



Social Impact Assessment

Maitland Private Hospital, 175 Chisholm St,
Ashtonfield NSW 2323

April 2023

Disclaimer

This document has been prepared for the sole use of the authorised recipient, and this document may not be used, copied or reproduced in whole or part for any purpose other than that for which AAP Consulting supplied it. No other party should rely on this document without the prior written consent of AAP Consulting.

AAP Consulting undertakes no duty, nor accepts any responsibility, to any third party who may rely upon or use this document. AAP Consulting assumes no liability to a third party for any inaccuracies or omissions to that information. Where this document indicates that third parties have provided information, AAP Consulting has made no independent verification of this information except as expressly stated.

©AAP Consulting Pty Ltd, 2023

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Overview	5
1.2	Objectives of the social impact assessment	6
1.3	Structure of this SIA	6
2	Regional Planning and Strategic Context	8
2.1	Regulatory context	8
2.2	Community plans and strategies	8
3	Social Locality	9
3.1	Defining the social locality	9
4	Social Impact Assessment Approach	10
4.1	Approach to SIA	10
4.2	Stakeholder identification	10
4.3	Stakeholder engagement	11
4.4	Risk assessment	15
4.5	Assumptions	15
5	Social baseline	16
5.1	Regional context Maitland Local Government Area	16
5.1.1	Local context	17
6	Assessment and Prediction of Social Impacts	19
6.1	Overview of assessment and prediction of social impacts	19
6.2	Overview of social impacts	19
6.3	Summary of SIA mitigation measures and residual mitigated risk	24
6.4	Summary of likely or perceived social impacts	24
7	Recommendations and Conclusion	26

8	References	27
	Appendix A. Information Sheet	28
	Appendix B. Social Impact Risking Methodology	30
	Appendix C. Community Profiling	32
	Table 1.1 Structure of this technical paper	6
	Table 4.1 Identified stakeholders	10
	Table 4.2 Targeted engagement opportunities.....	11
	Table 4.3 Feedback from engagement	13
	Table 5.1 Community snapshot.....	18
	Table 6.1 Social impact categories (DPE, 2021).....	19
	Table 6.2 Perceived or likely social impacts	20
	Table 6.3 Summary of SIA mitigation and management measures.....	24
	Table 6.4 Social impact summary	25

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

AAP Consulting Pty Ltd has been engaged by SLR to prepare a Social Impact Assessment (SIA) for a Development Application (DA) for lodgement with Maitland City Council for expansion of the Maitland Private Hospital at 175 Chisholm Street, Ashtonfield (Lot 102, DP 1010923) (the Proposal) within the City of Maitland Local Government Area (LGA).

HealthCare (HEC) have a number of concurrent applications relating to the Maitland Private Hospital site. The first application is a modification to the still current 2015DA15-2853 application that was approved by Council with conditions by way of consent notice dated 17 November 2016. The modification primarily involves incorporating the approved at-grade car parking previously proposed and approved at 9 and 11 Molucca Close (Lots 4 DP245545 and Lot 5 DP245545) and relocating of these spaces internal to the main site as part of the new multi upper deck car park.

This report has been prepared to provide a social impact assessment relevant to the second application which is a new expansion of the existing (and approved) use that will include:

- Addition of a second-floor hospital ward for day time oncology services including:
 - nine consulting rooms
 - eleven patient bays
 - support rooms including treatment room, reception, storage rooms, staff base and room, cleaning rooms, and amenities
- Expansion of existing upper deck car park to provide:
 - an additional 63 car parking spaces in total, 35 of which are additional to the previously approved spaces to be provided on a new upper deck car park in the south-eastern corner of the site
 - two motorcycle parks
- Some minor realignments to the lower level existing car parks
- Some demolition works
- Increase in staff positions (up to 12 additional positions)

Both pedestrian and vehicular access to the site is from Chisholm Road which is designated as a local road. There are no proposed amendments or changes to the site access as part of the development proposals.

This report presents an analysis and assessment of the social context of the Proposal. The SIA has been prepared with reference to industry-leading practice, including the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) Social Impact Assessment Guideline, published in November 2021

(DPE, 2021) and in response to City of Maitland Council Development Control Plan 2010 - Part C (Design Guidelines), (MCC, 2011).

1.2 Objectives of the social impact assessment

Social impact assessment is the process of understanding and managing the social impact of projects and programs on people. This SIA will provide a framework to identify, predict, and evaluate likely social impacts on people and propose considered responses to those impacts. The objectives adopted for this social impact assessment include the following:

- Providing a clear and consistent framework for identifying, predicting, evaluating, and responding to the social impacts as part of the overall assessment process
- Promoting better development outcomes through a focus on enhancing positive social impacts and minimising negative social impacts
- Supporting informed decision-making by strengthening the quality and relevance of information and analysis provided to the consent authority
- Ensuring that approved projects' likely social impacts are managed transparently and accountable over the Proposal's life cycle through conditions of consent and monitoring and reporting requirements.

