NSW Department of Housing has itself used different terminology over time and in relation to different activities. For example, the term 'Neighbourhood Improvement' was largely though not exclusively related to the physical upgrades and estate redesign associated with the NIP in the mid- to late 1990s, which was superseded by the 'Community Renewal Strategy' in 1999, and the Community Renewal Program in 2003. The latter had an increased focus on social and economic development activities and objectives. See also Jacobs, Arthurson & Randolph 2004; Wood, Randolph and Judd 2002; and Stubbs & Hardy 2000). 'Urban Redevelopment' in the current context more readily relates to the large-scale demolition and/or disposal of public housing stock, and the relocation or dispersal of tenants from areas of high public housing concentration (though often to other areas of high concentration) (DOH 2004a).

³ See for example Stubbs, J. 2005, *Leaving Minto: A Study of the Social and Economic Impacts of Public Housing Estate Redevelopment*, MRAG and the Social Justice and Social Change Research Centre, UWS.

⁴ See literature reviewed in Stubbs, J. & Storer, J. 1996, *Social Cost Benefit Analysis of Neighbourhood Improvement Program: Case Study Airds*, NSW Department of Housing.

A participatory approach to estate renewal or redevelopment will ensure that all views can be better taken into account in planning and implementing renewal strategies. A key component of such an approach is a thorough consultation process prior to major decisions being made about the direction of estate renewal. This survey provides a strong foundation for incorporating diverse resident views into the planning and renewal process.

1.3 Characteristics of the Bonnyrigg Estate

1.3.1 Composition and Layout

The Bonnyrigg study area contains 927 dwellings of which 812 are public housing, 11 are leased to and managed by community housing, 13 are owned by the Aboriginal Housing Office (HFA), and 99 are privately owned. That is, a total of 828 are owned by social housing providers, with the balance in private ownership, principally owner-occupancy.

HFA and Community Housing is scattered around the estate. Privately owned housing included in the study area is made up of newer housing which is clustered (principally around the central section of Tarlington Parade at Louise Place and Emma Close); or scattered throughout the public housing cottage areas (principally former public housing that has been purchased by former tenants or those from outside the estate). Private housing is coloured 'white' on the following map (see Figure 1 below).

A further cluster of public housing was also included in the survey at request of the Department as it is in close proximity to the study area - 30 aged units at Bibby's Place to the north of the estate, across Bonnyrigg Avenue.

The estate is laid out in the 'Radburn' design, with separation between pedestrian and vehicular access, walkways providing links between different sections of the estate and open space and community and retail facilities, and many houses facing onto these open space areas or walkways. The backs of the houses frequently 'face' the street, with a carport or garage opening onto the street. Housing in selected section of the estate have been refurbished, and houses realigned to a more conventional orientation (areas around the southern end of Tarlington Parade) under the former Neighbourhood Improvement Program. However, the majority of the estate has not been upgraded in this way.

The study area is effectively divided into two geographical 'halves', with no vehicular movement possible between the two sections. Streets are thus clustered around the two principal thoroughfares: Tarlington Parade in the western half of the estate, and Bunker Parade, in the Eastern half. The various streets in the two estate halves are further segmented into generally discreet cottage areas townhouse areas. The 'light brown' coloured section are public housing, divided into townhouse areas (superlots shown as one non-segmented area on the following map); and cottage areas (Torrens titled areas which are shown with defined blocks) (see **Figure 1** below).




Figure 1: Bonnyrigg Study Area and Precincts

1.3.2 Demographic Overview

At the time of the 2001 Census, the total population of the study area was 3300 people.

Apart from the high proportion of social housing, one of the most significant demographic factors is the degree of cultural and linguistic diversity in the study area. At the time of the 2001 Census, around one-half of these people were born overseas. Some 43% reported that they did not speak English or did not speak it well compared with only 4.4% for Sydney Statistical Division (SSD). Of these, the most common languages spoken were: English (30.3%), Vietnamese (26.4%), Khmer (7.0%), Arabic (6.4%), Chinese (5.6%) and Spanish (4%). The survey sample as well as discussions with Departmental staff indicate that the community has become even more culturally diverse since the Census.

Not surprisingly, the Bonnyrigg Study Area also differs considerably from NSW and SSD on a range of other socio-economic indicators. It has a much higher general unemployment rate, lower household income levels, and a much younger age structure. Levels of formal qualifications were also somewhat lower than for NSW and SSD. There were also slightly more people from an Indigenous background living in Bonnyrigg.

Selected indicators for SSD, NSW and the study area (based on aggregated CCDs) are set out in Table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1: Selected Indicators of Socio-Economic Indicators

Selected Indicators		NSW	SSD	Bonnyrigg Stud Area
Income Levels	Individual Median Income	\$300-\$399	\$400-\$499	\$160-\$199
	Household Median Income	\$800-\$999	\$800-\$899	\$400-\$499
Unemployment (15 + years as a % of L/M)	General	7.20%	6.11%	29.2%
Age Profile	Median Age	35	33	27
	Under 18 Years of Age	24.7%	24.0%	34.6%
	Over 65 years	13.1%	12.0%	10.3%
English Language Proficiency	Speaks English 'not well or not at all'	3.0%	4.4%	43.4%
	Top 3 language groups	Chinese (3.2%) Arabic (2.3%) Italian (1.5%)	Chinese (4.9%), Arab (3.6%), Greek (2.1%)	Vietnamese (26.4%) Khmer (7.0%) Arabic (6.4%)
	Speaks Language other than English at home	18.8%	27.3%	67.5%
Public Housing Resident		4.9%	5.1%	89.0%
Low Educational Level	Left school before completing Year 10	18.8%	15.9%	22.7%
Aboriginality		1.9%	0.9%	2.9%

(Source: ABS 2001 Census)

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims and Objectives of the Study

The main purpose of the study is to provide comprehensive and statistically reliable input to planning for Bonnyrigg Living Communities area, and to enhance the consultation process on estate renewal or redevelopment. Two broad aims are related to this:

1. To provide basic information about housing and locational needs and preferences as part of planning for estate renewal or redevelopment;
2. To gain a more detailed understanding of the relationship of residents to their community, precinct or estate, as a context to developing appropriate strategies for renewal or redevelopment.

As such, four main study objectives were identified by the Department, these being to:

1. Identify resident behaviour, perceptions and attitudes towards Bonnyrigg and their dwellings;
2. Establish baseline data on social cohesion in the community;
3. Identify the numbers of public housing tenants who would prefer to stay in the area or move to another location and, if they would prefer to move, their preferred place of residence;
4. Broadly identify resident perceptions and attitudes towards being tenants of the Department relative to becoming tenants of a community housing provider, and tenant willingness to make such a transition.

These aims and objective underpinned the development of the methodology outlined below.

2.2 Design of Methodology

There were two main inputs to the design of the methodology.

- A **Project Reference Group (PRG)** provided initial guidance on the development of the study methodology. The PRG was made up of representatives of the NSW Department of Housing, Fairfield City Council, and academics and practitioners engaged in urban renewal studies or activities in Bonnyrigg and other estates.

Specifically, this group determined that a detailed survey of a representative sample of social housing and private-tenure households in the Bonnyrigg Living Communities area would be conducted, and that the survey would:

- Incorporate a range of questions from different sources to meet the aims and objectives outlined above. This included questions based on a previous study of Minto redevelopment conducted by one of the authors of the current report;⁵ several sets of questions related to measure of 'social cohesion' in Bonnyrigg; and other questions of interest to the Department in its planning for estate redevelopment;

⁵ See Stubbs 2005 *op cit*.

- Achieve appropriate levels of confidence across the total sample and, for selected variables including length of residence, type and tenure of housing, respondent age, ethnicity and family structure, and appropriate small area comparisons;
 - Be conducted face to face;
 - Ensure access through extensive use of interpreters and bilingual interviewers, and appropriate survey logistics;
 - Incorporate a mixture of close (pre-coded) questions, and open ended questions that could be either coded at the time of data entry, or analysed and reported as qualitative data (respondent comments) to better understand quantitative responses; and
 - Be consultative in the development of questions and methods used.
- A second level of input to the study's methodology came from the **Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group (BCRG)**, made up of a diverse range of government agencies and NGOs, and private and social housing resident representatives. The BCRG agreed with the general direction of methodology put forward by the PRG. However, it also put forward the following suggestions, which were incorporated into the study's methodology.
 - Ensure that all residents in the study area were given adequate opportunity to participate in the survey, rather than a representative sample (originally the survey was to involve a random sample of 350 households);
 - Expand the range of questions to include issues which they believed to be of primary concern to residents affected;
 - Ensure that there was regular feedback to the BCRG on the progress of the survey, and the results as they became available.

2.3 Development of Survey Instrument (Questionnaire)

The survey instrument was developed over three meetings (one with the PRG and two with the BCRG), with additional input received from members of these groups outside of formal meetings. The survey was further refined through being piloted with two groups: a group of colleagues and human service representatives, and with interviewers (including bi-lingual workers) recruited and trained to administer the survey (see below).

In designing and implementing the survey, the cultural and linguistic diversity of the Bonnyrigg community was a critical factor. The draft survey was translated into the main community languages in order to ensure its wording was appropriate for different cultural groups.

A range of introductory material in plain English was also developed, and translated into the main community languages. Again, this material was developed in consultation with the Project and Community Reference Groups, and was reviewed by bi-lingual workers and the translation service to ensure its cultural and linguistic appropriateness. Documents provided to interviewees at different stages of the process are included at **Attachment A**.

Taking into account the various purposes for which the information was to be used, as well as resource constraints, it was decided that a two-level survey instrument would be developed. The instruments would include different types of sampling, depth of questions and methods of administration. These two levels were:

- **An in-depth ('maxi-') survey** that sought to gain detailed information from a statistically reliable sample of residents (350) across the whole population, and on key variables. It was decided that this 'maxi-survey' would be administered face-to-face. In addition to the basic topics covered in the 'mini-survey' (see below), additional questions were added to allow for a more detailed understanding of residents' perceptions and experiences. The maxi-survey included a mix of quantitative (closed, pre-coded questions), and more qualitative (open ended, free response post- or pre-coded) questions). The more detailed sections included questions about resident behaviour, perceptions and attitudes towards Bonnyrigg and their dwellings, levels of satisfaction, and aspirations for their area. Some sets of questions were consistent with those previously used by some of the authors to establish baseline data on social cohesion in the community (the 'Buckner-scale' described below). It was designed to take from 20 to 40 minutes to deliver.

Due to the need to achieve sufficient confidence in the findings, it was decided that up to three callbacks would be allowed for to gain a face-to-face interview with the required number of households. As well as ensuring a high response rate, multiple callbacks and face to face interviewing also provided increased accessibility for residents with barriers to participation (e.g. for those with low levels of functional literacy, or who are identified as requiring an interpreter on the first call around). Callbacks were also planned for different times and days, and most surveying was scheduled for Thursday through Sunday during daylight hours. This was to maximise access for residents with differing commitments, for example those who worked, or played weekend sport. Those who were not home on the third callbacks were left a copy of the 'mini-survey' with translated materials, and details for later collection and assistance if required (see **Attachment B** for the 'maxi-survey' pro forma).

- Participation in **a core ('mini-) survey'** was offered to all remaining residents of the Bonnyrigg study area who were not selected to participate in the 'maxi-survey', potentially providing for a 'census' of all households in the study area for key questions. The 'mini-survey' mainly included closed (pre-coded) questions, and focussed on residents' pre-and post-renewal preferences in housing, location and desired future qualities of their area. It included the collection of data on basic demographic characteristics, and special needs, as well as questions related to their preference to remain in their area or be relocated, preferred housing provider, and overall positive or negative views toward the area.

The 'mini-survey' was designed to take from 5 to 15 minutes to conduct (or fill out) to increase the likelihood of response. To increase access and response rate, the first call around involved a face-to-face interview. If the respondent was not at home, the survey was left with relevant information and translated materials, and a form setting out the pickup time and place was left with the survey. Respondents were also given the options of leaving the survey at the Department of Housing office at the Mall. The option to have the survey collected later was also given to all respondents if they did not wish to be interviewed in person (see **Attachment D** for the 'mini-survey' pro forma).

In the case of both surveys, the option was always made available to be interviewed by an interpreter (or by one of the bilingual interviewers if their language was available), even if this exceeded the allotted number of callbacks. A letter under the University's letterhead was also sent to everyone in the study area one week prior to the survey taking place to ensure that residents were prepared for the initial call around. This letter and all other documentation complied with the University's ethics requirements, and emphasised that the survey was confidential and voluntary (see **Attachment A**).

2.4 Selection of Sample for Maxi Surveys

Using the hypergeometric test, it was found that a total of 350 or more maxi surveys would need to be completed in order to obtain the required confidence (ie. 95% plus or minus 2.5% at the 50% statistic). In order to allow for refusals and people not being at home, 450 households were initially selected for maxi surveys with the rest being selected for minis.

The sample was randomly selected. However, in order to achieve an appropriate level of confidence for the smaller populations, most of the members of these smaller 'populations' were included in the sample. As such, the sampling was a form of stratified cluster sample.

The selection process was as follows:

- All households that were part of the private enclave were selected for a maxi. The private enclave was made up as follows:
 - All houses on Louise Place (a total of 13 households);
 - All houses on Emma Close (a total of 8 households);
 - Even number on Tarlington Parade from 26 to 36, plus 6,8 and 8a (a total of 9 households); and
 - Odd numbers on Cabramatta Road West from 677 to 703 (a total of 10 households).
 - The private enclave was made up of a total of 40 households.
- A further 41 of those private households that were scattered around the estate were randomly selected for maxis, which made 81 of the 116 private households that were given maxis.
- Of the 30 aged units on Bibby's Place, 25 were randomly selected for maxis.
- All of the 13 households scattered throughout the estate that were Aboriginal housing were given maxis.
- All of the 11 households scattered throughout the estate that were community housing were allocated maxis.
- Of the 737 DOH households, 327 were randomly selected for maxis. These were selected so that each street gave a representative number of maxis (see **Figure 1** above to review locations).

2.5 Recruitment and Training

Recruitment of appropriate interviewees was a vital part of the survey process. Advertisements for experienced (including bi-lingual) staff were placed through job network agencies in Fairfield-Liverpool sub-region, and also with local health and welfare agencies and ethno-specific services. The project was successful in attracting nine experienced interviewers, six of them bi-lingual (four Vietnamese, one Arabic, and one Khmer-speaking). Interpreters were contracted to assist with other less common languages, with around 80 interpreter sessions conducted (mainly Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, Lao and Serbian).

Two group training sessions were conducted for interviewers. These training sessions involved information on the purpose and the challenges of delivering the survey, an orientation to the estate, briefing on processes and logistics, and directions on OHS issues and maintaining personal safety. They also focused on methods of delivering the survey, and a modelling and discussion of appropriate recording techniques and note taking. The first training session also acted as a one of the pilots for the survey, and assisted with its further refinement as noted above.

Field supervision and regular debriefing was consistently available, and one of the team leaders was generally available at all times in the field, or otherwise contactable by mobile phone in the event of any questions or problems arising.

Recruitment and training materials are provided at **Attachment D**.

2.6 Analysis

2.6.1 Basic Frequencies and Cross-Tabulations

All of the information obtained from the questionnaires was entered into the program SPSS, and overall frequencies cross-tabulations produced. Cross-tabs were completed for all questions by the following:

- Private and social housing tenures – attitudes of respondents living in private housing on the estate (either owned or rented) were compared with attitudes of those living in social housing (either DOH, community housing or Aboriginal housing).
- Housing type – attitudes of respondents living in cottages were compared with attitudes of those living in townhouses. Only those respondents living in social housing were considered.
- Estate half – attitudes of respondents living on either side of the estate were compared. Only those living in social housing were considered.
- Population cluster – attitudes of respondents living in four social housing clusters were considered.
- Australian and overseas born – attitudes of respondents born in Australia were compared with attitudes of those born overseas.
- Gender – attitudes of male respondents were compared with those of female respondents.
- Length of time in Bonnyrigg – attitudes of respondents were compared based upon how long they had lived on the estate.
- Age – attitudes of respondents were compared based on their age.

Differences between the attitudes of the groups mentioned were tested as to whether or not they were statistically significant differences using the binomial test with a 95% confidence interval (ie. an alpha value of 0.05). Populations were assumed to be infinite for the purposes of this test, which, at worst, is a conservative assumption.

2.6.2 Other Comparative Data

The survey included 18 questions based on the Buckner (1988) scale of social cohesion (also discussed in the *Findings* section below).

Maxi' survey respondents were read a series of statements, and were asked to nominate their level of agreement with these statements, referring to their own 'neighbourhood'. Specifically, they were given a 5 point scale (Lichert-scale), and asked to select whether they 'strongly agreed', 'agreed', 'neither agreed nor disagreed', 'disagreed' or 'strongly disagreed with the statements. These questions were grouped for analysis according to the three dimension of Buckner's 'social cohesion' ('sense of community', 'attraction to neighbourhood', and 'interaction with neighbourhood').

Comparisons were also drawn between the results of the current survey and those from one previously conducted across diverse neighbourhoods in Greater Western Sydney by authors of this report. In the case of the previous Western Sydney survey, an abridged set of questions were asked (12 in all). As such, comparison is only possible between this more limited set of questions.

As noted earlier, the number of households on the Bonnyrigg Estate is approximately 900, and from these the number of households who were asked the 18 Buckner-scale questions was 348. This was sufficient for a high level of confidence to be achieved in the findings. The number of households in Greater Western Sydney (GWS) is around 600,000. From these households, 776 were asked the Buckner Scale questions in the earlier survey used for comparative purposes. These households were randomly selected from CCDs across Western Sydney, and can therefore be assumed to be a representative sample. It is assumed that this provided reasonable confidence in the findings drawn from this survey.

Binomial tests were run on the results from these two samples in order to find any differences of statistical significance between the attitudes of people in the general Greater Western Sydney area and those who live on the Bonnyrigg Estate. For the purposes of this test, the populations were both assumed to be infinite which, at worst, is a conservative view to take for this purpose. A confidence interval of 95% was used for all tests ($\alpha = 0.05$).

3. BONNYRIGG SURVEY FINDINGS

3.1 Total Respondents

This section provides an overview of survey findings for all respondents (basic frequencies). Later in this section, findings on questions related to the Buckner scale of 'social cohesion' are contrasted with those from a study of Greater Western Sydney. The comparison with Western Sydney overall provides a useful benchmark for the Bonnyrigg population. This is followed by a detailed review of a range of cross-tabulations conducted on key variables where there was sufficient responses to make such comparisons possible.

3.2 Profile of Respondents

3.2.1 Mini and Maxi Survey Respondents

A total of 666 of the 927 Bonnyrigg households responded to the survey (72% of households). Of these:

- 350 completed 'maxi' (expanded) surveys; and
- 316 completed 'mini' (basic) surveys, containing questions common to both types of surveys.

3.2.2 Housing Tenure

Of those surveyed:

- 576 (86%) lived in public housing;
- 67 (10%) lived in private housing, 62 as owners and 5 as tenants;
- 12 (2%) were Aboriginal Housing tenants; and
- 11 (2%) lived in community housing.

The current tenure mix in the study area is around 88% social housing (mainly public housing), and 12% private housing (mainly owner occupied). As such, the sample was reasonably representative of this breakdown, with a slightly lower proportion of private residents in the sample.




Figure 2

3.2.3 Housing Type

In terms of housing type, respondent were distributed as follows:

- 434 (65%) in cottages (367 public and 67 private);
- 190 (28%) in townhouses (all public);
- 7 (2%) in flats or units; and
- 24 (7%) in 'other' (which were aged persons units at Bibby's Place).

3.2.4 Length of Time in Bonnyrigg

A majority of survey respondents (52%) had lived in Bonnyrigg more than 10 years, while just over one quarter had lived there for 20 years or more, with the following more detailed breakdown:

- Less than 2 years 13%
- 2-4 years 15%
- 5-9 years 20%
- 10-19 years 27%
- 20-24 years 17%
- 25 or more years 8%




Figure 3

3.2.5 Gender

Respondents were heavily skewed toward females, with only one-third of respondents male (33%).