The report draws on a variety of publicly available secondary source material. This data is drawn from government or other public agency sources where possible. In addition to these secondary materials, primary information derived from a community consultation process is also presented to identify issues of interest to the local community regarding the Proposal. Consultation is recognised as an essential element of these reports and as an input to Council's decision-making processes.

This SIA has been prepared by a suitably qualified author with reference to industry-leading practice.

1.3 Structure of this SIA

The structure of this technical paper is influenced by the SIA Guideline (DPE, 2021) requirements and is outlined below.

Table 1.1 Structure of this technical paper

Chapter	Description
Chapter 1	Introduces the development proposal and structure of this report
Chapter 2	Establishes the relevant legislative and policy context of the assessment
Chapter 3	Describes the social locality
Chapter 4	Describes the methodology for this assessment
Chapter 5	Establishes the social baseline
Chapter 6	Describes and assesses the development Proposal's expected and perceived potential social impacts.

Chapter	Description
Chapter 7	Concludes assessment

2 Regional Planning and Strategic Context

2.1 Regulatory context

The SIA addresses the requirements of section 4.15(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act, 1979) and the City of Maitland Council Development Control Plan 2010 - Part C (Design Guidelines), (MCC, 2011).

2.2 Community plans and strategies

A review of local and regional community plans has been undertaken to identify community values and aspirations in the social locality. Community strategic plans are overarching Council policy documents prepared based on extensive community engagement and provide valuable insights into issues important to communities.

2.2.1 Hunter Regional Plan 2041

The Hunter Regional Plan 2036 is the overarching strategic planning framework for the region, published by the DPE (DPE, 2022.). The Hunter region comprises ten local government areas, including Port Stephens, Newcastle, Lake Macquarie, Cessnock, Maitland, Dungog, Mid-coast, Singleton, Muswellbrook and the Upper Hunter. The Hunter Regional Plan 2041 has nine objectives, one of which is Objective 8: *Plan for businesses and services at the heart of healthy, prosperous and innovative communities thriving communities* (page 82). This Proposal directly supports this objective by providing facilities that will enhance residents' health, quality of life and well-being.

2.2.2 Maitland +10 Community Strategic Plan

Maitland +10: Together, we make Maitland (MCC, 2022) sets the priorities of the community of Maitland between 2023 and 2033 and beyond and is informed by broad community consultation across the LGA. Theme 1 identified in the Plan is *Let's connect with each other*. Within this theme is Objective 4, *To be healthy and active with access to local services and facilities* and the strategic direction of *Ensure the community and health services and facilities we need are available as our population grows*. This Proposal will help to achieve this vision by delivering increased service capacity in the health care services to the community.

3 Social Locality

3.1 Defining the social locality

An investigation into the social locality has been undertaken to inform this assessment. As per the SIA Guideline, there is no prescribed meaning or fixed, predefined geographic boundary to a social locality; rather, each project's social locality is determined depending on its nature and impact.

Defining the social locality begins with an understanding of the nature of the Proposal, the characteristics of affected communities and how positive and negative impacts may be reasonably perceived or experienced by different people within the community.

Social impacts in and beyond the Proposal's site boundary, both positive and negative, may also be considered during approval processes in terms of public interest and the site's suitability for the Proposal.

This Proposal has a relatively focused social locality and has been determined based on consideration of:

- The nature and scale of the Proposal and its associated activities
- The characteristics of surrounding communities and how positive and negative impacts may be reasonably perceived or experienced by different people, including those vulnerable or marginalised
- The potentially affected built or natural features near the Proposal that have social value or importance.

Based on the above, this assessment has considered the following social locality:

- **'Nearby neighbours'** is applied to those landholders adjacent to the proposal area. This is identified as the geographic area in which communities are most likely to experience social impacts from the Proposal.
- **'Community'** is applied where the spatial extent of social impacts is generally broader than the nearby neighbours. In the geographical context required for this SIA, 'community' refers to the East Maitland – Metford Statistical Analysis Area (SA2) area.
- **'Region'** in some instances, the 'area of social influence' is extended to a 'region' to reflect likely social impacts on a broader community. In this case, the indirect areas of influence or 'region' includes the Maitland LGA.

4 Social Impact Assessment Approach

4.1 Approach to SIA

SIA is a way to predict and assess the potential impacts (positive and negative) of a proposed project or program. It provides an approach that analyses these outcomes through a social lens and provides a foundation for developing methods to improve social outcomes. When aligned with current best practices, the SIA has a strong participatory component. Participation allows those impacted by the Proposal to provide their own position on potential impacts and their context and meaning.

The SIA involved identifying and scoping social impacts to help determine the level of assessment and effort required to address impacts, including:

- gaining an understanding of the Proposal's social locality
- considering the characteristics of the communities within the social locality: this is described as the social baseline and considers a range of data sources
- identifying likely social impacts for different groups in the social locality included stakeholder identification and analysis and identification of likely social impacts for different groups, including the level to which these impacts needed to be assessed and the assessment methods
- analysis of social impacts included predicting and analysing positive and negative social impacts against baseline conditions, assessing potential impacts and proposing arrangements to monitor and manage residual social impacts.