Figure 4

3.2.6 Age Profile

The spread of ages of respondents was as follows:

- 6% were less than 25 years;
- 24% were aged 25-39 years;
- 34% were 40-54 years old;
- 26% were 55-69 years;
- 10% were 70 or older.




Figure 5

3.2.7 Family Structure

Whilst just under 28% of respondents did not have dependent children living with them, 72% reported that they did with:

- 52% having 2 or less children;

- 18% had 3-4 children; and
- 2% had 5 or more children.

3.2.8 Family Nearby

More than 60% of respondents reported that they had family members living relatively close by, with the main suburbs noted as Bonnyrigg, Cabramatta, Bosley Park, or elsewhere in the Fairfield LGA.

3.2.9 Main Source of Income

A strong majority of respondents reported that their main source of income was from government income support, with:

- 77 % reporting pensions or benefits as their main source;
- 21% reporting wages constituted the main family income; and
- 2% reporting investments or other sources of primary income.

3.2.10 Country of Birth and Language

The sample was heavily weighted toward respondents who were born in non-English Speaking countries, with the following breakdown in descending order:

- Vietnam 32.6%
- Australia 28.4%
- Other 16.9%
- Cambodia 6.2%
- Iraq 5.0%
- Laos 3.5%
- Lebanon 3.0%
- Chile 2.2%
- China 1.3%
- Croatia 0.8%

In terms of language spoken, over 72% of the sample spoke languages other than English at home. Of these, languages spoken were:

- Vietnamese 32.0%
- Arabic 8.3%
- Khmer 6.5%
- Spanish 4.8%
- Lao 3.6%
- Assyrian 2.9%
- Cantonese 1.8%
- Mandarin 1.1%
- Other 10.5%




Figure 6

3.2.11 Indigenous Respondents

4.2% of respondents reported that they were from Aboriginal or TSI backgrounds.

3.3 Attitude To Life In Bonnyrigg ('Maxi' Respondents Only)

3.3.1 Positive and Negative Aspects

'Maxi' respondents were asked free response questions early in the interview about the best and worst things about living in Bonnyrigg. They were then asked to comment on their overall feelings about life in their community.

NOTE: *n* does not equal 100% as there were multiple (up to 3) responses allowed per respondent.

In terms of the 'things they **liked best**' about living in Bonnyrigg (positive aspects of the area), respondents were most likely to nominate the following:

- Convenience - close to facilities, services, transport - 253 (72%);
- Good neighbour/community - 91 (26%);
- Like area – used to it/long terms association - 83 (24%);
- Nice/quiet area - 72 (21%);
- Close to family - 24 (7%);
- Safe area - 17 (5%);
- Other reasons (2-5% representation each) included garden, cheap area to rent or buy, or other locality attributes.

Less than 6% of respondents said they liked 'nothing' about the area, or were unable to nominate any positive attribute.

In terms of the 'things respondents **liked least**' about living in Bonnyrigg (negative aspects of the area), respondents were most likely to nominate the following:

- Theft or break-ins – 77 (22%)
- Drug dealers or drugs - 37 (11%)
- Crime generally (unspecified) - 37 (11%);
- Bad people – 33 (9%);
- Disruptive children - 24 (7%);
- Unsafe area/feeling - 21 (6%);
- Noisy area - 21 (6%);
- Bad area – 20 (6%);
- Other response with less than 5% of response rate were: vandalism, violence, unsatisfactory housing, rubbish, stigma and bad lighting.

Around 35% of respondents said that there was 'nothing' that they did not like about the area.

3.3.2 Overall Feelings About Bonnyrigg ('Maxi' Respondents Only)

There was a strong overall feeling of positiveness about living in Bonnyrigg among survey respondents:

- More than three-quarters (77%) reported that they feel 'very' or 'quite positive' about living in Bonnyrigg at the present time (36% and 41% respectively);
- Only 10.6% reported feeling 'quite' or 'very negative' about life In Bonnyrigg (6.3% and 4.3% respectively);
- Around 13% felt neutral, or were not sure about their overall feelings.




Figure 7

3.4 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg (all respondents – ‘Maxi’ and ‘Mini’)

3.4.1 Knowledge of the Redevelopment

Over 90% of Bonnyrigg respondents had heard about the redevelopment of their area, though their understanding of what has been proposed to date varied, sometimes considerably. To an extent, their understanding of what is proposed influenced their overall views toward or support for the redevelopment.

3.4.2 General Support for the Redevelopment

There was majority support for the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg overall:

- Around 32% of Bonnyrigg respondents ‘strongly supported’ the redevelopment, whilst a further 34% ‘generally supported’ it (65% in total);
- Nine per cent each ‘strongly opposed’ or ‘generally opposed’ the redevelopment (total of 18%);
- Almost 17% did not feel that they knew enough yet to comment.




Figure 8

However, it should be noted that the nature of support for the redevelopment is to a large extent dependent upon what respondents believed is proposed for their area (e.g. if they believed that it would lead them to getting a ‘better or new house’). Later cross-tabulations will explore these issues in more detail.

Further, qualitative data (principally recorded comments of residents) also indicate that some of the support quantified above is heavily qualified by a number of provisos (e.g. ‘that I can come back’; ‘that I have an equivalent house and not have to live in a flat’; ‘that I can come back to this exact spot and keep my garden’). This will be explored in more detail later in the report.

3.4.2 Overall Form of the Redevelopment

There was a considerable spread of attitudes regarding what form the redevelopment should take, with a minority (39%) supporting a more 'radical redevelopment' (demolition of the whole estate), and a majority (51%) favouring some form of more gradual or 'case by case' renewal.

- Almost 39% of respondents favoured an approach that would see the Bonnyrigg estate 'totally demolished and new houses built';
- Around 32% preferred to see only the 'most run down or worst areas redeveloped and new houses built', with the remainder of the estate renovated or improved;
- Nineteen per cent wanted 'most of the houses kept, but renovated or improved';
- Just over 11% felt that they 'did not know enough' yet to comment.




Figure 9

3.4.3 Preferred Tenure Mix Post-Renewal

As noted above, the existing tenure mix in the study area is around 88% social housing and 12% private housing.

A relatively high proportion of respondents were satisfied with the existing tenure mix in the study area, or felt that tenure mix was not an important issue. An analysis of qualitative remarks for the 'don't really care' pre-coded option indicate an underlying level of satisfaction with the current mix arrangement (e.g. 'seems to work fine as it is', or 'why does it matter?') A minority of residents wanted a one-third mix or lower concentration of social housing. Details are as follows:

- 27% of respondents favoured 'the same mix of public and private housing as now'; whilst a further 17% said they 'didn't really care' what mix the future estate had or that they did not see it as an issue (44% in total);
- 36% of respondents preferred a 50-50 mix of public-private housing in the renewal area;
- 8% wanted only 30% public housing, and a further 12% wanted a 'small amount of public housing scattered among private housing' (20% in total).

As such, effectively 80% of respondents wanted at least 50% public housing, with at least half of these being generally satisfied with a similar tenure mix arrangement to the present.




Figure 10

3.5 Housing and Locational Choice (all respondents)

3.5.1 Locational Preference Prior to Announcement of Redevelopment

Respondents reported a clear intention to remain in Bonnyrigg *prior* to the redevelopment being announced.

- Sixty-five per cent reported that they 'definitely wanted to stay' in Bonnyrigg *prior* to the announced redevelopment in December 2004, while a further 13% said they would 'probably' have stayed (78% in total);
- Almost 19% would definitely or probably have moved (10% and 9% respectively);
- Around 4% reported that they were undecided.




Figure 11: Locational Preference Pre-Announcement

In terms of how long they intended to stay:

- A majority (56%) intended to stay more than 10 years;
- 14% would have stayed 5 years or less;
- 6% reported they would have stayed 5-10 years;
- A quarter was uncertain about how long they would have stayed.

3.5.2 Locational Preference Post-Announcement of Redevelopment

When asked if they would *now stay* in the area, or return to it, if their home were demolished as part of the redevelopment, a lower proportion said that they would stay or return compared with their pre-announcement position:

- Fifty-six per cent said they would definitely prefer to stay in Bonnyrigg after any redevelopment (9 percentage point lower than prior to the announcement); whilst 11% said that they would probably stay post-redevelopment (2 percentage points lower), a total of 67% (or 11 percentage points lower than before the development was announced);
- There was a reasonable consistency between pre-and post-announcement views of leaving Bonnyrigg, with 20% saying that they probably or definitely would move if their home were demolished as part of the redevelopment;
- The major movement was in those who had not yet decided or were effectively 'sitting on the fence' until more detail were announced (13%, up 9 percentage points).




Figure 12: Locational Preference Post-Announcement

Preliminary analysis of the qualitative data indicates that there is a reasonably high level of concern about the post-redevelopment housing allocation in terms of type of home (with 'flats' nominated by many as an unsatisfactory housing replacement), their future location within the estate, and the extent to which existing 'good neighbours' may be replaced with less satisfactory ones.

Of the 20% who reported that they *now intended to leave* if their home were demolished as part of the redevelopment:

- Almost 17% would prefer to live in an estate like Bonnyrigg, while a further 18% didn't really care, or did not know (10% and 8% respectively);
- 59% would like to live in an area with more private owners and renters, with a preliminary analysis of results showing some concern that residents may be relocated to one of the larger estates like those in the Macarthur;
- A further 4% would prefer private rental, and 3% nominated community housing.

3.5.3 Type of Housing Preferred Post-Redevelopment

All Bonnyrigg social housing tenants (public, community and Aboriginal housing) were asked what type of housing they would prefer to live in after the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg. There was a decided preference for detached housing among the sample.

- Almost 78% preferred to live in a cottage (free standing home);
- Around 10% expressed a preference for a villa (single storey dwelling with a small private back yard);
- 6% wanted townhouse (double storey attached home with a small private back yard);
- Only 3% would prefer a flat or unit.




Figure 13: Preferred Dwelling Type Post-Redevelopment

3.5.4 Community Housing Options

All social housing tenants were asked if they would consider living in community housing after the redevelopment, and were given a brief description of the nature of community housing.

- Only 7% of respondents said that they 'would like to live' in community housing, but a further 22% said that they would consider it;
- 38% said that they 'would not like to live' in community housing;
- Around 40% said that they did not know enough to offer an opinion about community housing at this stage, and would need to consider it further in the future.

Apart from unfamiliarity with the tenure, there appeared to be some concerns about relative housing security, rental costs, and location, which influenced the extent to which respondents felt they could commit themselves to community housing at this time.

3.6 Improvement to Home at Own Cost

Social housing respondents were asked if they had made any improvements to their homes *at their own expense*, and the nature and extent of these improvements:

- 20% cited 'many or major improvements';
- 35% described 'some improvements'; and
- 45% said they had made few improvements.

The main types of improvements described were:

- Security grills and doors throughout;
- Floor coverings (tiles or carpets) often throughout;
- Painting inside and outside;
- Outside paving or concreting of front and/or back yards;
- Significant soft and hard landscaping;
- Cupboards, built in wardrobes;
- Air-conditioning;
- In some cases, substantial renovations to interiors, including kitchens and bathrooms.

NOTE: There were some contradictions between respondents' assessment of the extent of their improvements, and those described, with people tending to under-rate the amount of work they had in fact carried out.

3.7 Special Needs

Respondents were asked whether they had any special needs that needed to be taken into account in finding them a new home or area.

- Almost half of social housing respondents said that they did have such a need, with the main ones including:
 - Disability or illness that required proximity to established service links;
 - Single storey home and physical modifications due to one or more members having a mobility problem;
 - No carpet due to asthma or other chest conditions;
 - Need to be close to shops due to age, lack of mobility and lack of private transport.

3.8 Pets

A substantial proportion of respondents reported that they had pets that required a backyard (45%).

3.9 Involuntary Acquisition of Private Dwelling

Private owners were asked whether they would be prepared to sell their home, in the unlikely event that the project needed to acquire it (e.g. for road works). Interestingly, a clear majority (63%) of respondents were prepared to sell their home to the Department of Housing or a development partner, *provided* they were 'properly compensated'.

- 28% actively wanted to sell their home, or would be happy to do so if properly compensated (8% and 20% respectively);
- 35% felt that it would be 'OK' to do so;
- 22% did not want to sell their home or were strongly opposed (14% and 8% respectively); and
- 15% were still undecided about the involuntary sale of their home.




Figure 14: Attitude Towards Dwelling Acquisition

The amount and nature of compensation was not discussed as part of the survey, though there was often discussion and qualified support among those who said they would sell their home, pending much more information about an appropriate package. From comments offered, this was generally taken to mean that the home would be purchased for at least the amount that would enable them to purchase a free-standing dwelling elsewhere in the sub-region, or to buy a new cottage within the redevelopment area.

3.10 Community Participation ('Maxi' Respondents only)

3.10.1 Anticipation of Opportunity to Participate

Respondents selected for the expanded survey were asked if they believed they would have the opportunity to 'have a say' over what happens during the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg.

- A minority (43%) believed that they would have 'a great deal of opportunity' or 'some opportunity' (14% and 30% respectively);
- 21% said they did not know if they would have the opportunity to have a say;
- 36% believed they would have little or no opportunity to have a say over what happens in their area (20% and 16% respectively).




Figure 15: Anticipation of Opportunity to Participate

A preliminary analysis of the data indicates that most of the concern surrounds the extent to which attitudes and needs expressed will be incorporated into the planning and outcomes of the renewal exercise, rather than the extent to which residents will be able to have the chance to express these needs or preferences.

3.10.2 Desire to be Involved In Redevelopment

They were also asked if they wanted to be involved in planning for their area in the future.

- It was interesting that only 43% were clear that they wanted to actively participate in the future in their area at this stage, whilst a further 17% were not yet sure if they wanted this active involvement.

3.11 Impacts of the Redevelopment

3.11.1 Impacts So Far

- More than half of the respondents reported that there had been some impact from the announcement of the redevelopment so far (14% a 'major impact', and 39% 'some impact'); whilst 40% said there had been no impact so far.
- 50% reported that it had been 'more negative', and a further 22% that it had been both negative and positive.
- Negative impacts included family and personal stress, insecurity personally and in the neighbourhood, fear loss of good friends, family, neighbours and services.
- Positive impacts were principally a perception that something positive was happening, and possibility of a new or better home,

3.11.2 Future Impacts

- 65% of people reported that they felt that there would be a major impacts or some impact in the future, and of these there was a relatively even distribution of those who felt it would be positive, negative or a mixture of both.
 - Those who anticipated a positive outcome mostly believed that they would receive a 'better home', 'better services' or a 'safer environment';
 - Those who felt it would be more negative mainly anticipated 'leaving family or friends', 'leaving the community', loss of services, transport and shops, loss of garden or home improvements, and family or personal stress and ill-health.

3.12 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services

Social Housing tenants were asked about their level of satisfaction with the standard of their home, and with the services provided by the housing provider.

- There was a high level of satisfaction with the standard of their home overall, with 73% of respondents reporting that they were 'very happy', or 'happy'; whilst a further 7% said they were undecided. Only 4% were very unhappy.
- Respondents were somewhat less happy with services provided, though 63% were still 'very happy', or 'happy'. Only 7% were 'very unhappy'.

3.13 Degree of 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood/s (Maxi Survey Respondents only)

Various conceptions or measures of what is termed 'social cohesion' have been developed to explore the extent to which there is an inter-relationship or connectedness between residents of a given area or social group.

At the meso-level, Buckner (1988) developed a 'neighbourhood cohesion instrument', using what he regarded as three dimensions of cohesion in neighbourhoods: sense of community (e.g. "I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood"), attraction to neighbourhood (e.g. "Overall, I'm very attracted to living in this neighbourhood"), and degree of interaction within the neighbourhood (e.g. "I visit with my neighbours in their homes"). These scores, though based on individual perceptions of neighbourhood cohesion, may be used to develop and test hypotheses at the neighbourhood level of analysis.⁶

Other social theorists such as Vinson (2004) have conceptualised 'social cohesion' as containing three key elements: *social and support networks*; *social participation*; and *community engagement*.⁷

⁶ Buckner, J.C., 1988, The development of an instrument to measure neighbourhood cohesion, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16:771-91

⁷ See for example Vinson, T. 2004, *Community adversity and resilience: the distribution of social disadvantage in Victoria and New South Wales and the mediating role of social cohesion*, Ignatius Centre, Jesuit Social Services, Melbourne. Vinson outlines three key components of social cohesion: *social and support networks* (including access to social support in times of need); *social participation* (as the obverse of social isolation and being cut off from relationships providing friendship and company); and *community engagement* (including volunteering which draws people together to work for the benefit of others).

The survey included several elements that attempted to explore the extent of social cohesion within the Bonnyrigg 'neighbourhood', and smaller 'neighbourhoods' within the estate.

- The Buckner-scale of 18 questions on different dimension of social cohesion;
- A set of basic question on community perceptions of safety;
- Several questions on volunteering;
- Several questions on the extent and nature of participation in religious institutions in or near the neighbourhood.

3.14 Buckner Scale of 'Social Cohesion'

As noted earlier, the survey included 18 questions based on the Buckner (1988) scale of social cohesion, which have previously been applied across diverse neighbourhoods in Westerns Sydney by authors of this report.⁸ These questions have been grouped for analysis according to the three dimension of Buckner's 'social cohesion'.

'Maxi' survey respondents were read a series of statements, and were asked to nominate their level of agreement with these statements, referring to their own 'neighbourhood'.

3.14.1 Sense of community

Respondents were read the statement, *'I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood'*, and asked to nominate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed using the Lichert-scale.

- Three-quarters of residents responded that they either 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' with this statement (51% and 23% respectively);
- Around 12% did not have a view either way;
- Only 13% 'disagreed' or strongly 'disagreed' with the statement (10% and 3% respectively) (see Table ? below).

'I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood'




Figure 16

Respondents were read the statement, *'The friendships and associations I have with other people in my neighbourhood mean a lot to me'*, and again asked to respond using the Lichert-scale. The response was quite similar to that regarding 'sense of belonging' above.

- Almost 70% agreed or strongly agreed with that neighbourhood friendships were important to them (49% and 21% respectively);
- 17% disagreed to varying degrees;
- 14% could not take a firm position (see Table ? below).

'The friendships and associations I have with other people in my neighbourhood mean a lot to me'




Figure 17

Respondents were read the statement, *'I think I agree with most people in my neighbourhood about what is important in life'*, and again asked to their level of agreement or disagreement.

- Whilst a majority (53%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, a considerable number found it difficult to respond to with certainty (23%);
- 23% disagreed with the statement, a small proportion 'strongly'.

'I think I agree with most people in my neighbourhood about what is important in life'




Figure 18

Respondents report a strong to very strong sense of 'loyalty to people in their neighbourhood', with around 82% agreeing with this statement. Only 7% disagreed with this statement in total.

'I feel loyal to the people in my neighbourhood'




Figure 19

When read the statement, 'I like to think of myself as similar to people in this neighbourhood', there was a reasonable level of agreement, though again a high rate of respondents 'neither agreed nor disagreed' with the statement.

- 62% agreed with the statement (10% strongly, and 51% generally);

- 21% neither agreed nor disagreed;
- 17% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

'I like to think of myself as similar to the people who live in this neighbourhood'




Figure 20

Over 65% agreed or strongly agreed that 'a strong feeling of friendliness exists in this neighbourhood', with around 19% disagreeing to varying degrees with the statement.

'A strong feeling of friendliness exists in this neighbourhood'




Figure 21

Similar to more general statements about community life, a relatively high proportion (70%) of respondents reported that 'Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community' (15% very strongly, and 56% strongly).

'Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community'




Figure 22

3.14.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood

Statements relating to Buckner's second dimension of 'neighbourhood cohesion' ('Attraction to Neighbourhood') were also read to 'Maxi' survey respondents.