4.2 Stakeholder identification

Stakeholder analysis has been undertaken to identify communities and stakeholders interested in the Proposal. Table 4.1 categorises stakeholders, including any group or individual that might have an interest and/or be impacted by the proposed construction and post-construction operations.

Table 4.1 Identified stakeholders

Stakeholder Group	Stakeholder	Interest
Nearby neighbours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landholders and residents adjacent to the Proposal, including directly adjacent neighbours or those that share a boundary, including those residing in Chisholm Road, Tahitian Court, Luzon Street and Molucca Close. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction impacts including parking, noise and changes to the visual landscape • Parking during operations and access
Emergency services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maitland Hospital, Metford Road • Fire and Rescue NSW East Maitland Fire Station, Chelmsford Dr • St John's Ambulance, Ken Tubman Dr, Maitland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access during construction and operations

Stakeholder Group	Stakeholder	Interest
Local Businesses and service providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Molly Morgan Motor Inn Green Hills Specialist Centre Ashtonfield Gardens Retirement Village Maitland Private Hospitals including patients and visitors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on access and parking Amenity impacts including noise during construction for employees and customers
Education and childminding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hunter Valley Grammar School Ashtonfield Public School Kindy Patch Ashtonfield 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on access and parking Amenity impacts including noise during construction for employees and customers
Road users	Road users travelling along Chisholm Road and Northcote Street, Ashtonfield, including light and heavy vehicles, local taxis, buses, transport operators, pedestrians and cyclists.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on access including detours and delays
Elected representatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mayor and Councilors, Maitland City Council Local Member for Maitland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community opinion and concerns over construction and operation impacts Improved access to health services
Local Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General manager and officers, Maitland City Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community opinion and concerns over construction and operation impacts Improved access to health services

4.3 Stakeholder engagement

4.3.1 Overview of engagement

Community and stakeholder engagement to inform this assessment was undertaken between February and March 2023. Multiple methods for people to provide feedback were included in the engagement approach, as shown in Table 4.2. A copy of the information sheet is included in Appendix A.

Table 4.2 Targeted engagement opportunities

Engagement tool	Purpose	Description	Audience
Project information sheet	Sharing information	An information sheet to introduce the Proposal and the SIA was shared with nearby neighbours. This was delivered by hand to ensure specific information reached its intended recipients. It was delivered to over 200 nearby properties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nearby neighbours along Torres Close, Molucca Close, Tahitian Court, Luzon Street and Verdant Drive Properties along Northcote Street and Chisholm Road, adjacent to the proposed centre.

Engagement tool	Purpose	Description	Audience
		This information sheet was also provided to Health Care and made available in the foyer of Maitland Hospital for visitors and patients.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitors, patients and staff of Maitland Private Hospital
Contact phone number and email	Sharing information	All stakeholders were provided a direct line to the proponent for information requests via email or phone. This was contained in the information sheet.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearby neighbours along Torres Close, Molucca Close, Tahitian Court, Luzon Street and Verdant Drive • Properties along Northcote Street and Chisholm Road, adjacent to the proposed centre. • Visitors, patients and staff of Maitland Private Hospital
Online survey and survey tool	‘Opt-in’ methodology to collect information and insights/ collaborating in decision making	An online survey to ascertain feedback from the community was shared with nearby neighbours. This was incorporated into the Project information sheet as an ‘opt-in’ research methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearby neighbours along Torres Close, Molucca Close, Tahitian Court, Luzon Street and Verdant Drive • Properties along Northcote Street and Chisholm Road, adjacent to the proposed centre. • Visitors, patients and staff of Maitland Private Hospital
Targeted interviews	‘Opt-out methodology’ to collect information and insights/ collaborating in decision making	Targeted interviews were conducted with key stakeholders to further understand potential impacts on people. This was an ‘opt-out’ research methodology.	
Site visit and observations	Observation	To help inform this assessment, AAP Consulting conducted site visits on the 15 th and 18 th March 2023 and undertook some observational analysis of human behaviours in the area. The timing of site visits was varied between school pick up and drop off time, Saturday mornings and middle of a week day.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People visiting or living in the social locality

4.3.2 Engagement outcomes

Feedback collected from the engagement is shown in Table 4.3. This feedback assisted with increasing the understanding of the potential impacts of the project on those people most likely to be affected and also potential mitigation and management measures.