In terms of general attraction to the neighbourhood:

- Just on 80% of respondents reported that they felt 'very attracted to living in their neighbourhood' (24% strongly agree, and 56% agree).
- Less than 10% disagreed with this statement

'Overall I am very attracted to living in this neighbourhood'




Figure 23

Consistent with other findings:

- Only 23% reported that they would '*like to move out of this neighbourhood, given the chance*'.

- More than three-quarters (77%) reported that they agreed or strongly agreed with the proposition that they '*planned to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years*'.

'Given the opportunity, I would like to move out of this neighbourhood'




Figure 24

'I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years'




Figure 25

3.14.3 Degree of Interaction Within The Neighbourhood

Statements relating to Buckner's third dimension of 'neighbourhood cohesion' ('Interaction in the Neighbourhood') were also included for 'Maxi' survey respondents.

Just over half (51%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they '*visited their neighbours in their homes*', whilst 42% did not agree. However, there appeared to be some confusion with this question, and some inconsistency as discussed later in the report.

'I visit my neighbours in their homes'




Figure 26

As discussed later in the report, a relatively high proportion of respondents appeared to struggle with the statement, '*If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something I'd think of it as something "we" were doing rather than something "they" were doing*'. This was particularly the case for the very large proportion of respondents who spoke little or no English.

Whilst 40% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, almost 30% could 'neither agree nor disagree', and 41 respondents (13%) abstained from the question, most saying that they 'did not understand what it meant'. This is discussed later in the report.

'If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something I'd think of it as something "we" were doing rather than something "they" were doing'




Figure 27

- A majority of respondents (55%) agreed to varying degrees that they could 'go to someone in their neighbourhood if they needed advice about something'.
- Thirty-seven per cent disagreed with this statement, however.

Language-related issues also made answering this question problematic for a high proportion of residents, also discussed later.

'If I needed advice about something I could go to someone in my neighbourhood'




Figure 28

There was a near universal feeling (91%) that neighbours would provide 'help in an emergency', with only 4% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with this statement, and a low level of undecided respondents.

'I believe my neighbours would help me in an emergency'




Figure 29

Respondents were a little more circumspect about 'borrowing things from their neighbours, with only 46% agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement.

The degree of ambivalence to this statement appeared to be related to several factors (e.g. embarrassment, pride at being 'poor but able to manage', and cultural factors), as noted later in this report, and the statements of the respondents and observations of the interviewers appeared to contradict the statement on a number of occasions.

'I borrow things from my neighbours'




Figure 30

More than three-quarters of respondents said that they would be '*willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood*'.

- 60% agreed and 16% strongly agreed with this statement;
- 18% were undecided (often qualifying it with, 'it depends on what it is');
- Only 7% said that they would be unwilling to work with others on community improvement activities.

'I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood'




Figure 31

- Almost half of respondents agreed to varying degrees that they '*rarely invited neighbours to visit*', though again there was some confusion and ambivalence evident about the wording of this statement;
- 45% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

'I rarely invite people in my neighbourhood to my house to visit'




Figure 32

- In terms of regularly ‘stopping and chatting with their neighbours’, again the cultural and language mix of the question made it problematic. Interviewers recorded on their survey forms that people with poor English had reasonably frequently answered ‘disagree’ to this question, yet had said later that they ‘smile an wave’ to everyone, or that neighbours on either side ‘had the key to their front door’.
- Nonetheless, just over three quarters of reported that they agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

'I regularly stop and chat with people in my neighbourhood'




Figure 33

3.15 Safety

Four questions were included on perceptions of safety in the neighbourhood among Bonnyrigg residents. Briefly, responses to these questions were as follows:

- Around 85% of people felt ‘safe at home alone during the day, whilst 9% disagreed with the statement;
- 85% also felt safe walking around the neighbourhood during the day, with 9% also disagreeing;
- 68% of people felt safe alone at home during the night, with 25% disagreeing with this statement;
- Around one-third of people felt safe walking around their neighbourhood at night, whilst 61% did not, and 13% neither agreed nor disagreed.

3.16 Volunteering

A minority of Bonnyrigg respondents reported that they regularly volunteered in a community agency or organisation (15%).

3.17 Attendance at Place of Worship

A much higher proportion of respondents attended a place of worship in the local area, for a variety of reasons.

- 47.3% reported that they regularly attended a place of worship in or close to Bonnyrigg, with several Buddhist temples, Catholic or other Christian churches, or the Mosque the most common responses. Of these:
 - 98% attended religious services;
 - 35% attended cultural activities;
 - 21% attended educational or children's activities;
 - 8% attended family support or counselling activities.

4. COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF BUCKNER SCALE QUESTION FOR BONNYRIGG & GWS

The above results from the current survey in Bonnyrigg have been compared with those from a survey conducted earlier in Western Sydney. As noted earlier, the previous survey included a more limited range of questions. Comparisons between the two surveys are reported below under statements contained in the Western Sydney survey.

4.1 Sense of Community

4.1.1 'I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood'

- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to say that they neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement, with 19% of respondents from GWS saying this, compared with 12% of respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate.


4.1.2 'The friendships and associations I have with other people in my neighbourhood mean a lot to me'

- There were found to be no differences of statistical significance between the results for this statement for Bonnyrigg Estate compared with GWS.

4.1.3 'Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community'

- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree with this statement than those respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate. Of those respondents from GWS, 20% said that they strongly agreed with this statement, compared with 15% of those from Bonnyrigg.
- On the other hand, respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate were significantly more likely to either agree or strongly agree with this statement than those from GWS. Of those respondents from Bonnyrigg, 70% either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, compared with 62% of those from GWS.

Figure 34: 'Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community'




4.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood

4.2.1 'Overall I am very attracted to living in this neighbourhood'

- Respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate were found to be significantly more likely to agree or strongly agree with this statement than those from GWS. 80% of respondents from Bonnyrigg agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, compared with 69% of those from GWS.
- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to say that they neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement, with 20% of respondents from GWS saying this, compared with 10% of respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate.


Figure 35 'Overall I am very attracted to living in this neighbourhood'



4.2.2 'Given the opportunity I would like to move out of this suburb'

- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree with this statement, with 15% of respondents from GWS saying this, compared with 9% of respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate.
- Respondents from GWS were also found to be significantly more likely to either agree or strongly agree with this statement than those respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate, with 37% from GWS agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement, compared with 24% from Bonnyrigg.
- Respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate were found to be significantly more likely to strongly disagree with this statement than those from GWS. 23% of respondents from Bonnyrigg strongly disagreed with this statement, compared with 16% from GWS.
- Respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate were also found to be significantly more likely to either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement than those from GWS. 67% of respondents from Bonnyrigg disagreed or strongly disagreed, compared with 46% from GWS.
- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to say that they neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement, with 17% of respondents from GWS saying this, compared with 10% of respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate.


Figure 36: 'Given the opportunity I would like to move out of this suburb'



4.2.3 'I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years'

- Respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree with this statement than those respondents from GWS. 34% of respondents from Bonnyrigg strongly agreed with this statement, compared with 27% of those from GWS.
- Also, respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate were significantly more likely to say that they either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement than those from GWS. 76% of respondents from Bonnyrigg either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, compared with 63% of those from GWS.
- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to strongly disagree with this statement than those respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate, although no significant difference was found between GWS and Bonnyrigg for the number of respondents who either disagreed or strongly disagreed. 8% of respondents from GWS strongly disagreed with this statement, compared with 3% from Bonnyrigg.
- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to say that they neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement, with 20% of respondents from GWS saying this, compared with 10% of respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate.

Figure 37: 'I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years'




4.3 Degree of Interaction Within The Neighbourhood

4.3.1 'I visit my neighbours in their homes'

- Respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate were found to be significantly more likely to disagree or strongly disagree with this statement than those from GWS. 42% of respondents from Bonnyrigg disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, compared with 35% of those from GWS.
- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to say that they neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement, with 19% of respondents from GWS saying this, compared with 7% of respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate.

Figure 38: 'I visit my neighbours in their homes'




4.3.2 'I believe my neighbours would help me in an emergency'

- There were found to be no differences of statistical significance between the results for this statement for Bonnyrigg Estate compared with GWS.

4.3.3 'I borrow things from my neighbours'

- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree with this statement than those respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate, although no significant difference was found for the number who either agreed or strongly agreed. 14% of respondents from GWS strongly agreed with this statement, compared with 9% of those from Bonnyrigg.
- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to say that they neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement, with 12% of respondents from GWS saying this, compared with 3% of respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate.


Figure 39: 'I borrow things from my neighbours'



4.3.4 'I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood'

- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree with this statement than those respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate. 35% of respondents from GWS strongly agreed with this statement, compared with 16% of those from Bonnyrigg.
- Respondents from GWS were also found to be significantly more likely to either agree or strongly agree with this statement than those respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate, with 86% from GWS agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement, compared with 76% from Bonnyrigg.
- Respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate were found to be significantly more likely to neither agree nor disagree with this statement than those respondents from GWS. 18% of respondents from Bonnyrigg said that they neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement, compared with 8% of those from GWS.


Figure 40: 'I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood'



4.3.5 'I rarely invite people in my neighbourhood to my house to visit'

- Respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate were found to be significantly more likely to either agree or strongly agree with this statement. 48% of respondents from Bonnyrigg either said that they agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, compared with 34% of respondents from GWS.
- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to strongly disagree with this statement than those respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate, although no significant difference was found between GWS and Bonnyrigg for the number of respondents who either disagreed or strongly disagreed. 14% of respondents from GWS strongly disagreed with this statement, compared with 8% from Bonnyrigg.
- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to say that they neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement, with 21% of respondents from GWS saying this, compared with 7% of respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate.


Figure 41: 'I rarely invite people in my neighbourhood to my house to visit'



4.3.6 'I regularly stop and chat with people in my neighbourhood'

- Respondents from GWS were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree with this statement than those respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate. 25% of respondents from GWS strongly agreed with this statement, compared with 17% of those from Bonnyrigg.
- On the other hand, respondents from the Bonnyrigg Estate were significantly more likely to either agree or strongly agree with this statement than those from GWS. 76% of respondents from Bonnyrigg either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, compared with 69% of those from GWS.

Figure 42: 'I regularly stop and chat with people in my neighbourhood'



5. SELECTED CROSS-TABULATIONS

This section provides selected cross-tabulations for key findings of the Bonnyrigg Survey. Reportage on these cross-tabulations here is not exhaustive, but provided for issues that are likely to be important in planning for the redevelopment.

In general, findings are only reported on cross-tabulations where they are statistically significant (using the chi-squared test).⁹ However, some non-statistically significant results have been included where they are likely to be important for redevelopment planning. These are noted where they are included, and should be viewed as descriptive only, and treated with caution.

Cross-tabulations reported below are:

- Private and social housing tenures (including all forms of social housing (public, community and HFA);
- Housing type (public cottage versus public townhouse);
- Estate half (streets clustered around Tarlington versus those around Bunker Parade);
- Overseas born and Australian born respondents;
- Gender;
- Length of time in Bonnyrigg; and
- Age of respondents.

A smaller area analysis was also undertaken (at the street and precinct level). However, there were some areas where response rate was relatively low, or the total population itself was too small, to draw conclusion with adequate confidence levels. They have been tabulated and made available to the Department, and may provide some guidance for planning purposes, but in general should not be relied upon for detailed decisions about the estate.

⁹ Alpha = 0.05

6. PRIVATE AND SOCIAL HOUSING TENURE


This section compares key findings for private and social housing respondents (the latter including all forms of social housing – public, community and HFA). It should be noted that private households were asked a far more limited range of questions than social housing tenants, due to differential impacts (e.g. rehousing and locational choice questions only affected social housing respondents).

6.1 Respondent Profile

There were a number of key differences in the profile of social and private housing respondents.

- Social housing tenants were far more likely to be **longer-term residents**, with 53.9% of social housing tenants living in the area 10 years or over, compared with 34.9% of private tenants. Also, respondents living in private housing were significantly more likely to have lived on the estate for 4 years or less (39.4% compared with 26.4% of respondents living in social housing). These differences are likely to reflect the timing of the different types of development, and the purchase of some scattered public housing after some years of use as public housing.

Figure 43A: How long have you lived in the Bonnyrigg area?



- Almost all homes in the private housing sample were free standing cottages (98.5%), compared with 62.3% for social housing respondents.
- Private residents were more likely to have a balanced gender profile. Of those respondents living in social housing 70.4% were female compared with 41.8% of those in private housing.
- Those living in private housing were significantly more likely to be aged under 40 than those in social housing (50.8% compared with 28.3% respectively).
- Private households were also more likely to have family close by (75.8% compared with 59.0%); and to have salary or wages as their main source of income (58.2% compared with only 16.5% for social housing tenants).
- A much higher proportion of private respondents were found to have been born in overseas countries (87.1% compared with 69.8%) and to speak languages other than English at home (89.6% compared with 70.2% of social housing tenants surveyed).
- There were no private respondents from an ATSI background.

6.2 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg

Level of satisfaction with life in Bonnyrigg were equally high among private and public housing residents (75.6% private and 76.7% public housing respondents said they felt quite or very positive about the area), though public housing tenants were more likely to report that they felt 'very positive' about the area (37.7% compared with 22.2% for private respondents).

In terms of **positive aspects** of life in the area:

- Social tenants were twice as likely to report that they had 'good neighbours' or 'community' than those in private tenures (27.9% compared with 13.3% respectively).
- Social tenants were also more likely to say that they 'liked the area' than those in private tenures (19.3% compared with 8.9%), although this difference was not found to be statistically significant.

In terms of **negative aspects** of life in Bonnyrigg:


- Private householders were far more likely to report that negative feelings were related to it being a 'noisy area' than were social housing tenants (20.0% compared with 3.9% respectively).
- Social tenants were significantly more likely to report that there was nothing negative about the area (36.7% compared with 20.0% of private tenants).

6.3 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg

There were some significant differences between private and social householders regarding their views toward the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg.

- Private residents were considerably more likely to strongly or generally **support the redevelopment** than social housing tenants, with 85.1% of private householders supporting the redevelopment, compared with only 62.6% of social housing tenants. Also, private residents were significantly more likely to strongly support the redevelopment (46.3% compared with 30.0% of social tenants) and significantly less likely to not really support or strongly oppose the redevelopment (6.0% compared with 19.2% of social tenants).

Figure 43B: Do you support the redevelopment?



- Private householders were almost twice as likely to **prefer the 'total redevelopment (demolition)'** of the estate that social housing respondents (61.2% and 36.0% respectively), whereas social tenants were more likely than private householders to want to see 'Most of the housing kept, but renovated or improved' (19.8% compared with 7.5% respectively).
- Private respondents were also far likely to prefer a greater '**dilution**' of **public housing** in the redeveloped Bonnyrigg, with around 53.7% of private householders wanting either one-third public housing or a smaller amount scattered among private housing compared with only 15.7% of social housing tenants preferring this reduced mix. Social tenants were more likely than private residents to want the mix to be similar to the current mix (28.5% compared with 13.4% respectively).

6.4 Housing and Locational Choice

- An equivalent percentage of social housing and private respondents had intended to stay in Bonnyrigg *prior* to the announcement of the redevelopment in December 2004 (78% and 73% respectively), though social housing tenants were more likely to report they had 'definitely' intended to stay (66.4% compared with 49.3% of private respondents).
- However, social housing tenants were far more likely to report that they were committed to staying in the area long-term, with 59.8% saying they wanted to remain in the area more than 10 years, compared with 31.3% of private residents.

6.5 Community Participation

Private and social housing respondents reported both an equivalent degree of belief that they would be involved in the redevelopment, and wish to be involved in the future.

6.6 Impact of Redevelopment

- Private respondents were far more likely to report that there had been no impact upon themselves or their families due to the announced Bonnyrigg redevelopment. Of those respondents living in private housing, 55.6% said there had been no impact so far compared with 38.2% of social tenants.
- Of the 37.8% of private respondents who reported such impacts to date, they were far more likely to report that these impacts had been 'more positive' than social housing tenants (76.5% compared with 22.2% respectively). These positive impacts mainly related to a feeling that 'something positive was happening to the area', with 75.0% of private respondents putting this forward as a positive of the redevelopment compared with 32.5% of social tenants.
- Social tenants were significantly more likely to see 'the opportunity to get a better home' as a positive current impact than private residents (60.7% compared with 18.8% respectively).
- However, both groups were equally likely to report perceived future impacts, but private tenants were far more likely to report that these impacts would be unequivocally positive (80.0% compared with only 30.9% of social housing tenants).
- Private residents were significantly more likely to see 'better services' as a likely positive future impact than social residents (40.9% compared with 20.7% respectively), as well as 'financial benefits' (13.0% of private compared with 2.5% of social).


6.7 Degree of 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood

As noted earlier, the survey included 18 questions based on the Buckner (1988) scale of social cohesion. Respondents rated their level of agreement or disagreement with a set of statements on a 5-point (Lichert) scale.

6.7.1 Sense of Community

- Social housing tenants were considerably more likely to report that they felt they '**belonged to this neighbourhood**' than their private housing counterparts (76% compared with 62% agreeing or strongly agreeing), as well as being more likely to strongly agree (25% compared with 7%);

Figure 44: 'I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood'



- Those in social housing were also far more likely to strongly agree with the statement that, ***'The friendships and associations I have with other people in my neighbourhood mean a lot to me'***, (22% compared with 9% for those in private housing); though their views overall were relatively similar when agree and strongly agree responses were combined.
- Although each group had a very positive response to the proposition that they had a sense of ***'loyalty to people in their neighbourhood'*** (over 80% each), social housing tenants were far more likely to strongly agree with this statement (almost 20% compared with no (0%) of private respondents).
- A similar proportion of social housing respondents agreed or strongly agreed that ***'a strong feeling of friendliness exists in this neighbourhood'***; however, social householders still agreed with the proposition (53% compare with 64% for social housing tenants were far more likely to strongly agree with this statement (18% compared with 2%);
- Both groups agreed to varying amounts with the proposition that ***'Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community'*** (over 70% each group); but again, those in social housing were far more likely to strongly agree with this aspect of community attachment (17% compared with no (0%) private housing respondents).

6.7.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood

- Respondents living in social housing were significantly more likely to strongly agree with the proposition that they were ***'very attracted to living in the Bonnyrigg neighbourhood'*** (25.7% compared with 11.1% of those living in private housing);
- A strong and comparable majority of each group disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposition that they would ***'like to move out of this neighbourhood, given the chance'***. However, respondents living in public housing were far more likely to strongly disagree than those in private (25.1% compared with 6.7%)
- When asked whether they ***'planned to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years'***, respondents living in public housing were significantly more likely say that they strongly agreed (37.2% compared with 13.3% of private respondents).

6.7.3 Degree of Interaction Within The Neighbourhood

- Those in social housing and private housing were similar in the extent to which they **'visited their neighbours in their homes'** (52% compared with 44%);
- Those in private tenures appeared to struggle somewhat less with the proposition, **'If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something I'd think of it as something "we" were doing rather than something "they" were doing'**, with 15.8% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing compared with 32.3% of social housing tenants. Nonetheless, there was still a relatively high abstinence from this question or inability to agree or disagree among private householders.
- Private householders were significantly less likely to strongly agree that they could **'go to someone in their neighbourhood if they needed advice about something'** (none (0.0%) strongly agreed compared with 12.0% of social housing tenants);
- There was a near universal feeling (over 91%) among respondents of each group that neighbours would provide **'help in an emergency'**;
- Respondents in each group appeared reluctant about **'borrowing things from their neighbours'**, with private residents even less likely to borrow than their social housing counterparts (40% and 46% agreed respectively), although this difference was not statistically significant;
- As noted earlier, more than three-quarters of respondents said that they would be **'willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood'**, with equivalent responses from public and social housing respondents.
- Almost half of respondents of each group agreed to varying degrees that they **'rarely invited neighbours to visit'**;
- Again there was a strong similarity in the response to the proposition that respondents regularly **'stop and chat with their neighbours'** with just over three quarters reporting that they agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. However, like many other questions above, other questions, social housing tenants were far more likely to report that they 'strongly agreed' with this question (19% compared with only 4% from private residents).

6.8 Safety

In terms of perceptions of neighbourhood safety:

- A similarly high proportion of each group (80-85%) reported that they felt **'safe at home alone during the day'**; and that they **'felt safe walking around the neighbourhood during the day'** (around 85% for each).
- A slightly lower proportion of private respondents felt **'safe at home alone during the night'** (57.8% compared with almost 69.4% of those in social housing).
- There was also a slight difference between the two groups when asked to respond to the proposition that **'I feel safe walking around the neighbourhood during the night'** (27.3% of public respondents agreed or strongly agreed compared with 15.6% of private respondents).

6.9 Volunteering

There was no significant difference between public and private tenures in the reported rate of **volunteering** in the local community among private residents (20% compared with 14% for social housing tenants).

6.10 Attendance at Place of Worship

There was a comparable level of **attendance at a local place of worship** among private and social housing respondents, at around one-half of the sample in each group, as well as comparability in their reasons for attending, except that private households were more likely to report that they attended for 'family support or counselling'.

7. HOUSING TYPE

This section compares key findings for respondents living in cottages (detached houses) with those respondents living in townhouses in all forms of social housing (i.e. DOH, community housing and Aboriginal housing). The degree to which differences in residents' experiences, views and preferences are attributable to factors related to their housing type is examined in this section. This section does not consider private owners or renters, nor does it consider those respondents living in housing other than cottages and townhouses.

7.1 Background

Of the 666 household surveyed on the Bonnyrigg Estate, 369 were public cottages and 187 were public townhouses. This means that 55.4% of households surveyed were public cottages and 28.1% were public townhouses.




Figure 45

7.2 Respondent Profile

The respondent profiles of the two groups were found to be comparable. In other words, there was found to be no significant difference between the results of the two groups on any of the questions used in analysis of the profile of respondents.

7.3 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg

The type of housing in which respondents lived appeared to have little effect on how satisfied each group felt about life in Bonnyrigg. There was no significant difference found between the two groups for question 2a (maxi).

There were reasonable similarities between the 'likes' and 'dislikes' of each group. Respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to report 'drugs, drug dealers, needles left lying around, etc' as a negative (6.7% of those respondents living in cottages compared with 21.2% of those living in townhouses).




Figure 46

7.4 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg

There were found to be many significant differences between the attitudes of respondents in cottages and those living in townhouses regarding their views toward the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg.

- Respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to not know about the planned redevelopment than those living in cottages. 7.5% of respondents living in townhouses did not know of the redevelopment, compared with 3.5% of those living in cottages.
- There were found to be significant differences between the two groups regarding their support of the redevelopment. Respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to strongly support the redevelopment with 39.8% saying this, compared with 25.3% of those living in cottages. Also, respondents living in townhouses were significantly more likely to generally or strongly support the redevelopment with 71.0% selecting either of these options, compared with 59.0% of those living in cottages. Respondents living in cottages were found to be significantly more likely to either generally or strongly oppose the redevelopment with 22.8% selecting either of these options, compared with 15.6% of those living in townhouses.




Figure 47

- Respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to want the estate 'totally redeveloped or demolished and new homes built' with 42.7% of respondents living in townhouses selecting this option, compared with 32.8% of those living in cottages. Respondents living in cottages were found to be significantly more likely to want 'the most run down or worst areas redeveloped and new homes built' with 37.7% of respondents living in cottages selecting this option, compared with 22.2% of those living in townhouses.
- There was found to be no significant difference when considering the preferred tenure mix of the estate post-redevelopment.

7.5 Housing and Locational Choice

- Respondents living in townhouses were more likely to report that they 'definitely' wanted to leave Bonnyrigg prior to the redevelopment being announced (12.4% compared with 7.1% for cottages). However, the vast majority of townhouse dwellers reported that they would definitely or probably have remained in the area (78.5%).
- Both groups were similar in the length of time they had intended to stay in the estate.
- There was found to be no significant difference between the two groups regarding whether they would stay in Bonnyrigg or move to another area if their house was demolished as part of the redevelopment.
- With respect to preferred rental arrangement if moved to another area, there was no difference of statistical significance between the two groups.
- Respondents living in cottages were found to be significantly more likely to want to live in a cottage post-redevelopment than those living in townhouses, whereas respondents living in townhouses were significantly more likely to want a townhouse or a villa. It was found that 85.8% of respondents living in cottages wanted a cottage post-redevelopment, compared with 71.4% of respondents in townhouses. Of the respondents living in townhouses, 9.2% wanted to live in a townhouse post-redevelopment and 17.3% wanted to live in a villa, compared with 4.6% and 5.2% respectively for cottage dwellers.




Figure 48

7.6 Community Housing Options

Respondents living in cottages were found to be significantly more likely to not want to live in community housing with 45.1% saying this, compared with 27.6% of those living in townhouses. Respondents living in townhouses were more likely to respond 'don't know' when asked if they would consider living in community housing with 40.5% saying this, compared with 28.3% of those respondents living in cottages.

7.7 Improvement to Home at Own Cost

Each group reported that they had carried out a comparable level and type of improvement to their homes at their own cost. There was found to be no difference of statistical significance between the two groups in this respect.

7.8 Special Needs

Respondents were asked whether they had any special needs that needed to be taken into account in finding them a new home or area.

Respondents in town houses were significantly more likely to say they had a special need, such as a disability, mobility or social issue (62.6% of respondents in townhouses compared with 41.8% of those in cottages).

7.9 Community Participation

- A significantly larger proportion of respondents in cottages reported that they believed that they would have a 'great deal of opportunity' to have a say over what happens in the redevelopment with 19.6% saying this, compared with 4.7% of those respondents living in townhouses, however there was found to be no significant difference between the two groups with regard to the number who answered either 'some' or 'a great deal' of opportunity.
- Cottage dwellers were also significantly more likely to say that they would have either 'not very much opportunity' or 'no opportunity at all' to have a say with 41.8% saying this, compared with 22.4% of those living in townhouses. Respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to say that they didn't know whether they would have the opportunity to have a say with 27.1% saying this, compared with 16.5% of those living in cottages.




Figure 49

- Townhouse respondents were significantly more likely to want to have some involvement in the future with 57.6% saying this, compared with 38.1% of those living in cottages.

7.10 Impacts of Redevelopment

- There was found to be no significant difference between the two groups regarding whether there was 'any impact so far', nor regarding whether this change was negative or positive. However, respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to respond that one of the positive current impacts of the redevelopment was 'the opportunity to get a better home' with 83.9% saying this, compared with 52.1% of those respondents living in cottages.




Figure 50

7.11 Satisfaction with Housing and Services

- Respondents living in cottages were found to be significantly more likely to be 'very happy' with the standard of their housing with 32.8% saying this, compared with 23.2% of those living in townhouses.
- Respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to be 'very happy' with the service provided by the DOH or provider with 21.9% saying this, compared with 13.9% of respondents living in cottages.

7.12 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood

7.12.1 Sense of Community

The results of the Buckner-scale questions show that there are significant differences in many areas in regard to how respondent living in cottages feel about the sense of community in the Bonnyrigg Estate compared with how respondents living in townhouses feel.

- Respondents living in townhouses were significantly more likely to strongly disagree with the statement '***I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood***'. It was found that 5.9% of respondents living in townhouses strongly disagreed with this statement, compared with 1.0% of those living in cottages.

- There was found to be no significant differences between the two groups for the statement ***'The friendships and associations I have with other people in my neighbourhood mean a lot to me'***.
- Respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to either agree or strongly agree with the statement ***'I think I agree with most people in my neighbourhood about what is important in life'***. 65.9% of respondents living in townhouses either said that they agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, compared with 48.2% of cottage dwellers.
- Respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree with the statement ***'I feel loyal to the people in my neighbourhood'*** with 29.3% saying this, compared with 14.1% of those living in cottages. However, respondents living in townhouses were also found to be significantly more likely to either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement (12.2% of townhouses compared with 4.2% of cottages).




Figure 51

- Respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to strongly disagree with the statement ***'I like to think of myself as similar to the people who live in this neighbourhood'*** with 9.5% saying this, compared with 2.6% of respondents living in cottages.
- Respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to disagree or strongly disagree with the statement ***'A strong feeling of friendliness exists in this neighbourhood'*** (26.8% of respondents living in townhouses compared with 14.3% of respondents living in cottages). Also, respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to strongly disagree with the statement with 8.5% saying this, compared with 1.6% of cottage dwellers.




Figure 52

- Townhouse dwellers were found to be significantly more likely to strongly disagree with the statement ***'Living in this community gives me a sense of community'***. 7.1% of respondents living in townhouses strongly disagreed, compared with 1.0% of cottage dwellers.

7.12.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood

Each group reported similar levels of attraction to neighbourhood, including intention to remain a resident into the foreseeable future. The attitudes of the two groups in terms of attraction to neighbourhood and intention to remain a resident were found not to be statistically significant.

7.12.3 Degree of Interaction Within The Neighbourhood

There were many significant differences between respondents in different types of housing in terms of social cohesion measured by degree of interaction with their neighbourhood.

- Those in townhouses were significantly more likely to agree or strongly agree with the proposition, ***'If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something I'd think of it as something "we" were doing rather than something "they" were doing'*** (51.4% of townhouse dwellers compared with 32.6% of cottage dwellers). However, townhouse dwellers were also significantly more likely to strongly disagree with the statement (9.7% of townhouse dwellers compared with 3.4% of cottage dwellers).

'If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something I'd think of it as something "we" were doing rather than something "they" were doing'




Figure 53

- Those in townhouses were also much more likely to report that they could ***'go to someone in their neighbourhood if they needed advice about something'*** than those in cottages (67.9% of townhouse dwellers agreed or strongly agreed compared with 51.8% of cottage dwellers). Also, townhouse dwellers were significantly more likely to strongly agree with the statement with 20.2% saying this, compared with 8.8% of cottage dwellers.

'If I needed advice about something I could go to someone in my neighbourhood'




Figure 54

- Respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree with the statement '***I believe my neighbours would help me in an emergency***'. Of the townhouse dwellers 54.1% strongly agreed, compared with 38.7% of cottage dwellers.
- Townhouse dwellers were found to be significantly more likely to strongly disagree with the statement '***I borrow things from my neighbours***' with 27.1% saying this, compared with 14.5% of cottage dwellers.
- Those in townhouses were significantly more likely to strongly agree that they would be '***willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood***' (22.6% compared with 13.2% of those in cottages). Townhouse dwellers were also found to be significantly more likely to strongly disagree (2.4% compared with no cottage dwellers whatsoever). Cottage dwellers were found to be significantly more likely to neither agree nor disagree with 22.6% saying this, compared with 10.7% of townhouse dwellers.




Figure 55

- Respondents living in townhouses were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree with the proposition that they '***rarely invite people in my neighbourhood to my house to visit***'. Of those living in townhouses, 17.6% strongly agreed, compared with 7.3% of those living in cottages.
- Also, townhouse dwellers were significantly more likely to strongly disagree when asked whether they '***regularly stop and chat with people in my neighbourhood***'. Of the townhouse dwellers 8.2% strongly disagreed, compared with 0.5% of cottage dwellers.

7.13 Safety

In terms of perceptions of neighbourhood safety:

- A similarly high proportion of each group reported that they felt **'safe at home alone during the day'**; and that they **'felt safe walking around the neighbourhood during the day'**. There were found to be no significant differences between the two groups with respect to their feelings of safety during the day.
- Those living in cottages were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree that **'When I'm alone at home during the night I feel safe'** (22.2% compared with 10.6% of those living in townhouses). Also, respondents living in cottages were found to be significantly less likely to strongly disagree with the statement with 4.1% responding in this way, compared with 17.6% of respondents living in townhouses.




Figure 56

- Townhouse dwellers were significantly more likely to disagree or strongly disagree when asked whether they **'feel safe walking around my neighbourhood during the night'**. Of the townhouse dwellers 74.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, compared with 53.6% of cottage dwellers. Also, townhouse dwellers were significantly more likely to strongly disagree with 40.0% responding in this way, compared with 17.0% of cottage dwellers. Cottage dwellers were significantly more likely to neither agree nor disagree with 16.0% saying this, compared with 5.9% of townhouse dwellers.




Figure 57

7.14 Volunteering and Attendance at Place of Worship

There was no discernable difference in the extent to which those cottages reported that they volunteered in the community or attended a place of worship, ie. no significant differences were found between the two groups.

8. ESTATE HALF (TARLINGTON & BUNKER PARADES)

This section compares key findings for respondents living in Tarlington Parade and streets off Tarlington Parade with those respondents living in Bunker Parade and streets off Bunker Parade in all forms of social housing (ie. DOH, community housing and Aboriginal housing). The degree to which differences in residents' experiences, views and preferences are attributable to factors related to their housing location is examined in this section. This section does not consider private owners or renters.

Of the 666 respondents 565 are considered in this section, 250 living in the 'Tarlington half' (44.2% of respondents considered in this section) and 315 living in the 'Bunker half' (55.8% of respondents considered in this section).

Distribution of Public Households




Figure 58

8.1 Profile of Respondents

- There was found to be no difference of statistical significance between the two halves of the estate in terms of housing tenure.
- A significantly larger proportion of respondents in the Bunker half lived in cottages (70.2% compared with 57.8% of those living in the Tarlington half of the estate). Also, a significantly larger proportion of respondents in the Tarlington half lived in townhouses or villas (37.8% compared with 29.5% of respondents in the Bunker half) as well as flats or units (2.8% compared with no respondents in the Bunker half).




Figure 59

- In general, residents living in both halves of the estate were found to have been living in the estate for a comparable amount of time, except that respondents living in the Bunker half were significantly more likely to have been living in the estate for 25+ years. Of the respondents living in the Bunker half 11.5% had been living on the estate for 25 or more years, compared with 6.0% of respondents living on the Tarlington half.
- Where the respondents lived on the estate was found to have no significant correlation with their gender (70.3% female on Tarlington side and 72.6% on Bunker side).
- Respondents living on the Tarlington side of the estate were found to be significantly more likely to be 55 years old or over. Of the respondents living on the Tarlington side, 38.9% were 55 or over, compared with 30.2% of those living on the Bunker side.
- The side of the estate that the respondents lived on had no significant correlation with whether or not they had children living with them. However, it was found to have a significant correlation with the number of children living with them if they did. Respondents living on the Tarlington side were significantly more likely to have one child living with them (44.3% of those respondents who had children, compared with 33.3% of those on the Bunker side), and respondents living on the Bunker side were significantly more likely to have 3 or more children (33.3% of those respondents who had children living with them, compared with 21.9% of those living on the Tarlington side).




Figure 60

- The side of the estate on which the respondent lived did not significantly affect the likelihood of them having family nearby, nor did it significantly affect what their main source of income was likely to be.
- The proportion of respondents on either side of the estate who were born in different countries were found to be comparable, with the exception of Lebanese of whom 5.0% of the respondents from the Tarlington side were made up, compared with 1.7% of the Bunker side (this difference was found to be significant). The same was found for language spoken at home with the exception of Arabic. Respondents living on the Tarlington side of the estate were found to be significantly more likely to speak Arabic at home (16.5% compared with 8.8% of those living on the Bunker side).
- Comparable proportions of indigenous respondents lived on either side of the estate (no significant difference was found between the proportions living on either side of the estate).

8.2 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg

- In terms of positive aspects of life in Bonnyrigg, things that were reported as positive aspects were in comparable proportions for each of the two sides of the estate. However, respondents living in the Tarlington half were significantly more likely to report crime as a negative (17.3% compared with 7.2% of respondents living in the Bunker half).
- There was found to be no significant correlation between the side of the estate that on which the respondent lived and whether they felt more positive or negative about living in Bonnyrigg overall.

8.3 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg

There was found to be no significant differences in the attitude of the respondents to the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg depending on where they lived in the estate.

8.4 Housing and Locational Choice

No significant correlation was found between where on the estate respondents lived and their attitudes toward housing and locational choice, except that respondents living in the Tarlington half were significantly more likely to say that they didn't know whether they wanted to live in community housing (39.4% compared with 27.5% of respondents living in Bunker half).

8.5 Community Housing Options

There were no significant differences in the attitudes of respondents on either side of the estate regarding their want to live in community housing.

8.6 Improvement to Home at Own Cost

Similar levels and types of improvements were made to surveyed households on either side of the estate.

8.7 Special Needs

There were found to be no significant differences in respondents living on either side of the estate regarding special needs.

8.8 Community Participation

No significant correlation was found between where on the estate respondents lived and their attitudes toward community participation, except that respondents living in the Tarlington half were significantly more likely to say that they 'didn't know' when asked the question ***'Do you think that you will have the opportunity to have a say over what happens in the future in your area'*** (27.3% compared with 16.2% of respondents living in Bunker half).

8.9 Impacts of the Redevelopment

- In terms of whether there were any impacts experienced by the respondent so far, there was found to be no significant correlation between the answer given and the side of the estate that the respondent lived on, nor was there any significant correlation between the side of the estate that the respondent lived on and whether they thought that this impact was positive or negative. All of the types of impacts selected by the respondents were comparable for the two sides of the estate.
- The side of the estate on which the respondents lived was also found not to affect how they responded to the question of whether they thought there would be any future impacts, nor whether they thought these would be positive or negative.
- Of the types of impacts that were expected by respondents, only two had significant differences. Respondents living on the Tarlington side were found to be significantly more likely to fear loss of community services with 25.5% reporting this, compared with 9.7% of those respondents living on the Bunker side. Respondents living on the Bunker side were found to be significantly more likely to fear a loss of garden or home improvements with 34.7% reporting this, compared with 12.8% of respondents living on the Tarlington side.

8.10 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services

No significant correlation was found between where on the estate respondents lived and their satisfaction with standard of housing and services provided by DOH/provider.

8.11 Degree of 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood/s

Not many differences of statistical significance were found between the two halves of the estate in terms of 'social cohesion'.

8.11.1 Sense of Community

The only difference in sense of community between the two halves of the estate that was found to have statistical significance was in answer to the proposition **'I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood'**. Respondents living in the Tarlington half of the estate were significantly more likely to strongly agree with this statement. Of the respondents living in the Tarlington half 33.6% strongly agreed, compared with 22.9% of those living in the Bunker half.

8.11.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood

There was found to be little significant correlation between estate half and attraction of respondents to their neighbourhood. The only significant difference was in response to the proposition **'I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years'**. Of those respondents living on the Tarlington side 13.0% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement, compared with 5.4% of those living on the Bunker side, and this difference was found to be significant.

8.11.3 Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood

Significant differences were found in the degree of respondents' interaction within their neighbourhood between the two sides of the estate in several areas. These significant differences are listed below:

- In response to the proposition **'If I needed advice about something I could go to someone in my neighbourhood'**, 18.2% of respondents in the Tarlington half of the estate strongly agreed, compared with 8.5% of those living in the Bunker half.
- Of the respondents living on the Bunker side of the estate, 93.4% agreed or strongly agreed that **'my neighbours would help me in an emergency'**, compared with 86.4% of those living on the Tarlington side.
- When read the statement **'I borrow things from my neighbours'**, 25.7% of those living in the Tarlington half strongly disagreed, compared with 13.8% of those living in the Bunker half.
- Of those living on the Tarlington side of the estate 5.5% strongly disagreed with the proposition that they **'regularly stop and chat with people in my neighbourhood'**, compared with 1.2% of those living on the Bunker side.