The issues raised included:

- The impact of the Project on parking, which is already a key issue in the area
- Traffic congestion associated with construction and operation of the project, particularly on Norfolk Street
- Construction noise

The benefits included:

- Provision of more health services for the local community
- Potential employment opportunities

Table 4.3 Feedback from engagement

Audience and purpose	Summary of feedback and sentiment
Method: online survey	
<p>Stakeholders: Proximal landholders (4 responses in total)</p> <p>Purpose of engagement: an ‘opt-in’ methodology to collect qualitative feedback about what those living in close proximity to the Project value about the area they live in. Also provided an opportunity to understand further how people expect the Project to impact them that served to further help inform scoping of likely impacts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In total 4 proximal landowners provided feedback to the online survey. The survey was distributed during the doorknock, and letterbox drop undertaken as part of the broader project engagement. • Respondents noted that the convenience to public transport, shops and amenities was something that they valued about living in the area, along with it being a good area for walking, families with a lack of noise. • Three of the four respondents were either neutral or positive in terms of Project Sentiment, while one respondent was not accepting of the Proposal. • Project concerns largely centred around the impact of the Project on parking in the vicinity of the hospital including along Chisolm and Norfolk Streets and the potential exacerbation of existing issues. • Other concerns noted included potential increase in noise, that it could make it harder for walkers and school children to cross roads and that it could result in a potential drop in real estate values. • The positive benefits related to the provision of more health services for the local community. • The most cited mitigation measure was the provision of additional parking space as part of the proposal. • In terms of road works, it was suggested that any impacts to the road network avoided peak congestion times around school pick up and drop off.
Method: Targeted interviews	

Audience and purpose	Summary of feedback and sentiment
<p>Stakeholder: Strata Manager of Tahitian Courts, the nearest neighbours to the Project.</p> <p>Purpose: to follow up the letterbox drop and try and ascertain further feedback from the nearest residents around how they expect the project to impact them.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AAP Consulting contacted the strata manager of the Tahitian Courts directly to try and ascertain more feedback relating to the Proposal from those living closest to it. • A copy of the project information sheet was emailed to the strata manager who confirmed that they would forward to the residents. • The primary concern was whether residents at Tahitian Court will be impacted in terms of view from the construction of the second floor. • The strata manager suggested that screening might mitigate some of the impact to resident views. • The Strata also manages the strata for Medical Suite 1 including the car parking and water supply and noted that there might be issues with increased costs associated with this.
<p>Stakeholder: Survey respondents (3)</p> <p>To acknowledge receipt of the responses to the survey and also further understand how the respondents expect the Project to impact them.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concern relating to traffic and parking on Norfolk Street was reiterated, particularly with the school between the hours of 8-9am and 2-3pm. • One respondent who had moved to the area in the last 12 months noted that hospital staff were already parking on the streets, and this would further impact on an existing issue. • There was also concern that parking impacts would also be further exacerbated during construction period due to the workers. • The impacts to access were also noted - with people parking illegally across walkways and driveways. It was noted that this was both hospital staff and p-platers. • One respondent also identified a safety concern with nurses walking to their cars late at night. • Operational and construction noise was noted as a concern. One respondent provided feedback that occasionally there is a vent that makes noise, and they contact the hospital to address the issue directly. • Two respondents noted that they were not opposed to the actual expansion of the hospital as long as it is improved and maintained, and adequate parking is provided.
<p>Stakeholder: Manager of Molly Morgan Inn</p> <p>Purpose of engagement: Increase understanding of the potential impacts of the project on nearby social infrastructure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that the only concern is parking. The manager advised that they often have requests for people to park at the Motor Inn to access the hospital, which they accommodate. This is particularly an issue for older clients accessing the hospital.
<p>Stakeholder: Principal of Hunter Valley Grammar</p> <p>Purpose of engagement: Increase understanding of the potential impacts of the project on nearby social infrastructure and follow up</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that parking was a concern, and that the proposed 36 additional car parks is insufficient as currently many staff are parking on Norfolk Street. • Noted that pick up and drop off times are the biggest pressure points for the school and that they were already engaging with Council to address traffic flows. • Suggested that the Project utilise school holiday periods for construction. Also suggested that communication with both Hunter

Audience and purpose	Summary of feedback and sentiment
on comments made during engagements about the school.	Valley Grammar and Ashtonfield Public School was important, and that school bus flow is not disrupted, particularly in mornings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested advance notice of when the construction will commence.

4.4 Risk assessment

A risk assessment was conducted to determine the overall significance rating of the potential social impact with and without mitigation. The impacts have been evaluated according to the SIA Guideline (DPE, 2021). As part of this risk assessment, consideration was given to the following:

- The likely population to be affected, separately for each component of the Proposal.
- The timing of the potential social impact.
- The potential social impact's extent, duration, scale, and sensitivity.
- The likelihood and magnitude of the potential social impact.
- Any residual negative social impacts and how affected people would experience them.

The tables used to evaluate the likelihood of positive and negative social impacts and inform the magnitude of each impact before and after mitigation/enhancement was adapted from the SIA Guideline (DPE, 2021) and provided for reference in Appendix B.