8.12 Safety

In terms of feelings of safety, the only difference of statistical significance between respondents on either side of the estate was found to be in response to the proposition '***When I'm alone at home during the night I feel safe***'. Respondents living on the Tarlington side of the estate were found to be significantly more likely to disagree or strongly disagree with the statement than those living on the Bunker side (32.7% compared with 19.2% respectively).

8.13 Volunteering

Whether or not a respondent volunteered in a community agency or organisation was not found to have any significant correlation with where on the estate they lived.

8.14 Attendance at Place of Worship

Whether or not a respondent attended a place of worship was not found to have any significant correlation with where on the estate they lived.

9. TOWNHOUSES & COTTAGES IN HALVES OF ESTATE

This section compares key findings for respondents living in four clusters in all forms of social housing (ie. DOH, community housing and Aboriginal Housing). These clusters are as follows:

- Public cottages in Tarlington Parade and Streets off Tarlington Parade, 144 respondents (21.6% of all respondents);
- Public cottages in Bunker Parade and streets off Bunker Parade, 219 respondents (32.9% of all respondents);
- Public townhouses in Tarlington Parade and Streets off Tarlington Parade, 94 respondents (14.1% of all respondents); and
- Public townhouses in Bunker Parade and streets off Bunker Parade, 92 respondents (13.8% of all respondents).

Housing Cluster Distribution




Figure 61

The degree to which differences in residents' experiences, views and preferences are attributable to factors related to the housing cluster in which they live is examined in this section. This section does not consider private owners or renters, nor does it consider those respondents living in housing other than cottages and townhouses.

9.1 Respondent Profile

- In terms of housing tenure there was very little difference between the four clusters, except that respondents living in the townhouses off Tarlington were found to be significantly more likely to live in Aboriginal housing than those in the townhouses off Bunker (4.3% compared with no respondents at all, respectively).
- Respondents in the four clusters were found to have lived on the estate for a comparable length of time, except that the respondents living in the cottages off Bunker were found to be significantly more likely to have lived on the estate for 25 or more years than those living in the cottages off Tarlington (13.3% compared with 6.3% respectively).
- No significant differences were found between the four clusters when comparing genders of respondents.
- When comparing ages of respondents from the four clusters, it was found that those living in townhouses off Tarlington were significantly less likely to be under 25 than those living in the other three clusters (1.1% compared with 8.5% in the cottages off Tarlington, 7.8% in the cottages off Bunker and 7.6% in the townhouses off Bunker).
- Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were found to be significantly more likely to be 55 or over than those living in townhouses off Bunker and cottages off Bunker (44.1% compared with 28.3% and 31.0% respectively), however this was found to be largely due to estate half as noted above (35.9% of respondents living in cottages off Tarlington were 55 or over). Also, respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were significantly more likely to be 70 or over than those living in cottages off Bunker and townhouses off Bunker (15.1% compared with 7.8% and 2.2% respectively), and respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were found to be significantly less likely to be 70 or over than those living in cottages off Tarlington (8.5% of respondents living in cottages off Tarlington were 70 or over).




Figure 62

- The housing cluster in which the respondent lived was not found to have any significant correlation with whether or not they had children living with them. However, respondents living in cottages off Tarlington and townhouses off Tarlington were found to be significantly more likely to have only one child than those living in townhouses off Bunker (44.9% and 44.4% compared with 26.8% respectively). Respondents living in cottages off Bunker and townhouses off Bunker were found to be significantly more likely to have 3 or more children living with them than those living in Townhouses off Tarlington (34.3% and 29.6% compared with 15.3% respectively), although this was found to be more to do with the side of the estate the respondent lived on (24.3% of respondents living in cottages off Tarlington had 3 or more children). This is reported above. Respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were found to be significantly more likely to have 4 or more children than those living in townhouses off Tarlington (15.5% compared with 4.2% respectively).
- There was found to be no significant correlation between which of the four clusters the respondent lived in and whether or not they were likely to have family in Bonnyrigg or nearby suburbs, nor for what their main source of income was likely to be.
- There was very little to suggest that the four clusters were each made up of significantly different proportions of people with different backgrounds. The main difference found was that respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were significantly more likely to be Australian born than those living in cottages off Bunker and townhouses off Tarlington (39.5% compared with 27.7% and 20.2% respectively). Also, respondents living in cottages off Tarlington were significantly more likely to be Australian born than those living in townhouses off Tarlington (33.9% of respondents living in cottages off Tarlington were Australian born). Also, Lebanese born were found to be in significantly different proportions in some of the four clusters compared with others, however this was reported above as having more to do with comparison of estate halves.




Figure 63

- Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were found to be significantly more likely to speak a language other than English at home than those living in townhouses off Bunker (77.4% compared with 63.0% respectively). The only significant differences found between the four clusters regarding which language was spoken was for Arabic, although this was found to be more to do with which half of the estate the respondents lived in, as reported above.
- Indigenous respondents were in similar proportions in each of the four clusters.

9.2 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg

The positives and negatives that were ventured by respondents were in similar proportions across the four housing clusters. The significant differences were as follows:

- Respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were found to be significantly more likely to say that a 'long-term association with the area' was a positive aspect of living in Bonnyrigg (12.2% compared with 3.4% of respondents living in Cottages off Bunker).
- 'Crime' was significantly more likely to be put forward by respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington than by respondents living in cottages off Bunker (20.0% compared with 7.7% respectively).
- Significant differences between some of the four clusters was found for the proportion of respondents who put forward 'drugs, drug dealers, needles left lying around, etc' as a negative, although this was found to be mostly to do with estate half, as noted previously.

- Respondents living in cottages off Tarlington were significantly less likely to give 'bad people' as a negative for the area than those living in cottages off Bunker and townhouses off Bunker. 'Bad people' was given as a negative by 14.3% of respondents in townhouses off Bunker and 12.0% of respondents in cottages off Bunker, compared with 2.8% of respondents in cottages off Tarlington.




Figure 64

- 'Housing unsatisfactory' was given by 10.2% of respondents living in townhouses off Bunker compared with 1.4% of those living in cottages off Tarlington. This difference was found to be statistically significant.
- In terms of overall feelings toward living in Bonnyrigg, there was very little difference in the attitudes of respondents across the four clusters. The only difference found which was statistically significant was that respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were more likely to be very positive about the area than those living in townhouses off Bunker (54.3% compared with 32.7% respectively).

9.3 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg

- Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were found to be significantly more likely to not have heard about the proposed redevelopment than those living in cottages off Tarlington. Of the respondents in townhouses off Tarlington 8.5% hadn't heard of the redevelopment, compared with 2.8% of respondents living in cottages off Tarlington.
- In terms of support for the redevelopment and preferred form of the redevelopment, there were found to be some significant differences in the attitudes of respondents depending on which housing cluster they were part of. However, these differences were found to be mainly dependent upon whether respondents lived in cottages or townhouses, as reported above. There were found to be no significant differences whatsoever between the four clusters in terms of preferred tenure mix post-renewal.




Figure 65

9.4 Housing and Locational Choice

- No significant differences were found between any of the clusters regarding whether respondents wanted to stay in the area before the redevelopment was announced, nor how long they had intended to stay in the area.
- However, respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were found to be significantly more likely to wish to move if their house was demolished as part of the redevelopment than those living in cottages off Bunker (27.2% compared with 17.4% respectively).

9.5 Community Housing Options

- In terms of attitudes of respondents toward living in community housing, there were found to be some significant differences between the four housing clusters. Respondents living in cottages off Bunker were significantly more likely to say that they 'would like to' live in community housing than those living in townhouses off Bunker (9.8% compared with 1.1% respectively).

- Respondents living in cottages off Bunker were also significantly more likely to say that they 'didn't know' whether they would consider living in community housing than those living in the other three clusters (22.8% of respondents living in cottages off Bunker, compared with 43.6% of those in townhouses off Tarlington, 37.8% of those living in townhouses off Bunker and 36.4% of those in cottages off Tarlington).
- There were also found to be significant differences in the proportions of respondents saying that they would 'not like to' live in community housing between some of the clusters, but this was found to be mainly affected by whether they lived in cottages or townhouses.

9.6 Improvement to Home at Own Cost

No significant correlation was found between the cluster in which respondents lived and the likelihood of respondents having made varying degrees of improvements to their homes.

9.7 Special Needs

There were found to be significant differences across the four housing clusters in terms of special needs when finding housing, but this was found to be mainly affected by housing type (ie. cottage or townhouse) as noted previously.

9.8 Pets

Respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were found to be significantly more likely to have pets that would require a backyard than those living in cottages off Bunker and townhouses off Tarlington. Of those in townhouses off Bunker 60.0% had pets that would require a backyard, compared with 46.8% of those in cottages off Bunker and 44.7% of those in townhouses off Tarlington.




Figure 66

9.9 Community Participation

- Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were found to be significantly less likely to say that they expected to have ‘no opportunity at all’ to have a say over what happens in the area in the future than those living in the three other clusters. Of those respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington 2.9% responded in this way, compared with 19.4% of those in cottages off Tarlington, 17.9% of those in cottages off Bunker and 16.3% of those in townhouses off Bunker. Also, those living in townhouses off Tarlington were significantly more likely to say that they ‘didn’t know’ whether they would have an opportunity than those living in cottages off Bunker (37.1% compared with 14.5% respectively). All other significant differences found were mainly found to be to do with whether the respondents lived in cottages or townhouses, and these differences have been noted previously.




Figure 67

- Significant differences were found between some clusters in respondents' attitudes toward wanting to become more involved in planning for the area, but these differences were found to be mainly due to whether respondents lived in cottages or townhouses, as reported previously.

9.10 Impacts of the Redevelopment

- The cluster in which respondents lived was found not to significantly influence the way in which the respondents answered the question of whether or not the announced redevelopment had 'any impact so far'. However, respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were found to be significantly more likely to say that the impact was more positive than those living in cottages off Bunker (32.3% of those respondents who said there had been an impact compared with 14.9%).




Figure 68

- Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were found to be significantly more likely to report as a positive impact 'More optimism, feeling that something positive is happening to area' than those living in cottages off Tarlington and townhouses off Bunker (66.7% of respondents saying that they had experienced a positive impact compared with 23.5% and 15.0% respectively).
- Some significant differences were found in the proportion of respondents from the four clusters who said that the 'opportunity to get a better home' was a positive, but this was found to be mainly related to whether respondents lived in cottages or townhouses, as reported before.




Figure 69

- The negative 'family or personal stress' was given as a current impact by a significantly larger proportion of respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington than those living in cottages off Bunker (50.0% of respondents saying that they had experienced a negative impact compared with 19.3% respectively).
- Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were also found to have significantly more concerns for the future than those living in cottages off Bunker (68.8% of respondents saying that they had experienced a negative impact compared with 40.4% respectively).




Figure 70

- As with current impacts, whether respondents were likely to think there would be future impacts was not found to be significantly affected by the housing cluster in which they lived. However, respondents living in the townhouses off Bunker were found to be significantly more likely to think that the impacts would be more positive than those living in cottages off Bunker (45.5% of those respondents who thought there would be a future impact compared with 23.9% respectively). Also, respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were found to be significantly more likely to say that the impact would be both positive and negative than those living in townhouses off Bunker (52.4% of respondents who said there would be a future impact compared with 24.2% respectively).




Figure 71

- Of the types of impacts that respondents expected, only the negatives were found to have significant differences. Significantly more respondents living in cottages off Bunker reported 'loss of family and friends' as a negative than did those respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington (50.0% of respondents saying that there would be a negative impact compared with 13.3%, respectively).
- Respondents living in cottages off Tarlington were significantly more likely to report 'rent change' as negative impact than those living in townhouses off Bunker (21.9% of respondents who said there would be a negative impact compared with no respondents living in townhouses off Bunker).
- Significant differences were found in the number of respondents who ventured 'loss of community services' as a negative, although this was found to be mainly affected by the estate half on which the respondent lived, as noted previously.
- Respondents living in cottages off Bunker were significantly more likely to report the 'loss of garden or home improvements' as a negative, with 37.0% of respondents saying that there would be a negative impact reporting this, than those living in cottages off Tarlington, with 9.4%.




Figure 72

9.11 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services

- Respondents living in cottages off Bunker were found to be significantly more likely to report that they were happy or very happy with the standard of their home than those living in townhouses off Bunker (77.1% compared with 65.9% respectively). Also, those living in cottages off Bunker were significantly more likely to report that they were very happy with their home than those living in townhouses off Bunker (35.3% compared with 17.6% respectively).
- In terms of satisfaction with services provided by DOH or provider, significantly more respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington reported being very happy than those living in cottages off Tarlington and cottages off Bunker (25.5% compared with 11.8% and 15.6% respectively).




Figure 73

9.12 Degree of 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood/s

9.12.1 Sense of Community

- In response to the proposition ***'I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood'*** there were found to be some significant differences between the four housing clusters. Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were significantly more likely to answer 'strongly agree' than those living in cottages off Bunker or townhouses off Bunker (45.7% compared with 25.9% and 16.3% respectively). Also, respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were significantly more likely to strongly disagree than those living in cottages off Bunker (6.1% compared with 0.9% respectively).




Figure 74

- Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were significantly more likely to strongly agree than those living in cottages off Bunker when read the statement ***'The friendships and associations I have with other people in my neighbourhood mean a lot to me'*** (37.1% compared with 18.1% respectively).
- Significantly more respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington strongly agreed than did those living in cottages off Tarlington when read the statement ***'I think I agree with most people in my neighbourhood about what is important in life'*** (17.1% compared with 4.2% respectively). There were also significant differences between the housing cluster in terms of the number who either agreed or strongly agreed, although this was found to correlate mainly with whether respondents lived in cottages or townhouses.




Figure 75

- Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree that they ***‘feel loyal to the people in my neighbourhood’*** than respondents living in the other three housing clusters (42.4% compared with 14.1% of those in cottages off Tarlington, 14.8% of those in cottages off Bunker and 20.8% of those in townhouses off Bunker). Those living in townhouses off Bunker were found to be significantly more likely to disagree or strongly disagree than those living in cottages off Tarlington (12.5% compared with 2.8% respectively).




Figure 76

- In response to the statement ***‘I like to think of myself as similar to the people who live in this neighbourhood’***, significantly more respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington strongly agreed than those living in the other three clusters (31.4% compared with 6.3% of those in townhouses off Bunker, 8.6% of those in cottages off Tarlington and 11.1% of those in cottages off Bunker). Significant differences were found in the proportions of respondents answering ‘strongly disagree’ between some clusters, but this difference was found to be mainly due to whether respondents lived in cottages or townhouses, as reported previously.




Figure 77

- Some significant differences were found between how the clusters responded to the statement '**A strong feeling of friendliness exists in this neighbourhood**'. However these were found to be mainly affected by whether respondents lived in cottages or townhouses as reported above, and likewise with the proposition '**Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community**'.

9.12.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood

- In response to the proposition '**Overall I am very attracted to living in this neighbourhood**', respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree than those in townhouses off Bunker (37.1% compared with 14.3% respectively). Respondents living in cottages off Tarlington and townhouses off Bunker were found to be significantly more likely to disagree or strongly disagree than those living in cottages off Bunker (13.9% and 14.3% compared with 5.2% respectively). Respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were significantly more likely to reply 'strongly disagree' than those living in cottages off Tarlington (6.1% compared with no respondents, respectively).




Figure 78

- Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were found to be significantly more likely to strongly disagree with the statement '***Given the opportunity, I would like to move out of this neighbourhood***' than those from the other three clusters (47.1% compared with 20.8% of those in cottages off Tarlington, 24.8% of those in townhouses off Bunker and 22.4% of those in cottages off Bunker).




Figure 79

- Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were found to be significantly more likely to strongly agree when asked whether they ***‘plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years’*** than those living in the other three housing clusters (64.7% compared with 31.3% of those in townhouses off Bunker, 35.0% of those in cottages off Bunker and 35.2% of those in cottages off Tarlington). Also, those living in townhouses off Bunker were significantly more likely to disagree or strongly disagree than those in townhouses off Tarlington (18.8% compared with 2.9% respectively).




Figure 80

9.12.3 Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood

- In terms of their responses to the proposition ***‘I visit my neighbours in their homes’***, some differences of statistical significance were found between the number of respondents from the clusters who responded with ‘strongly disagree’, although this was found to be mainly due to whether they lived in cottages or townhouses as reported previously.
- Some significant differences were found in the number of respondents saying that they ‘strongly agree’ with the statement ***‘If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something I’d think of it as something “we” were doing rather than something “they” were doing’*** between those living in cottages off Bunker and townhouses off Tarlington compared with those living in cottages off Tarlington (11.0% and 18.8% compared with 0.0% respectively). Some significant differences were found in the proportions who answered ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’, but this was found to be mostly due to housing type (ie. cottage or townhouse). Respondents living in cottages off Tarlington were significantly more likely to neither agree nor disagree with the statement than those in the three other clusters (42.9% compared with 21.9% of those in townhouses off Tarlington, 23.1% of those in townhouses off Bunker and 28.0% of those in cottages off Bunker). Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were significantly more likely to strongly disagree with the statement than those in cottages off Tarlington and cottages off Bunker (15.6% compared with 2.9% and 3.0% respectively).

If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something I'd think of it as something 'we' were doing rather than something 'they' were doing




Figure 81

- In response to the proposition ***'If I needed advice about something I could go to someone in my neighbourhood'***, respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were significantly more likely to strongly agree than those living in the three other clusters (40.0% compared with 6.3% of those in townhouses off Bunker, 8.3% of those in cottages off Tarlington and 9.5% of those in cottages off Bunker).

If I needed advice about something I could go to someone in my neighbourhood




Figure 82

- In response to the statement ***'I believe my neighbours would help me in an emergency'***, some significant differences were found in proportion who answered 'strongly agree', but this difference was found to be mainly due to housing type. Some significant differences were also found in proportion who answered 'agree' 'strongly agree', but this difference was found to be mainly due to the side of the estate on which respondents lived. Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were significantly more likely to disagree or strongly disagree than those living in cottages off Bunker (8.6% compared with 1.7% respectively).




Figure 83

- Respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were significantly more likely to agree or strongly agree with the statement ***'I borrow things from my neighbours'*** than those in cottages off Tarlington (65.3% compared with 42.3% respectively), and substantially more likely than those in townhouses off Tarlington and cottages off Bunker (45.7% and 46.2% respectively – note that these differences are not statistically significant). Respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were significantly less likely to disagree or strongly disagree than those living in the other three clusters (30.6% compared with 54.3% of those in townhouses off Tarlington, 53.5% of those in cottages off Tarlington and 50.4% of those in cottages off Bunker). Also, those living in townhouses off Tarlington were significantly more likely to strongly disagree than those in cottages off Bunker (37.1% compared with 10.3% respectively).




Figure 84

- In terms of willingness to ***‘work with others on something to improve my neighbourhood’***, those respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were significantly more likely to agree or strongly agree that they would be willing than those living in cottages off Tarlington (83.7% compared with 64.8% respectively). Any other significant differences were found to be mainly either due to housing type or estate half, as reported previously.
- Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were significantly more likely to agree or strongly agree with the statement ***‘I rarely invite people in my neighbourhood to my house to visit’*** than those in cottages off Bunker (62.9% compared with 42.2% respectively), and substantially more likely than those in townhouses off Bunker and cottages off Tarlington (42.9% and 45.1% respectively – note that these differences are not statistically significant). Also, respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were significantly more likely to disagree or strongly disagree than those living in townhouses off Tarlington (53.1% compared with 31.4% respectively).




Figure 85

- In response to the statement '***I regularly stop and chat with people in my neighbourhood***', those respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were significantly more likely to strongly disagree than those living in each of the three other housing clusters (17.1% compared with no respondents living cottages off Tarlington, 0.9% of respondents living in cottages off Bunker and 2.0% of respondents living in townhouses off Bunker).




Figure 86

9.13 Safety

- Virtually no significant correlation was found between which housing cluster respondents lived in and how safe they were likely to feel during the day, either at home alone or walking around the neighbourhood. Respondents living in townhouses off Tarlington were significantly more likely than those living in cottages off Bunker to strongly disagree when asked whether they feel safe when alone at home during the day (8.6% compared with 1.7%).
- In terms of feelings of safety during the night, significant differences were found to be influenced either mainly by housing type or mainly by estate half, and these differences have been noted previously. Those which were not are as follows:
 - Respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were found to be significantly more likely to neither agree nor disagree when asked whether they felt safe at home alone during the night than those in cottages off Tarlington (12.2% compared with 2.8% respectively).
 - Respondents living in townhouses off Bunker were significantly less likely to agree or strongly agree when asked whether they felt safe walking around at night than those living in either of the other three clusters (10.2% compared with 34.3% of those in townhouses off Tarlington, 33.3% of those in cottages off Tarlington and 28.2% of those in cottages off Bunker), and were also significantly less likely to strongly agree than those from the three other clusters (no respondents living in townhouses off Bunker strongly agreed compared with 8.6% of respondents in townhouses off Tarlington, 8.5% of respondents in cottages off Bunker and 8.3% of those in cottages off Tarlington).

Do you think you will have an opportunity to have a say over what happens to your area in the future?




Figure 87




Figure 88

9.14 Volunteering

There was found to be no significant correlation between the cluster in which respondents lived and the likelihood of respondents having made varying degrees of improvements to their homes.

9.15 Attendance at Local Place of Worship

No significant correlation was found between the cluster in which respondents lived and the likelihood of respondents attending a local place of worship.

10. AUSTRALIAN AND OVERSEAS BORN

This section compares key findings for Australian-born respondents and those born in non-English speaking countries. Again, only those findings which are statistically significant and/or likely to be of particular interest to the redevelopment are reported.

10.1 Background

Of the 602 respondents who answered the question 'What is your country of birth?', 171 (28.4%) were born in Australia and 431 (71.6%) were overseas-born (OSB). Of these OSB respondents, the leading country of birth was found to be Vietnam (45.5%), followed by Cambodia (8.8%), Iraq (7.0%), Laos (4.9%) and Lebanon (4.2%).

10.2 Respondent Profile

There were a number of key differences in the profile of social and private housing respondents.

- OSB respondents were far less likely to be very long-term residents (20+ years) than those born in Australia (18.0% and 40.9% respectively), and were twice as likely to have lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 2 years (15.6% compared with 7.0%).




Figure 89

- OSB respondents were almost three times as likely to live in a private home (12.5% compared with 4.7% of Australian-born) and were slightly more likely to be male (34.6% compared with 26.5% - not statistically significant).
- They were slightly less likely to have family in close proximity than Australian-born respondents (58.6% and 66.1% respectively – not statistically significant).
- OSB respondents were more likely than those born in Australia to have their main source of income as pensions and benefits (78.8% compared with 69.4%).

- Of those OSB, 93.5% spoke languages other than English at home compared with 17.6% of those born in Australia. Of those who spoke a language other than English at home, significantly more OSB respondents spoke Vietnamese than Australian-born (48.0% compared with 18.5% respectively), whereas Australian-born respondents were significantly more likely to speak Arabic (29.6% compared with 9.9% of OSB respondents).

10.3 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg

There were significant differences between the **level of satisfaction** with life in Bonnyrigg among OSB and Australian-born respondents:

- Of those respondents who were overseas-born, 38.3% reported that they felt 'very positive' about life in Bonnyrigg compared with 26.4% of Australian-born.
- Also, 79.4% of OSB respondent felt generally or very positive compared with 66.7% of those born in Australia;

OSB residents were more likely to value the following **positive aspects** of life in the area:

- '*Good neighbours or community associations*' (27.4% compared with 17.2% for Australian born – not statistically significant);
- '*Quiet or nice area*' (25.8% OSB compared with 9.2% Australian-born);
- Other attributes of Bonnyrigg, like '*like area, used to area*' (20.6% OSB compared with 13.8% Australian-born – not statistically significant); or '*safe area*' (6.0% OSB compared with 0.0% Australian-born).

Australian-born respondents were significantly more likely to say that they valued having family nearby (13.8% compared with 4.8% of OSB respondents), and also to say that there was nothing good about the area (10.3% compared with 4.0%).




Figure 90

In terms of **negative aspects** of life in Bonnyrigg:

- OSB were far less likely to report problems with drugs, dealers and needles left lying around the area, etc (21.8% of Australian-born respondents reported this as a problem compared with 7.3% of OSB respondents), and slightly less likely to be concerned with crime in general (9.3% compared with 16.1% - not statistically significant), though slightly more likely to be concerned specifically with theft or break-ins (23.4% compared with 18.4% of Australian-born respondents – not statistically significant).
- They were far more likely to report that ‘noise’ was a problem in the area (7.7% compared with 0.0% of Australian-born).




Figure 91

10.4 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg

- OSB respondents were significantly less likely to have heard about the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg, though this was still 90.5% of this group (compared with 96.5% of Australian-born).
- There was little difference between the two groups in terms of their support of the redevelopment, although Australian-born respondents were significantly more likely to say that they ‘don’t know enough yet to comment’ (22.4% compared with 14.4% of OSB).
- OSB respondents were significantly more likely to want to see the ‘estate totally redeveloped or demolished and new homes built’ (42.3% compared with 30.0% of Australian-born respondents), while Australian-born respondents were significantly more likely to take the more conservative view of either redeveloping only the ‘most run-down or worst areas’ or to keep most housing but ‘renovate or improve’ (63.5% compared with 44.2% of OSB respondents). Again, Australian-born respondents were significantly more likely to say that they ‘didn’t know enough yet to comment’ (13.5% compared with 6.5% of OSB respondents).




Figure 92

- OSB and Australian respondents had the same attitudes as to the mix of public and private housing post-redevelopment.

10.5 Housing and Locational Choice

The attitudes of respondents from the two groups in terms of 'locational choice' were found to be vastly different. All of the differences between the two groups shown in the two graphs below were found to be statistically significant.




Figure 93




Figure 94

In terms of housing choice, little difference was found between the two groups.

10.6 Improvement to Home at Own Cost

Respondents born in Australia were significantly more likely to say that they had made 'many or major improvements' to their home than those born overseas (27.0% compared with 18.4% respectively).

10.7 Community Participation

- OSB respondents were more optimistic about the degree to which they would be **able to participate** in planning for the redevelopment, with 18.1% saying that they expected to have a 'great deal of opportunity' compared with 5.7% of Australian-born respondents.
- Australian-born respondents were significantly more likely to **want to have be more involved** in the future than OSB respondents (51.7% compared with 39.3% respectively).

10.8 Impacts of Redevelopment

There was reasonable comparability between the two groups about the extent to which the announced redevelopment had had an impact **so far**, as well as whether these impacts had been positive or negative. However, there were significant differences regarding what constituted positive or negative impacts:

- OSB respondents were far less likely to report '*opportunity to leave Bonnyrigg*' as a potential **positive** (only 5.6% compared with over 40.0% for of Australian-born respondents) but far more likely to report optimism that '*something positive is happening*' (45.1% compared with only 20.0% of Australian-born respondents).
- OSB respondents were somewhat more likely than Australian-born respondents to report that **negatives** of the announced redevelopment so far included:

- 'Family or personal stress' (27.6% compared with 18.8%);
- A 'less safe environment/ more social problems' (11.1% / 3.1%);
- 'Loss of services or transport' (29.6% / 21.9%); and
- 'Concerns for the future' (47.5% / 40.6%).

However, none of these differences for negative impacts had statistical significance.

However, OSB respondents were slightly more likely to forecast that there **would be** at least '*some impact*' in the future (67.7% and 59.3% respectively – not statistically significant), whereas Australian-born respondents were significantly more likely to respond 'don't know' (26.7% compared with 15.7% of OSB respondents). OSB respondents were significantly more likely to anticipate that this would be predominantly negative (33.6% compared with 18.0% of those born in Australia). Some differences in anticipated 'negative impacts' included:

- The possibility that they would have to '*leave family or friends*' (40.0% of OSB and 26.5% of Australian-born respondents);
- Anticipated '*family stress or ill-health arising from the redevelopment*' (34.4% / 20.6%); and
- '*Leaving the community*' (32.2% / 26.5%); or '*lose community services*' (16.7% / 8.8%).

However, no differences in the anticipated impacts of the redevelopment ventured by respondents from the two groups were found to be statistically significant.

10.9 Satisfaction with Housing and Services

All Social Housing tenants were asked about their level of satisfaction with the standard of their home, and with the services provided by the housing provider.

- OSB respondents were far more likely to report that they were '*very happy*' with the **standard of their home** (32.9% compared with 22.8%).
- They were also far more likely to report that they were '*happy or very happy*' with the **services provided** by their housing provider (68.1% compared with 52.8% of Australian-born respondents). Australian-born respondents were far more likely to be '*unhappy or very unhappy*' (33.1% compared with 20.7% of OSB respondents).




Figure 95

10.10 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood

As noted earlier, respondents rated their level of agreement or disagreement with a set of statements about 'social cohesion' on a 5-point (Lichert) scale.

10.10.1 Sense of Community

- Australian-born respondents were significantly more likely to disagree or strongly disagree that they **'belonged to this neighbourhood'** than OSB respondents (23.0% compared with 10.1% respectively), and were also more likely to strongly disagree (8.0% of those born in Australia compared with 1.2% of OSB respondents).




Figure 96

- The two groups had comparable feelings about the importance of **'the friendships and associations I have with other people in my neighbourhood'**, as well as in response to the statement **'I think I agree with most people in my neighbourhood about what is important in life'**.
- Also, the two groups were equally likely to give a very positive response to the proposition that they had a sense of **'loyalty to people in their neighbourhood'** (around 80% of each group agreeing or strongly agreeing).
- A somewhat higher proportion of OSB respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, **'I like to think of myself as similar to people in this neighbourhood'** (64.5% OSB and 54.0% of Australian-born respondents – not statistically significant).
- There was reasonable comparability between the two groups in terms of agreement and disagreement with the proposition that **'a strong feeling of friendliness exists in this neighbourhood'**.
- OSB respondents were significantly more likely to agree or strongly agree that **'Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community'** (73.0% compared with 60.9% Australian-born). Those respondents born in Australia were significantly more likely to disagree or strongly disagree with the statement than those born overseas (25.3% compared with 10.7% respectively) and to strongly disagree (5.7% compared with 1.6% respectively).




Figure 97

10.10.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood

- OSB respondents were more likely to agree or strongly agree that they were **'very attracted to living in the neighbourhood'** than Australian-born respondents (84.3% compared with 66.3%), whereas those born in Australia were significantly more likely to disagree or strongly disagree (20.9% compared with 6.9% of those born overseas) and to strongly disagree (7.0% compared with 1.2% of those born overseas).




Figure 89

- There was an indication that people born overseas had a greater attachment to the neighbourhood from the way they responded to statements about their intention to remain in the area. Of those respondents born overseas 80.1% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they **'planned to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years'**, compared with around 62.8% of Australian-born respondents, whereas those born in Australia were more likely to disagree or strongly disagree (24.4% compared with 10.6% of OSB respondents) and to strongly disagree (5.8% compared with 1.6% of OSB respondents).

'I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years'




Figure 99

- Australian-born respondents were far more likely to respond negatively to the statement that they would **'like to move out of this neighbourhood, given the chance'**, with 33.3% agreeing or strongly agreeing compared with 21.1% of OSB respondents, as well as 16.1% strongly agreeing compared with 7.3% of OSB respondents.

10.10.3 Degree of Interaction Within The Neighbourhood

- The degree to which each group reported that they agreed with the proposition that they **'visited their neighbours in their homes'** was reasonably comparable.
- OSB respondents appeared to struggle even more than their Australian born counterparts with the proposition, **'If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something I'd think of it as something "we" were doing rather than something "they" were doing'**, with almost one-third neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statement, and a higher than average proportion abstaining from this question. The views of the two groups were not found to differ significantly.
- The two groups held comparable views about whether they could **'go to someone in their neighbourhood if they needed advice about something'**, except that Australian-born respondents were significantly more likely to strongly agree (16.5% compared with 8.5% of OSB respondents). The two groups also held comparable views in regard to the proposition **'I believe my neighbours would help me in an emergency'**.
- Respondents in each group were again reluctant about **'borrowing things from their neighbours'**, with Australian-born respondents more likely to be strongly reluctant than those born overseas (31.0% compared with 16.6% respectively).
- As noted earlier, more than three-quarters of respondents said that they would be **'willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood'**, with comparable responses from each group.
- OSB respondents were significantly less likely to report that they **'rarely invited neighbours to visit'** and more likely to report that they would. Any significant differences in regard to this proposition are shown in the below graph.




Figure 100

- Again there was a strong similarity in the response to the proposition that respondents regularly ***'stop and chat with their neighbours'*** though a slightly higher proportion of OSB respondents reported that they agreed or strongly agreed, or that they could not respond.

10.11 Safety

In terms of perceptions of neighbourhood safety:

- A high proportion of each group reported that they felt ***'safe at home alone during the day'***, though a higher proportion of Australian-born respondents reported that they strongly disagreed when asked whether they ***'felt safe walking around the neighbourhood during the day'*** (6.9% compared with 2.0% of OSB respondents).
- A slightly lower proportion of Australian-born respondents felt ***'safe at home alone during the night'*** (63.2% compared with 70.2% of those OSB – not statistically significant), and a significantly higher proportion strongly disagreed when asked if they ***'feel safe walking around the neighbourhood during the night'*** (36.8% compared with 20.2% respectively).

10.12 Volunteering & Attendance at Place of Worship

- OSB respondents were as likely to **volunteer** as Australian-born respondents. However, they reported that they were more than twice as likely to **attend a place of worship** than their Australian born counterparts (55.3% compared with 27.8% - statistically significant).

11. GENDER OF RESPONDENTS

This section compares key findings for male and female respondents. Of the 658 respondents who answered the question of gender, 214 were male (32.5%) and 444 were female (67.5%).

11.1 Respondent Profile

There were a number of significant differences in the profile of respondents based on gender.

- Females tended to be more likely than males to reside in a Townhouse or Villa (30.5% compared to 23.9%). [0.08]
- Females were more likely than males to be aged 40-54 years (39.5% compared to 23.4%).
- Females were more likely than males to have children living with them (77.5% compared to 62.1%).
- Males were more likely than females to have family in Bonnyrigg or nearby suburbs (66.7% compared to 57.6%).
- Females were more likely than males to rely on a Pension or benefits as their main source of income (80.6% compared to 69.3%).
- Males were more likely than females to rely on employment and wages as their main source of income (27.4% compared to 17.8%).
- Females tended to be more likely than males to be born in Australia (30.9% compared to 23.3%). [0.056]
- Males tended to be more likely than females to be born in Vietnam (37.8% compared to 29.9%) [0.052].
- Males were more likely than females to reside in private housing (18.2% compared to 6.3%).
- Females were more likely than males to reside in public cottages (59.6% compared to 49.3%).

11.2 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg

Overall, both males and females were more likely than not to respond that they felt positive about living in Bonnyrigg.

In terms of **negative aspects** of life in Bonnyrigg:

- Males were significantly more likely to respond that theft and break-ins were a negative aspect of Bonnyrigg (30.1% compared to 17.9%).
- Males were more likely than females to be happy and very happy with the standard of housing (79.3% compared to 70.5%).

11.3 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg

There was no significant difference between response rates on attitude to the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg based on gender.

11.4 Housing and Locational Choice

There was no significant difference between response rates based on gender.

11.5 Community Participation

There was no significant difference between response rates based on gender.

11.6 Impact of Redevelopment

Males and females differed to some extent on their responses to the both the impacts of the redevelopment so far, and the future impacts of the redevelopment.

- Females were more likely than males to respond that the announcement of the redevelopment has had “some impact” on them or their family so far (43.3% compared to 31.7%).
- Males were more likely than females to respond that the announcement of the redevelopment has had “no impact” on them or their family so far (47.2% compared to 36.6%). [0.55 – tendency or significant?]

Of those who responded that the impacts of the redevelopment would be **positive**:

- Females were more likely than males to select “Opportunity to get a better home” (59.2% compared to 41.4%). [0.1056 – tendency?]
- Males were far more likely than females to select “More optimism, feeling that something positive is happening to area” (65.5% compared to 28.6%).

Of those who responded that the impacts of the redevelopment would be **negative**:

- Males were more likely than females to select “Area more unsettled, resident insecurity” (43.6% compared to 29.6%).
- Females were more likely than males to select “Family or personal stress” (27.6% compared to 15.8%). [0.15].

Of those who responded they thought the redevelopment **will have “some” or a “major” impact** on them or their family **in the future**:

- Males were tended(?) to be more likely than females to respond that the impact would be “More Positive” (43.1% compared to 33.3%). [0.17]
- Females were more likely than males to respond that the impact would be “Both positive and negative” (37.9% compared to 23.6%).

Of the **positive future impacts** selected:

- Females tended(?) to be more likely than males to select “Better home” (78.5% compared to 67.3%). [0.15].
- Males were more likely than females to select “Better services” (39.6% compared to 16.1%).
- Females tended(?) to be more likely than males to select “Less stigma / mixed area” (8.3% compared to 17%). [0.16].

Of the **negative future impacts** selected:

- Males tended(?) to be more likely than females to select “Leave family or friends” (46.3% compared to 33%). [0.14]
- Females tended to be more likely than males to select “Further from schools” (19.5% compared to 7.3%).
- Females were more likely than males to select “Less access to transport” (33% compared to 14.6%).

11.7 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services

- Males were more likely than females to be happy and very happy with the standard of housing (79.3% compared to 70.5%).

11.8 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood

As noted earlier, the survey included 18 questions based on the Buckner (1988) scale of social cohesion. Respondents rated their level of agreement or disagreement with a set of statements on a 5-point (Lichert) scale.

11.8.1 *Sense of Community*

- Males tended to be more likely than females to agree with the statement "Living in this neighbourhood gives me a sense of community" (76.4% compared to 67.3%). [0.07 tendency]
- Males were more likely than females to agree with the statement "I like to think of myself as similar to the people who live in this neighbourhood" (69.1% compared to 58.4%).
- Males tended to be more likely than females to agree with the statement "A strong feeling of friendliness exists in this neighbourhood" (71.1% compared to 62.2%). [0.1006 – tendency?]

11.8.2 *Attraction to Neighbourhood*

- There was a tendency for males to agree more readily with the statement "I plan to remain a resident of this neighbourhood for a number of years" (80.5% compared to 73.8%). [0.16]

11.8.3 *Degree of Interaction Within The Neighbourhood*

- Males were more likely than females to agree with the statement "I regularly stop and chat with people in my neighbourhood" (80.5% compared to 73.9%). [0.17]

11.9 Safety

- Males were more likely than females to agree with the statement "When I'm alone in my home during the day I feel safe" (89.4% compared to 82.1%). [0.07 – tendency].
- Males were more likely than females to agree with the statement "I feel safe walking around my neighbourhood during the day" (90.6% compared to 82.1%). [0.07 – tendency].
- Males were far more likely than females to agree with the statement "I feel safe walking around my neighbourhood during the night" (35% compared to 20.5%).

11.10 Volunteering

- Males were more likely than females to agree with the statement "I would be willing to work together with others on something to improve my neighbourhood" (84.5% compared to 71.1%).

11.11 Attendance at Place of Worship

There was no significant difference between males and females.

12. LENGTH OF TIME IN BONNYRIGG

This section compared key findings based on how long respondents have lived in Bonnyrigg.

12.1 Respondent Profile




Figure 101




Figure 102




Figure 103

Almost half of respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for 20 years or more were born in Australia. Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for over 20 years or more were more than twice as likely to be born in Australia than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 20 years (47.6% compared to 22.3%).




Figure 104

12.2 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg

Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for 10 or more years were far more likely to feel “very positive” about living in Bonnyrigg at the moment than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 10 years. However, no significant differences were found when considering ‘quite’ or ‘very positive’.