4.5 Assumptions

Assumptions applied to complete this social impact assessment include:

- The key findings of the background studies and technical reports are accurate.
- Social data available for each study area accurately reflects the community demographic profile.
- All findings are based on the information available at the time of writing. However, it is possible that social, economic, demographic, cultural, environmental or proposal-related information may change following the publication of this SIA.
- Secondary data sources have been produced using various methodologies, which also come with assumptions and limitations. To ensure the data is credible and robust, official (e.g., Government) sources have been prioritised, and limitations have been noted where relevant.

5 Social baseline

This chapter presents the social baseline for the Proposal and describes the social context without it. It documents the existing social environment, conditions, and trends relevant to the Proposal and defines characteristics of the communities within the Proposal's social locality, including any vulnerable groups. The social baseline provides a point of comparison – it can be used as a reference against which to measure the Proposal's impacts as it develops and/or to determine the adequacy of existing facilities (Vanclay, 2015).

It considers any built or natural features on or near the Proposal that could be affected and the intangible values that people may associate with these features. Examples may include a sense of place or belonging and the relevant social, cultural, demographic trends or social change processes occurring now or in the past, near the Proposal and in the broader region.

The unit of analysis for the local context is the East Maitland – Metford (SA2) and the Maitland LGA. These areas are considered most reflective of the proximal community and residents/landholders surrounding the proposal area.

For this assessment, a summary of the social baseline is provided as an overview of the existing environment. Additional supplementary data that supports the assessment, such as the community profile dataset, is included in Appendix C.

5.1 Regional context Maitland Local Government Area

The Proposal sits within the Maitland Local Government Area (LGA) in the Lower Hunter Region of New South Wales, in the traditional lands of the Wonnarua people. The LGA hosts a range of rural and residential areas and has a long history of coal mining, manufacturing, construction, agriculture (e.g., grazing and poultry), all of which are primary employment sectors.

The LGA is home to 90,553 people (estimated resident population, (REMPAN, 2023).

Maitland's gross regional product (GRP) is estimated at \$5.830 billion, which represents 0.9% of New South Wales's gross state product (GSP) of \$643.145 billion (REMPAN, 2022). In terms of employment, of those participating in the labour force, 57% work full-time and 31.4% part-time. An analysis of the jobs held by the local workers in Maitland City (ABS, 2021) shows the three most popular industry sectors as follows:

- Coal mining (2,191 people or 5.1% of the population)
- Other social assistance services (912 people or 3.4% of the population)
- Hospitals (except psychiatric hospitals) (1,701 people or 3.9% of the population)

In comparison, NSW employed 0.6% of the population in coal mining, 2.4% in other social assistance services and 4.2% in Hospitals (except psychiatric hospitals).

The Maitland LGA is predominately on the land of the Wonnarua Nation. Within its boundaries are many significant Aboriginal sites that provide important information about their relationship and

special connection with the lands. Today, Wonnarua Nation culture is preserved through the work of numerous individuals and by the Mindaribba Local Aboriginal Land Council. Maitland City Council works to foster a strong relationship with its First Nations people through its Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Reference Group. In 2021 approximately 7.5 % of the population in Maitland was Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander, compared to 3.4% of the NSW population (ABS, 2021).

Social ties between people were lower compared to NSW, with 11.1% of the Maitland LGA population participating in voluntary work through a community or organisation, compared to 13.0% in NSW. Mobility rates were stable – with over half of the population having lived in the area for at least five years (ABS, 2021).

In terms of transport, it is anticipated that connectivity to the new Western Sydney International Airport, and the expansion of Newcastle Airport, will drive innovative economic opportunities and increase visitors to the region. The Hunter Expressway also provides a direct route through the LGA between Maitland, the Hunter Valley and Newcastle.

Crime considerations are also an important baseline indicator when considering the potential impacts of a proposal on people. Data from the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research (BOSCAR, 2022) indicates that crime is relatively stable within the Maitland LGA, and many crimes are in decline. Indeed, the only exception is sexual assault which has risen by 12.9% over the last five years. Break-and-enter and theft from motor vehicles were down 18.1% and 21.1%, respectively, over the past two years. Other crimes, such as drug offences and antisocial behaviour offences (such as trespass and offensive conduct), remained stable or decreased over two years.

This assessment has also reviewed the socio-economic indexes for areas (SEIFA): a suite of indexes that the Australian Bureau of Statistics has created from social and economic Census Information. Specifically, this assessment looks at the Index of relative socio-economic disadvantage (IRSD), a general socio-economic index that summarises a range of information about the economic and social conditions of people and households within an area. The SEIFA score for Maitland in 2021 was 983, which is at the middle to lower end of the scale and is derived from attributes such as low income, low educational attainment, high unemployment, jobs in relatively unskilled occupations and variables that broadly reflect disadvantage rather than measure specific aspects of disadvantage (e.g., Indigenous and Separated/Divorced). At the advantaged end of the scale, households with high incomes, high education levels, large dwellings, high numbers of motor vehicles, spare bedrooms and professional occupations contribute to a higher score.