12.3 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg

Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 2 years were more likely to “Strongly support” the redevelopment than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg longer than 2 years (41.9% compared to 31.5%).

Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for over 25 years were far more likely to “Strongly oppose” the redevelopment than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 25 years (23.2% compared to 7.3%).

Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 2 years or more were far more likely to want the estate to be totally redeveloped or demolished and new houses built than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 20 years (23.4% compared to 43.7%).

Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for 20 years or more were far less likely to want the estate to be totally redeveloped or demolished and new houses built than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 20 years (23.4% compared to 43.7%).




Figure 105

Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for 20 years or more were more likely to want the more run down or worst areas redeveloped & new houses built than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 20 years (43.1% compared to 28%).

Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for 20 years or more were more likely to want most of the housing kept, but renovated or improved than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 20 years (26.4% compared to 15.7%).

12.4 Housing and Locational Choice

Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for 10 or more years were more likely to respond that they “definitely” wanted to stay in Bonnyrigg before the redevelopment was announced than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 10 years (71.1% compared to 57.7%). Of those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for 25 or more years, 78.6% responded they “definitely” wanted to stay in Bonnyrigg.

Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for 10 or more years were more likely to have intended to stay in Bonnyrigg for longer than 10 years than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 10 years (68.4% compared to 44.4%).




Figure 106

12.5 Community Housing Options

There were no significant differences in the attitudes of respondents of various ages regarding their want to live in community housing.

12.6 Improvement to Home at Own Cost

Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for over 20 years were far more likely to have made many or major improvements to their dwelling at their own cost than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 20 years (36.9% compared to 14.8%). Only 6.5% of Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 2 years had made many or major improvements to their dwelling at their own cost.

12.7 Special Needs

Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg more than 25 years tended to be more likely than all other year bands to have special needs when finding housing (65.4%, compared to an average response rate of 49.3%).

12.8 Community Participation

No significant differences found depending on age.

12.9 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services

No significant differences found depending on age.

12.10 ‘Social Cohesion’ in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood

12.10.1 Sense of Community




Figure 107




Figure 108

Respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for more than 25 years were far more likely to agree with the statement "I think I agree with most people in my neighbourhood about what is important in life" than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 25 years (87% compared to 50.8%).




Figure 109

100% of respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for more than 25 years agreed with the statement "I feel loyal to the people in my neighbourhood". This was significantly higher than all other tenure bands.




Figure 110

12.10.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood




Figure 111

12.10.3 Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood




Figure 112

There appears to be an overall tendency for respondents who had lived in Bonnyrigg for less than 2 years to demonstrate lower social cohesion if measured on the Buckner scale.

13. AGE OF RESPONDENTS

This section compares key findings for respondents based on their age.

13.1 Respondent Profile

There were a number of significant differences in the profile of respondents based on their age.




Figure 113




Figure 114




Figure 115




Figure 116

- Respondents aged less than 25 years were significantly more likely than all other age cohorts to be born in Australia (52.5%, compared to an average of 28.5% for *all* respondents).

13.2 Attitude to Life in Bonnyrigg

- Respondents aged 40 years and over were far more likely to respond that they felt “Very Positive” about living in Bonnyrigg at the moment than those aged less than 40 years (44.5% compared to 17.1%). However the percentages for Positive (including “Very Positive” and “Quite Positive”) were roughly the same for all age groups.

13.3 Attitude to the Redevelopment of Bonnyrigg

No significant difference.

13.4 Housing and Locational Choice




Figure 117

13.5 Community Participation

No significant difference.

13.6 Impacts of Redevelopment

No significant difference.

13.7 Satisfaction with Current Housing and Services

- Respondents aged 40 years and over were far less likely to have intended to stay in Bonnyrigg less than 5 years prior to the announcement of the redevelopment than those aged less than 40 years (8.2% compared to 26.9%).




Figure 118

13.8 'Social Cohesion' in Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood

The survey included 18 questions based on the Buckner (1988) scale of social cohesion. Respondents rated their level of agreement or disagreement with a set of statements on a 5-point (Lichert) scale.

13.8.1 Sense of Community




Figure 119

13.8.2 Attraction to Neighbourhood




Figure 120




Figure 121

13.8.3 Degree of Interaction Within the Neighbourhood

No significant difference.

13.9 Safety

No significant difference.

13.10 Volunteering & Attendance at Place of Worship

No significant difference.

14. DISCUSSION

14.1 Methodological Issues

The sample was sufficiently large and the profile generally representative of the population in the Study Area. It is therefore possible to draw conclusions about the views of Bonnyrigg residents with a reasonable level of certainty.

There was also sufficient response rate among various sub-groups within the Bonnyrigg Study Area to allow for a range of cross-tabulations to be undertaken with confidence on many of the key variables. The extensive use of bilingual staff and interpreters, face-to-face interview technique, and multiple callbacks allowed for a high participation rate for Bonnyrigg residents, including those with additional barriers of language, literacy, disability or family constraints.

Generally, there appeared to be a reasonable level of comfort among respondents about the questions asked and the method of survey administration, and a relatively low rate of refusal (around 70 refusals or around 8% of the population). The remainder of those who were not surveyed were generally not at home after repeated callbacks, or did not leave out their survey for collection even after reminder calls were made or follow up letters sent.

In terms of logistics, interviewers reported feeling safe during their walks around the estate and their interviews (generally conducted during the day but sometimes finishing in the early evening), and were also supported in the fields in various ways described above. The main exception was the extensive presence of dogs, and difficulties in gaining entrance to some properties, which required some ingenuity on the part of interviewers to make contact with the householder. The high response rate was a result of the extensive access mechanisms described in the Methodology section, as well as what appeared to be a general awareness of the redevelopment and a wish to have their say before any final decisions were made.

As to survey administration, the main difficulty arose from the 18 'Buckner-scale' questions for all groups, but particularly for those with limited or no English. The phrasing of the questions, the concepts involved, and the need to ask them 'as written' for consistency, made translations difficult for some languages most notably *"If the people in my neighbourhood were planning something I'd think of it as something "we" were doing rather than something "they" were doing"*). It was also evident that even English speakers struggled consistently with a few of the questions. Further, the concepts embedded in the questions also were viewed as 'Anglo-centric' or problematic by members of some cultural groups.

This generally explains the relatively high non-response to some of these questions. Nonetheless, there was generally a positive to very positive response to these measures of social cohesion among the Bonnyrigg population compared with a study undertaken in Greater Western Sydney (GWS) by authors of this report, despite the language, cultural and conceptual limitations. This is discussed further below.

14.2 Support for the Redevelopment and its Relationship to Views on Bonnyrigg and Understanding of Renewal

As noted above, there was general support for the Department's renewal activities in Bonnyrigg, with 65% of respondents supporting or strongly supporting the redevelopment. There was also a reasonable level of knowledge evident among respondents about the Department's current thinking on the direction that renewal activities could take. However, this support was heavily qualified by the comments that respondents made about their expectations and what they understood to be happening in the redevelopment. There were some significant differences between different population groups, with those in private housing and in public townhouses more likely to support the redevelopment than their social housing or cottage-dwelling neighbours. There was little difference between different 'halves' of the estate, nor on other variables examined.

At this stage, it appears that the Department's consultation strategy is having a positive impact upon the views and expectations of many Bonnyrigg residents. Whilst there is certainly concern about potential future impacts (discussed below), respondents also appear to be generally well informed about what is proposed at this stage, indicating reasonable attendance at consultation workshops as well as familiarity with the written material regularly distributed to all households by the Department. It's emphasis on regular and consistent information appears to be leading to reasonable confidence in the Department and its intentions in the planning for the Bonnyrigg renewal to date.

Consultation, including this survey, is preceding the development of the Masterplan and any firm renewal plans for Bonnyrigg; and the development of the Masterplan itself will precede any redevelopment or demolition. The presence of an active and apparently well-regarded Intensive Tenancy Management (ITM) program in Bonnyrigg also appears to be a factor in ensuring that residents are developing trust in the Department. The ITM's positive presence on the estate was the subject of frequent comment by Bonnyrigg residents, who reported that the ITM is also instrumental in ensuring that the messages contained in written information about the *Living Communities* program are consistently reinforced by less formal day to day contact with staff.

The relatively positive feelings evident in Bonnyrigg about renewal activities are also perhaps not surprising, given findings in urban renewal literature that *any* activity in an area which has experienced physical or social neglect is likely to be well regarded by residents, and that 'participation alone' can lead to many of the desired outcomes irrespective of other renewal strategies implemented.¹⁰ The added benefit of an active ITM presence is also important in building confidence that 'something positive' is happening on the estate.¹¹ The current attitude evident among many in this community provides an excellent basis of which to build participatory approaches to estate renewal as planning under the Bonnyrigg *Living Communities* program continues. Overall, Bonnyrigg residents also appeared optimistic about the potential to be involved in the redevelopment in the future, though just over one third believed that they would have 'little or no opportunity' to have a say over what happens in the redevelopment. At this stage, a minority (43%) expressed a definite desire to be involved in redevelopment planning or implementation though it is likely that this level of involvement will increase as more decisions are made that affect Bonnyrigg residents directly, and the redevelopment becomes imminent. Increased

¹⁰ Stubbs, J. & Storer, J. 1996, *Social Cost Benefit Analysis: Airds Case Study*, NSW Department of Housing.

¹¹ See for example Lewis, C.A., 1980, 'Gardening Programs Promote Improved Maintenance and Community Relations in Public Housing Developments', *Journal of Housing*, Vol. 37, No. 11.

involvement and enthusiasm is as likely to be as dependent upon the *outcomes* of consultation as the process itself, particularly as the project progresses and tradeoffs between various views and needs become necessary.

Further, as noted earlier, support for the redevelopment is heavily dependent on what residents *believe* will happen, and on the renewal process achieving certain positive outcomes for themselves or for the community that the majority value highly. It is significant in this regard that more than three-quarters of respondents felt positive or very positive about life in Bonnyrigg at the present time, and that certain population sub-groups are even more positive (e.g. those born in NES countries, and those older than 40 or who have lived longest in the area). They value the location relative to services, shops and religious and cultural institutions and networks, attributes of the neighbourhood, as well as the sense of community and friendships that Bonnyrigg offers.

In this regard, it was interesting that there was generally little significant difference between the different groups where one may expect to find some variation due, for example, to quality or design of housing. There was generally a lack of statistically significant difference between those in cottages and townhouses, or those in private versus social housing, though those in private housing were more likely to report 'very positive' feelings about the neighbourhood. This provides an indication that those in private housing as well as newer migrant groups have settled well in the area, and that it provides them with an environment in which they are generally happy to remain. This will also have a bearing on the extent to which certain cottage precincts can be redeveloped. However, there is an indication from the survey that a majority of those in 'scattered' private cottages would not be strongly opposed to their homes being purchased by the PPP if this became necessary (e.g. for road works, or general reconfiguration), provided they were '*properly compensated*'. From comments offered, this was generally taken to mean that the home would be purchased for at least the amount that would enable them to purchase a home elsewhere in the sub-region, or to buy a new cottage within the redevelopment area.

In terms of what they believe will happen during estate renewal, Bonnyrigg residents appear to have understood the message that 'everyone who wants to return can come back or remain' in Bonnyrigg, and that there will be significant physical and social improvements to their area and homes arising from the renewal. They have also understood that there will be more private housing in the area, but that it is still likely that a majority of public housing (in absolute terms) will be replaced or retained in Bonnyrigg. Uncertainty surrounds issues of density, how the different housing tenures will be configured, and the types of choices that they will in reality have. As such, a strongly qualified support for the redevelopment was evident among most respondents who supported it. Whilst there was often optimism about the future, this was generally accompanied by comments that indicated that such support was dependent upon '*being sure I can come back*', '*that I can keep my garden (or have a similar one)*', '*that I get a better house*' or '*definitely don't have to live in a flat*'.

The issue of '*good neighbours*' or '*neighbours who are more like family*' also came up frequently in respondents' comments about their future neighbourhood. The desire to retain such neighbours was expressed frequently. This appeared to increase with the length of time they had resided in the area, and also with the level of disability, or assistance that was provided by neighbours who appeared to fill the gap in market or community services in many respects.¹² Further evidence of high levels of 'social capital' and 'social cohesion' was provided by the positive responses to questions that sought to explore such cohesion, as noted below.

It is interesting that this interdependence also has a clear linguistic and cultural element, both among residents from the same cultural group, and between those who have a good command of English and those who do not. It was common for Bonnyrigg respondents to report that they assisted or received assistance from others in their neighbourhood in gaining access to official services that their lack of English would otherwise deny them. Common examples included assistance with forms, reading letters, or making or attending appointments. English speaking neighbours, as well as English-speaking children and family networks external to the estate, were of value in this regard. This appeared to provide an important conduit to mainstream social activities, and appeared to significantly reduce social isolation. The presence of clusters of residents from the same language or cultural background also appeared to be an important factor in reducing isolation, and providing positive experiences of community in the Bonnyrigg area. It was also important that 60% of respondents reported that they had close family living in or near Bonnyrigg. The historical importance of the Fairfield-Liverpool sub-region as a first point of settlement for a number of migrant groups was also evident from the number of overseas born residents who reported that they valued proximity to other family members, or noted in discussions that they had relocated into public housing from surrounding suburbs in Fairfield where they still had social networks. This was enhanced by the presence of a range of cultural and religious organisations close to the estate, particularly the presence of the various places of worship surrounding the estate. As noted above, those from a NESB were twice as likely to report that they attended a place of worship near the local community than those born in Australia.

A further factor that has an influence on whether residents have a preference for redevelopment of their home or area is the extent to which they have made changes to their home or their garden at their own expense. As noted above, more than half of all social housing tenants reported that they had made some or major improvements to their homes at their own expense, some quite extensive. This commonly included tiling floors throughout the home, painting, built-in wardrobes, security systems, and extensive paving or concreting. Interviewers field observations supported comments in the survey that many residents had in fact expected that Bonnyrigg was their permanent homes, and had invested time and financial resources into making it so. Likewise, interviewers frequently commented on the extent of work and care that had gone into gardens, including substantial planting and soft and hard landscaping. Multiple respondents in certain streets noted that much of their relationship with neighbours revolved around exchanging plants, and swapping vegetables and herbs. Elderly migrants from Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and mainland China appeared to be particularly attached to their gardens, some of which had extensive planting. It was also noted that the children or spouse of older OSB respondents quite often commented that the garden was '*what keeps [my father] alive*'. These community attributes that are not often glimpsed from outside homes or the high and often dilapidated fences. Again, a tension exists between the extent to which such resident-resourced or initiated 'improvements' can be accommodated within the estate redevelopment.

In summary, whilst there was clear support for the positive changes that the Bonnyrigg *Living Communities* program signalled, this must be considered in the context of the positive hopes that residents have about the renewal, and that it is conditional upon certain positive outcomes from the process. Principally, their support is contingent upon being able to remain in the area should they want to, that their housing situation will be at least commensurate with their current in terms of standard, type and improvements, and that there will be physical and social improvements to housing and infrastructure on the estate. Preservation of valued attributes of the existing community, including good neighbours, proximity to family or cultural and religious institutions, and continued access to social support for those with barriers to participation in the mainstream (particularly language or cultural barriers), are also pre-requisites to support for the redevelopment for many of those

surveyed. Whilst there is a strong base from which to pursue renewal activities, and a reasonable degree of trust in the Department and optimism in the future, the conditions placed on support may prove to be a considerable challenge during planning and implementation of physical renewal strategies.

14.3 Preferred Directions for the Redevelopment

Likewise, residents' views about future directions for the Bonnyrigg redevelopment may also pose a challenge, given the competing objectives facing those preparing the Masterplan and attendant policies and procedures, and the imperatives driving the renewal program. The results reported in the *Findings* section above regarding resident preferences on various aspects of the redevelopment may conflict with what is needed to achieve certain redevelopment objectives.

As noted previously, just over half of all survey respondents favoured a gradual, partial or selective redevelopment, though 39% supported a demolition of the whole estate. This is not necessarily too different to the Department's current thinking, where it is likely that selected areas will be retained and reconfigured or upgraded, and other areas demolished and rebuilt. However, there is not necessarily support for demolition of those areas that may be target for total redevelopment (e.g. townhouse areas close to the Plaza). As noted above, those in townhouses were more likely to want to see a total demolition of the estate, though in general, areas with townhouses are as likely to be satisfied with the area, and to have similar views about wanting to remain post-redevelopment. Whilst a relatively high proportion favour demolishing the 'worst areas', this often does not mean *their* area. Bonnyrigg townhouses appear to be in much better condition than those in some other estates, and are generally only one-storey, which may be the reasons for higher levels of satisfaction.

Planning for *which* areas will be redeveloped, upgraded and/or variously reconfigured requires far more detailed input than this survey can currently provide. The survey findings do not, for example, provide a rationale for automatically redeveloping all townhouse areas and upgrading all cottage areas. This points to the need for careful and detailed planning at the small area level, and sophisticated planning at the street or precinct level. How such planning is to be accommodated in the PPP process may present additional challenges for the project.

In terms of public-private mix, residents appeared to have limited concern with more abstract notions of 'mix', but very practical concerns that there is sufficient social housing to provide for the substantial majority who wish to remain in the neighbourhood. As noted earlier, there are some perceived benefits of introducing a higher component of private housing, notably that there will be more physical care of the area, more notice taken by decision-makers if there are more middle class or private owners, and that there will be a reduction in social problems, principally activities related to drugs. However, only 20% of respondents agreed that social housing should be reduced to 30% or less. As noted in the findings above, 80% of respondents preferred at least 50% public housing, whilst 44% were generally satisfied with a similar arrangement to the present mix or did not consider increased mix to be an issue. These results may have implications for the masterplanning phase, and future housing tenure and configuration. Some concerns were also expressed about the nature of the community that will emerge if there is a majority of private housing, including comments that social housing tenants could become 'outsiders in their own area', or 'looked down on' by the private home owners. Much will rely upon the sensitivity with which the estate is planned and configured, for example, the clustering versus dispersal of social housing, or housing allocated to different groups (e.g. older people with a common language). Such planning is

probably one of the greatest challenges for the success of the redevelopment, and requires detailed, sensitive and creative design and creative solutions with extensive community involvement.

Further, despite the current intention to increase densities in the redeveloped area, the strong preference for detached housing continued to be evident among respondents. Close to 80% of social housing respondents would choose a freestanding house with a private backyard if they had a choice post-redevelopment. Only 3% would select a flat or unit, with a majority of these already living in aged persons units in Bibby's Place. About 10 would choose a villa unit. Those in townhouses now were more likely to choose to live in a townhouse in the future, but their expectation of what a 'townhouse' means is likely to be shaped by their current experience in Bonnyrigg (i.e. generally a one-storey home with an adequate garden area). It was significant that over 70% of respondents had dependent children living with them, though not always young children (e.g. some were in further education or not in employment). Around 45% reported that they had pets that needed a back yard (principally large or multiple dogs). Again, strong resident aspirations regarding their preferred housing type may pose a considerable challenge where increased densities are necessary to achieve the level of replacement of social housing required to accommodate those who wish to remain in Bonnyrigg. The survey findings indicate that there will be strong resistance among a majority of residents to moving into high density living, and that this is likely to be a significant issue if there is to be community acceptance of redevelopment plans. Such tradeoffs between the desire to stay in Bonnyrigg, the volume of stock required, and the need to increase densities are inevitable in such PPP models of estate renewal. Again, strong community involvement in every stage of the planning is critical.

Finally, Community Housing is not yet a tenure with which the vast majority of respondents have any familiarity. There appeared to be some concerns about relative housing security, rental costs, and management, which influenced the extent to which respondents felt they could commit themselves to community housing at this time. Far more community education is required for residents to make an informed choice about this tenure should it become an issue in the future. However, a further factor is the relatively high level of satisfaction with their housing among public tenants, and the reasonable level of satisfaction with Departmental services. Again, the ITM also appears to have played a role in encouraging a positive image for the Department among tenants and others in the community.

14.4 Preference to Remain in Bonnyrigg Pre- and Post-Renewal

Given the trends discussed above, it is not surprising that respondents indicated a high level of commitment to remaining in Bonnyrigg *prior* to the redevelopment being announced, with more than three-quarters reporting that they would definitely or probably have stayed, a majority of these long-term. Interestingly, only 67% reported that they *now* intended to stay in the area after the announcement of the renewal, but the 11 percentage point-difference was mainly accounted for by more people wanting to wait and see what was proposed in the redevelopment.

Some significant differences were also evident among different population groups. Those in social housing were more likely to 'definitely' want to stay than their private counterparts, though this appeared to be influenced by the fact that social housing tenants had lived in the area for longer on average than those in private housing. Those who had lived on the estate more than 10 years tended to have a greater wish to remain than those who had lived in Bonnyrigg for a shorter time. It has also been noted that more than half of all public housing tenants reported that they had a 'special need' (generally illness or disability) that should be taken into account in the housing reallocation or relocation process. A high proportion of these were related to an illness or injury that made the location to their home *vis a vis* services or transport an important consideration. The convenient location of Bonnyrigg is no doubt a key factor in their preference to stay, and likely to remain so. Overseas born residents were considerably more likely to want to remain in Bonnyrigg, which is likely to be linked to their attachment to social networks and assistance gained from others in and near their neighbourhood. The importance of these associations, the reduction in social isolation, and likely influence on social well being has already been noted, and is discussed further below. However, as noted earlier, little difference was evident among different groups in terms of changes in attitude to remaining in the area *post*-redevelopment.

As noted in the findings, analysis of comments in the survey indicates that there is quite a high level of concern about post-redevelopment housing allocation in terms of type of home (with 'flats' nominated by many as an unsatisfactory housing replacement), their future location within the estate, and the extent to which existing 'good neighbours' may be replaced with less satisfactory ones. The challenges associated with this have already been noted.

14.5 Current and Anticipated Impacts

In terms of impacts of the redevelopment, more than half of Bonnyrigg respondents reported that there had been some impact already, with half of these saying it had been '*more negative*', and more than 20% saying it had had a mixed impact. The main concerns related to fear and uncertainty about their future, and particularly that they would lose their home, community and services that they valued.

It was also noted that 65% of respondents felt they would experience some or major impacts from the redevelopment in the future, with respondents fairly evenly divided between those who believed they would be more positive or more negative. Those who anticipated a positive outcome mostly believed that they would receive a 'better home', 'better services' or a 'safer environment'; whilst those who felt it would be more negative mainly feared 'leaving family or friends', 'leaving the community', loss of services, transport and shops, loss of garden or home improvements, and family or personal stress and ill-health.

These impacts will need to be explored in more detail as part of a comprehensive social impact assessment process during the Masterplanning phase. Experience in other estates indicates that the development of appropriate mitigation strategies, including relocation, allocation and redevelopment policies and procedures, and appropriate compensation, are a necessary part of mitigation. Other mechanisms have proven to be effective in areas undergoing redevelopment including the funding of an independent tenants advocate, and additional dedicated resources (including staff) within the Department to implement redevelopment procedures. Bonnyrigg is a unique neighbourhood, and the process of redevelopment here will of course have a different trajectory to that of other estates. The PPP process itself provides for quite a different process to that undertaken in NSW to the present time, and the Department has drawn on some of the lessons from other social housing redevelopment projects, both in NSW and elsewhere. However, some of the positive learnings from other areas¹³ may be useful despite the differences socially and physically, and the approach taken to redevelopment.

14.6 Social Cohesion

As noted earlier, various conceptions or measures of what is termed 'social cohesion' have been developed to explore the extent to which there is an inter-relationship or connectedness between residents of a given area or social group. At the meso-level, Buckner (1988) developed a 'neighbourhood cohesion instrument', using what he regarded as three dimensions of cohesion in neighbourhoods: sense of community (e.g. "I feel like I belong to this neighbourhood"), attraction to neighbourhood (e.g. "Overall, I'm very attracted to living in this neighbourhood"), and degree of interaction within the neighbourhood (e.g. "I visit with my neighbours in their homes"). These scores, though based on individual perceptions of neighbourhood cohesion, may be used to develop and test hypotheses at the neighbourhood level of analysis.¹⁴ Other social theorists such as Vinson (2004) have conceptualised 'social cohesion' as containing three key elements: *social and support networks*; *social participation*; and *community engagement*.¹⁵

The survey included several elements that attempted to explore the extent of social cohesion within the Bonnyrigg 'neighbourhood', and smaller 'neighbourhoods' within the estate. These were the 'Buckner-scale' of 18 questions on different dimensions of social cohesion; a set of basic questions on community perceptions of safety; several questions on volunteering, and on the extent and nature of participation in religious institutions in or near the neighbourhood.

As outlined above, the study has found that the Bonnyrigg community generally rated their neighbourhood as having a higher level of social cohesion on the two dimensions of the Buckner-scale compared with respondents to a Western Sydney-wide survey conducted previously by authors of this report¹⁶, and an equivalent level of social cohesion on the third dimension. There were particularly positive findings

¹³ See for example positive strategies implemented by the Department in Stubbs, J. 2005, *Leaving Minto: A Study of the Social and Economic Impacts of Housing Estate Redevelopment*, MRAG and UWS, pp. 119-120.

¹⁴ Buckner, J.C., 1988, 'The development of an instrument to measure neighbourhood cohesion', *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16:771-91

¹⁵ See for example Vinson, T. 2004, *Community adversity and resilience: the distribution of social disadvantage in Victoria and New South Wales and the mediating role of social cohesion*, Ignatius Centre, Jesuit Social Services, Melbourne. Vinson outlines three key components of social cohesion: *social and support networks* (including access to social support in times of need); *social participation* (as the obverse of social isolation and being cut off from relationships providing friendship and company); and *community engagement* (including volunteering which draws people together to work for the benefit of others).

¹⁶ Randolph, B, Hall, J. and Pang, L. (2000) *Who Cares About Western Sydney*, Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils

around indicators related to 'attraction to neighbourhood' compared with respondents from Greater Western Sydney (GWS). As noted earlier, Bonnyrigg residents were significantly more likely to report that they were '*attracted to living in their neighbourhood*', and that they '*planned to remain residents of their neighbourhood*' than residents of GWS generally. In terms of the Buckner-scale's 'sense of community' dimension, Bonnyrigg respondents were equally or slightly more likely to report positively on most of these indicators, including the importance of neighbourhood friendships and associations, and feelings of belonging. In terms of the 'interaction with neighbourhood' aspect of Buckner's conceptions of 'social cohesion', there was a reasonable level of similarity between respondents from GWS and Bonnyrigg overall, though those in Bonnyrigg reported a lesser propensity to '*visit*' or '*be visited in their homes*' by their neighbours. They were also less likely to report that they would be '*willing to work together with others to improve my neighbourhood*', though over three-quarters of those from Bonnyrigg still reported that they would be willing to do so. However, each group was generally as likely to report that they would '*help their neighbours in an emergency*', and '*borrow things from their neighbours*'. On the other hand, Bonnyrigg residents were significantly more likely to report that they '*regularly stop and chat with their neighbours*'.

It is perhaps not surprising that such relatively high levels of sense of community and neighbourhood interaction are evident in Bonnyrigg estate. As noted by Harvey (1976; 1989), the degree of interdependence of members of a geographic community may vary significantly with social affluence. In a poorer community, for example, family or neighbours may commonly provide those goods and services (e.g. childcare, transport to services) that would be provided by the private market in a more affluent neighbourhood. The relative lack of mobility (e.g. low level of car ownership or disability), and lower participation in the labour market also affect the extent to which residents of areas like Bonnyrigg centre activities upon the home and the neighbourhood, rather than a more distant work location. The close proximity to a range of shops, services, and religious and cultural institutions near Bonnyrigg estate will also serve to concentrate activities closer to the neighbourhood in which they live. Quite simply, it is to be expected that Bonnyrigg residents would be at home and walking around the area to reach services and activities more than those in a more affluent area with high levels of car ownership, higher participation in the workforce, and greater dislocation between workplace and home.

However, this does not necessarily explain the degree of positive 'attraction to neighbourhood' evident among Bonnyrigg residents. As noted by Rajulton (2000), high levels of interaction or belonging may simply indicate that those in the neighbourhood, social group or family to which they 'belong' have no choice', or have a negative experience from this 'attachment'. He thus describes two interrelated dimensions of perceived cohesion among different social groups: 'sense of belonging' and 'morale'. In Rajulton's view, 'belonging' comprises both cognitive and affective elements through experiences with the group, whilst 'morale' is a 'global affective response associated with belonging to this group'.¹⁷ Although 'sense of belonging' and 'morale' may be highly correlated, this will certainly not always be the case. For example, he uses the example of members of a family who may be tightly tied together in a 'pathological' sense and at the same time feel miserable. Likewise, natural disasters may increase the 'sense of belonging', but depress feelings of 'morale'. Rajulton notes that it is important to keep a 'separate track record of the two dimensions' as they could have 'different consequences'. In terms of the Bonnyrigg community, it is evident from the range of questions related to levels of satisfaction, desire to leave and valued neighbourhood attributes, that Rajulton's two dimensions ('belonging' and 'morale') are likely to be highly correlated in the present instance. It is also important not to idealise the Bonnyrigg neighbourhood in this regard. It is clear that there are things that residents would

¹⁷ Rajulton, F. 2000, *Indicators of Family Change and Social Cohesion*, University of Ontario.

change about their area if they could, particularly real and perceived crime and drug-related activities, as well as physical housing and estate issues. However, on the whole there are very positive feelings about the area, which result in a strong preference to remain among a large majority. This indicates both 'belonging' and 'morale' in Rajulton's schema.

Nonetheless, some methodological limitations regarding the use of these questions were discussed briefly above. These included the complexity of wording, and cultural context of some of the questions, which made translating and administering the questions problematic, particularly for some cultural groups. Other issues also make the use and interpretation of these questions somewhat problematic. These include the cultural context and meaning ascribed to some of the statements; issues related to English competency; and potential for overly favourable responses due to factors such as 'gratuitous concurrence', or desire to stay in the area.

First, the assumptions underlying some of the questions may not have the same meaning for respondents from different cultural or socio-economic groups. Statements regarding 'borrowing from neighbours' or 'visiting in their home' are a case in point. A positive response to these questions in the Buckner conception of social interaction is seen to yield positive findings about a given neighbourhood or community. However, there was often a strongly negative reaction from various groups including those from an English-speaking background to the statement that they would 'borrow something' from their neighbours, with responses indicating a strong feeling that it was important to be seen to be '*coping*' or '*managing*'. Commonly, respondents commented that they felt it was important to show they were '*on their feet*', or that it would be in some sense shameful for them to be seen to be unable to provide for themselves and their families. As such, some respondents ascribed a negative meaning to the concept of 'borrowing' which was linked to notions of being '*poor but independent*' despite the '*welfare label*', as one resident commented. As such, a low positive result in *this* community does not necessarily indicate a poor level of social cohesion, particularly where many of the other statements received positive results.

Similarly, comments were made by some respondents about the inappropriateness of 'visiting neighbours in their home' unless they very well known or related. This was seen to be problematic for some (e.g. for women from some religious groups). Whilst such a casual openness may be a sign of 'natural' or positive social interaction for some cultural groups, it did not appear to be viewed as such by all. At a more fundamental level, the meaning of terms like 'neighbourhood' or 'community' was frequently questioned by respondents (particularly those from different cultural backgrounds), and it was clear that the definition varied widely in both a geographic and a social sense between survey participants. The cultural context and meaning ascribed to the assumptions underpinning some Buckner statements therefore need to be more carefully considered before firm conclusions around the findings on these statements can be drawn.

A further problem arose in response to statements relating to whether respondents often stopped to '*talk with their neighbours*', or '*agreed with most people about what is important in life*'. These two aspects of social cohesion involve quite different degrees of communication, familiarity and social interaction. However, to a large extent they both require at least a common language. Interviewers frequently reported that a respondent answered '*disagree*' to this question, but that they said that they '*always wave*' and say '*hello*' and were prevented from speaking further due to having no common language. It was interesting that in some cases neighbours reported what could be seen as high-level trust relationships (e.g. having the key to another's house, or coming in to look after dogs and water plants when their neighbour was away), but answered '*disagree*' to several questions that

involved a shared language requirement. These measures are again far from unproblematic in such an ethnically diverse community with very low levels of competency in English.

A third issue relates to the potential for certain cultural groups to feel they must agree with various statements for the sake of politeness or because they do not fully understand the question (a form of 'gratuitous concurrence'¹⁸), or to agree for some other reason. It could also be that residents were more likely to report positively on their area out of fear that a negative response may lead to the loss of their home, for example. This could have influenced the response to a range of questions about the nature of the estate and their preferences. However, there are several factors to consider in this regard. First, there is a high level of consistency in the findings between questions asked earlier in the survey and those related specifically to social cohesion asked later. One would not expect such consistency when there are differing ways in which questions in various parts of the survey are asked (a form of 'triangulation'). Secondly, the extensive use of bilingual staff, interpreters and translated materials reduces the incidence of gratuitous concurrence.¹⁹ Finally, it *may* be that some reported more favourably on their area in order to preserve it than they may have under different circumstances. However, if this is the case, this is an interesting factor in itself, and does not indicate any less commitment to the area. Rather, it may verify the strong reported preference to stay evident at various points in the survey findings.

In terms of questions related to safety, there appears to be high degree of perceived personal safety whilst at home, and walking around the area during the day. Safety in the home was often attributed to 'good neighbours' who keep an eye on me when I'm on my own', or 'take care of the place when we're away'. It was interesting that walkways and accessibility of homes to open space was viewed with some ambivalence. Whilst such access was viewed as problematic in terms of nuisance and annoyance, the formation of streets into cul-de-sacs and proximity of neighbours was also viewed as a positive in terms of increased surveillance and safe play space for children. Common comments by respondents about Bonnyrigg '*being as safe as anywhere in Sydney*', or more often that it was '*safer than [the surrounding areas]*' from which people had come, or that '*neighbours take care of each other here*', also attest to the presence of what may be referred to as 'social capital', or shared trust between community members. Jacobs (1961) describes the development of mutuality or common responsibility emerging as a 'lesson nobody learns by being told. It is learned from the experience of *having* other people without ties of kinship or close friendship or formal responsibility to you take a modicum of public responsibility for you'. This was also apparent and commented upon many times by interviewers, who noted the sharing of resources, like overseeing of children's play, sharing of garden space or produce, and care of each other's homes. Again, this provides a sound foundation for the types of co-operative work that will be required during the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg, and described by Putnam (1995) who talks of 'social capital' as 'working cooperatively for the benefit of all', or the 'dedication of individual time and resources' a common goal.

The exception was in two streets where there were reported to be 'drug houses', though even in these streets other neighbours were often reported to '*keep an eye on each other*'. One house which was reported to have two such houses generally had a large number of children playing in it, though concerns were raised by those in a house adjoining that they always kept an eye on their children due to concerns about the '*constant flow of traffic to [their neighbour's home]*'. It appeared that being on good terms with less problematic neighbours was of heightened importance

¹⁸ See for example Goldring, J., Handley, R., Lamb, A. & Stubbs, J. 1997, *Cross-Cultural Communication and the Law Series*, Commonwealth Department of the Attorney General.

¹⁹ Stubbs, J. 1997, 'They Didn't Understand', *Video, Cross-Cultural Communication and the Law Series*, Commonwealth Department of the Attorney General.

where one of the households in a street may be linked to drug-related crime. There was also far less comfort walking around the area at night, with some common concern expressed about the risk of '*bad people hanging around*' or 'being attacked by druggies'. As noted in previous studies on effective urban renewal strategies, the vast majority of crime in an area like Bonnyrigg is created by a very small proportion of residents, and is often linked to drug sale or use. Family violence and nuisance and annoyance where there are a high proportion of unemployed young people, is also a common problem and, along with drug-related crime (including break and enter), a primary source of dissatisfaction in estates.²⁰ Dealing effectively with these issues, including early identification of and intervention in relation to the very small number of highly problematic households, and re-engagement of young people in meaningful education, training and labour market activities are two of the most important strategies for improving the lives of Bonnyrigg residents generally. Again, this is a significant challenge for the social renewal of the Bonnyrigg area.

²⁰ See for example Stubbs, J. and Hardy, M. 2000, Evaluation of three Urban Renewal Strategies Employed by the NSW Department of Housing in South Western Sydney, NSW Department of Housing; and Foster, J. and Hope, T. 1993, 'Housing, Community and Crime: the Impact of the Priority Estates Program', *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 32, No. 4, Chicago.

15 CONCLUSION

The Bonnyrigg Household Survey, commissioned by the NSW Department of Housing, provides an important and timely snapshot of an area on the brink of significant change. It finds a community relatively optimistic about the potential for an improved physical and social environment, with a strong commitment to their neighbourhood and a reasonable willingness to engage in the planning and redevelopment process. The relatively high degree of 'social cohesion' found to be present is consistent with other findings in the survey that, in general, Bonnyrigg residents feel positively toward their area, value it for its location, attributes and sense of community, and most wish to remain residents of the area for the foreseeable future. This is related to the strong sense of attachment that many cultural groups have with Bonnyrigg area, and perhaps with the significant cultural and linguistic diversity, where the social mix provided by such diversity appears to enhance people's experience of living there. There appear to be considerable benefits from the clustering of certain cultural groups, who provide mutual support, but also gain increased access to the mainstream through interaction with English-speaking or bi-culturally competent children or neighbours, or relatives in nearby suburbs. It is, in many respects, a unique housing estate.

Residents also have a generally supportive view of the redevelopment, though this is heavily conditional upon certain outcomes, most notably that the high proportion who wish to remain can be accommodated, and that their homes (and in many cases gardens) are at least commensurate with what they now have. A further important factor is the ability to retain neighbourhood associations and friendships where these are valued. In general, a more gradual and selective redevelopment of the 'worst' areas is favoured, though this does not automatically equate with demolition of townhouse areas. Careful small-area analysis and planning will be important if the expectations of residents are to be met in the future redevelopment.

The question of 'social mix' is not a pressing issue for the redevelopment as far as most residents are concerned. There are, however, some perceived benefits of introducing more private housing, provided this is not at the expense of sufficient public stock. However, the question of density and housing type are certainly issues that will need to be dealt with sensitively, and are likely to be key points of community concern in the planning phase.

As far as future impacts are concerned, there are considerable opportunities to mitigate real and perceived impacts of the redevelopment in the immediate and longer-term provided adequate consideration of social and economic impacts are factored into the masterplanning phase, and policies and procedures are developed and implemented in close consultation with the community, and monitored as to their effectiveness as mitigative measures.

Two social renewal strategies would have a significant impact upon the quality of life of residents in the Bonnyrigg Living Communities area, in the immediate and longer-term. The first is the early identification of and intervention in relation to the very small number of highly problematic households, principally those reported to be engaged in drug-related crime. A small proportion of residents can have a significant impact on feelings of safety and well being of a majority, but solutions to this issue are complex. A second is the re-engagement of young people in meaningful education; training and labour market activities. Making in-roads into the latter is one of the most important ways in which the renewal program can have an impact on the life opportunities of members of the community, as well as reducing the social costs

associated with unemployment.²¹ Again, this is a significant challenge for the social renewal of the Bonnyrigg area.

The challenges of the Bonnyrigg redevelopment are thus considerable. However, the survey findings indicate a sound foundation on which to build future collaboration with private and social housing residents in the Bonnyrigg *Living Communities* area, and a degree of optimism in an improved future. Much is likely to depend upon the extent to which the community can continue to be involved in shaping the future direction of their area, as well as managing and accommodating the differences that are already evident between the needs and aspirations of individual households as planning for the renewal of Bonnyrigg progress.

²¹ See Stubbs & Storer, 1996, *op. cit.*