5.1.1 Local context

The Proposal is located in Ashtonfield, in the (SA2) of East Maitland – Metford. The area is 170km north of Sydney, 32km north west of Newcastle.

Once known as Government Town, East Maitland was originally designed as the place for administrative and official buildings such as Maitland Goal, East Maitland Court House, the Lands Office and St Peters Church (MCC, 2023).

In terms of the resident population, the SA2 of east Maitland-Metford is home to 17,981 people (ABS, 2021), of which 6.9% are Aboriginal. It has a comparable median age to NSW, with a median age of 39, compared to just 36 for Maitland LGA and 39 for NSW.

Most residents (85.2%) are Australian born, with English and Australian ancestry being the dominant culture (43.6% and 42.7%, respectively). English is the primary language spoken at home, with only 8.0% of households speaking a non-English language.

There are lower levels of educational attainment among residents, with only 15.8% holding a bachelor's degree or above compared to 27.8% for NSW, and 9.5% received a year nine education compared to 7.4% for NSW. Household incomes were also lower than the NSW average (\$1590 median weekly income compared to \$1829 in NSW).

A review of the BOCSAR crime data for the year to September 2022 indicates that crime was stable in East Maitland. Microburbs also scored East Maitland as 4.9/10 for affluence (Microburbs, 2023).

Table 5.1 Community snapshot

Indicator	East Maitland-Metford (SA2)	Maitland LGA	NSW
Population	17,981	90,226	8,072,163
Male	48.8%	48.%	49.4%
Female	51.2%	51.3%	50.6%
Median age (years)	39	36	39
Aboriginal	6.9%	7.5%	3.4%
Families	4,936	25,244	2,135,964
Average children per family with children	1.8	1.9	1.8
Average people per household	2.5	2.7	2.6
Median weekly household income	\$1590	\$1766	\$1829
Median monthly mortgage repayments	\$1733	\$1829	\$2,167

6 Assessment and Prediction of Social Impacts

6.1 Overview of assessment and prediction of social impacts

This chapter assesses the likely social impacts arising from the Proposal. The assessment of likely positive and negative social impacts has been informed by feedback from the community during consultation, research and analysis of the areas surrounding the Proposal and extensive desktop review of available documents.

To assess the potential impacts, a risk assessment was carried out to determine the overall significance rating of the likely social impact with and without mitigation. The impacts are evaluated according to the SIA Guideline, considering the social impact categories in Table 6.1. A full explanation of the methods applied in undertaking this assessment and the rating scales used is provided in Appendix B.

This chapter also includes recommended responses to identified impacts –mitigation measures for potentially negative impacts and actions to enhance benefits and realise potential opportunities.

Table 6.1 Social impact categories (DPE, 2021)

Categories	Definition from the Social Impact Guidelines
Way of life	Including how people live, how they get around, how they work, how they play, and how they interact each day.
Community	Including composition, cohesion, character, how the community functions, and people's sense of place.
Accessibility	Including how people access and use infrastructure, services, and facilities, whether provided by a public, private, or not-for-profit organisation.
Culture	Both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, including shared beliefs, customs, values and stories, and connections to Country, land, waterways, places, and buildings.
Health and well-being	Including physical and mental health especially for people vulnerable to social exclusion or substantial change, psychological stress resulting from financial or other pressures, access to open space and effects on public health.
Surroundings	Including ecosystem services such as shade, pollution control, erosion control, public safety and security, access to and use of the natural and built environment, and aesthetic value and amenity.
Livelihoods	Including people's capacity to sustain themselves through employment or business.
Decision-making systems	Including the extent to which people can have a say in decisions that affect their lives and have access to complaint, remedy, and grievance mechanisms.

6.2 Overview of social impacts

Table 6.2 defines the likely social impact to people resulting from the Proposal and how they fall within each of the social impact categories. As per the SIA Guidelines (DPE, 2021), some proposals may have impacts in all the categories listed in Table 6.1, but others may only have a few. For this

Proposal, only the categories of accessibility, surroundings, health and wellbeing and way of life have been assessed as applicable to the assessment.

Table 6.2 Perceived or likely social impacts

Impact id.	Perceived or Likely Impact on People	Sentiment	Social Impact Categories
S01	Increase in traffic during construction and operations, compounding existing parking shortages and access issues	Negative	Health and well-being Accessibility Way of life
S02	Improved access to local healthcare facilities	Positive	Accessibility Health and Wellbeing
S03	Construction noise, causing amenity disruption for nearby neighbours	Negative	Health and wellbeing Way of life
S04	Changes to the visual landscape, including potential shading of adjacent properties due to construction of an additional level of the hospital	Negative	Way of Life

6.2.1 S01: Increase in traffic during construction and operations, compounding existing parking shortages and access issues

The potential for the Proposal to cause and exacerbate existing traffic issues in the local area was a key perceived impact expressed by the majority of stakeholders during consultation. Stakeholders raised concerns about operational traffic in the context of increased congestion, exacerbating access issues that they currently experience as residents living in the area or people working in the area.

In addition, there are existing traffic congestion issues in the locality, particularly given the location of the Hunter Valley Grammar School on Norfolk Street that sees heavy traffic between school drop off (8-9am) and pick up (2-3pm) times. Currently the Hunter Valley Grammar School is currently working with Maitland City Council to address traffic flow issues. As a result, the Hunter Valley Gramma School should receive advance notice of the timing of the construction period. There was concern from stakeholders that traffic congestion will be exacerbated particularly during the Project construction period.

Three site visits were conducted by AAP Consulting for the purpose of observing human behaviour. These site visits were carried out during varied times including:

- 8.15am to 10am weekday and 2.30 to 4pm weekday
- 9am to 11am Saturday

During these visits road user behaviour was observed as typical of a busy main road through an urban area. It was noted that during certain times of day, including the school drop off and pick up period, the roads in and around Chisolm Road and Norfolk Street were quite congested and there was

minimal parking available. Feedback from those living on the surrounding streets indicated that parking shortages are experienced at all times of the day and perceived that this was mainly due to staff from the hospital and patients accessing the hospital. There was also an increased impact during school drop off and pick up time.

During engagement, several stakeholders commented that the additional 36 car parks proposed for this Project would not be sufficient. However, it is no known if stakeholders were aware that these 36 car parks are additional to car parking spaces that area already approved as part of a separate development application. In total, an additional 63 car parking spaces will be provided. 35 of which are additional to the previously approved spaces to be provided on a new upper deck car park in the south-eastern corner of the site.

Operational impacts:

The Traffic, Transport and Parking Assessment undertaken by SLR (April 2023) assessed the Proposal in terms of parking demands, traffic generation and access arrangements for the development. The results concluded that overall, the development is expected to result in a marginal increase in traffic generation, with between 21 and 13 vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak respectively. When considered in the context of the existing traffic flows on Chisholm Road the development percentage impact is roughly 1% to 2%.

The traffic, transport and parking assessment also noted that while the Proposal includes additional beds, they are oncology beds and therefore only likely to be occupied in business hours with patients likely to be picked up and dropped off. Therefore, the demand for additional visitor parking was considered lower than for other types of wards (i.e., maternity and rehabilitation wards).

With regard to parking, the traffic assessment notes that the Proposal will see an additional 63 car parking spaces, which will increase the total number of car parking spaces to 260. In addition, the proposed parking layout would also be changed. The higher level parking would be allocated to staff parking and the lower deck (previously staff parking) would be reverted to visitor parking. This is important to note given that staff parking was identified as an issue leading to parking shortages on residential streets by stakeholders. Also, the traffic assessment concludes that the car parking provision is in excess of the Maitland Development Control Plan, however it has been identified under previous applications that demand for car parking at the existing hospital is in higher demand than the Maitland Development Control Plan allows. Therefore, a review of surrounding built up areas car parking standards for hospitals including both Penrith and Newcastle have been undertaken and car parking is proposed in line with these standards.

Given the outcome of the traffic assessment and the design of the Proposal (including the provision of adequate parking and the predicted generation of traffic), the impacts on the parking availability along local roads during events or particularly busy periods would be minimal, when compared to the existing environment. Directional signage that clearly directs all visitors to the hospital to parking should be provided and key decision points in the car park. Staff should also be directed to park in the available and dedicated staff spots, not on the local road network.

Construction impacts:

A Parking management Plan was developed by Intersect Traffic (March 2023) and notes that the Hospital will seek permission from Transport for NSW (TfNSW) to utilise the unused New England Highway road reserve area adjoining the north-eastern boundary of the site for use as a temporary construction employee parking area during construction works associated with DA 2015-2853. This will ensure the proposed development works do not unduly impact on the availability of on-site car parking during construction and minimise the impact of the construction works on availability of on-street car parking around the site. This will also minimise the residential amenity impacts of the development works on existing residents in Molucca Close. Engagement with the local community to inform them of how construction traffic will be managed, and the provision of a contact line will be important to ensure that any impacts that arise can be responded to and resolved in a timely manner.

6.2.2 Improved access to local healthcare facilities

One of the perceived benefits of the Proposal raised during the consultation was increased access to healthcare facilities for the local community.

Increasing healthcare facilities will increase the capacity to meet the demands of growing populations and provide increased choices for the social locality. As evidenced in the social baseline, this locality has a fast growing population with the Maitland LGA population increasing by 15% or 12,921 people between the 2016 and 2021 Census periods. To further enhance local access to the increased service capacity, it is suggested that the Hospital communicate the increased capacity through various means including on their website, social media / media and through a community newsletter.

Given that it is unknown at the time of authorship, if there is an existing need or shortage of oncology beds within this community – it isn't possible to assess the magnitude of the positive impact.

6.2.3 Construction noise, causing amenity disruption for nearby neighbours.

During engagement, a number of stakeholders identified the potential for acoustic impacts associated with the construction period particularly nearby neighbours and residents adjacent to the hospital. A Noise Assessment was undertaken by Muller Acoustic Consulting (April 2023) and indicates that modelled noise emissions from construction activities will be above the applicable construction management levels at several receivers during various phases of the construction works. Therefore, the following noise management measures have been provided in order to reduce potential impacts on surrounding receivers:

- implement boundary fences/retaining walls as early as possible to maximise their attenuation benefits to surrounding receivers
- toolbox and induction of personnel prior to shift to discuss noise control measures that may be implemented to reduce noise emissions to the community
- where possible use mobile screens or construction hording to act as barriers between construction works and receivers
- all plant should be shut down when not in use. Plant to be parked/started at farthest point from relevant assessment locations

- operating plant in a conservative manner (no over-revving)
- selection of the quietest suitable machinery available for each activity
- avoidance of noisy plant/machinery working simultaneously where practicable
- minimisation of metallic impact noise
- all plant are to utilise a broadband reverse alarm in lieu of the traditional hi frequency type

reverse alarm

- undertake letter box drops to notify receivers of potential works.

Given the outcome of the noise assessment and the design of the Proposal, noise impacts during construction are considered likely to nearby receivers, some of which may be considered vulnerable (such as the elderly). Targeted engagement with those people most impacted will be required prior to construction to ensure that adequate mitigation and management measures are implemented, that directly respond to the level of impact expected to people. This engagement could include one on one meetings, phone calls and/or doorknocks as examples. The engagement should be targeted, accessible and inclusive.

6.2.4 Changes to the visual landscape, including potential shading of adjacent properties because of the construction of an additional level of the hospital

The impact on the visual landscape was raised by one stakeholder during engagement, primarily due to the potential of overshadowing (shading) of nearby properties on Tahitian Court directly adjacent to the hospital. The SEE for this proposal found it to incorporate an appropriate scale, bulk and density for the location on the land. The scale, bulk and density are generally consistent, if not on the conservative side, with the approved surrounding uses. It also concludes that the streetscape and the amenity of the area will not be affected by the proposal, which is complementary to the established character of the area.

In terms of the potential for overshadowing, the Proposal adheres to suitable setbacks from boundaries and is single story in layout. In addition, the Proposal will remove five large trees at the rear of the site due to some safety concerns, which could potentially increase sunlight into some surrounding properties.

A Visual Impact Assessment was undertaken by Moir Landscape Architecture (March, 2023) and notes that the Project is likely to be visible at the intersection of the New England Highway and Chisholm Road, where the highest level of potential visual impact is experienced, mostly by vehicular receptors. The report also notes that the addition of one floor to the existing facility is likely to be visible, however it will be read as part of the existing built form and scale of the existing hospital. Therefore, the Project is unlikely, due to its form or scale, to be viewed as a dominant feature within the Study Area.

Considering the existing environment, it is considered unlikely that the Proposal will have a negative impact on the aesthetic value of the existing surroundings. The proposed changes, including the

removal of the trees should be communicated to people impacted prior to removal, with consideration of any changes to privacy and / or the way people currently experience their surroundings and additional mitigation measures implemented as required.

6.3 Summary of SIA mitigation measures and residual mitigated risk

The following tables summarises the recommended SIA mitigation and management measures discussed in the preceding section.

Table 6.3 Summary of SIA mitigation and management measures

Perceived or likely impact to people	SIA specific mitigation and management measure
Increase in traffic during construction and operations, compounding existing parking shortages and access issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of direction signage to clearly communicate the visitor and staff parking at the hospital • Education of hospital staff to park in the dedicated staff parking, and not on the surrounding streets • Established communication channels that encourage and facilitate two-way communications between surrounding residents and businesses, and the hospital • Communication to residents, staff and patients regarding the time of the construction period and implementation of a complaints management system in line with Australian standards. • Communication to the Hunter Valley Gramma School to advise of the timing of the construction period.
Improved access to local healthcare facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of the increased hospital service capacity to the local community through various mediums
Construction noise, causing amenity disruption for nearby neighbours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted engagement with those people most impacted prior to construction to ensure that adequate mitigation and management measures are implemented, that directly respond to the level of impact expected to people.
Changes to the visual landscape, including potential shading of adjacent properties due to construction of an additional level of the hospital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted engagement with those people potentially impacted by the tree removal, prior to works commencing, to consider any potential changes to the way people currently experience their surroundings, and any flow on negative changes, for example, changes to privacy.

6.4 Summary of likely or perceived social impacts

Table 6.4 provides a summary of the predicted likely or perceived social impacts in relation to the proposal considered mitigation measures.

Table 6.4 Social impact summary

Perceived or Likely Impact to People	Social Impact Category	Affected Parties	Mitigated Social Risk
Increase in traffic compounding parking shortages and causing safety and access issues	Health and well-being Accessibility Way of Life	Nearby neighbours and through traffic and local social infrastructure (i.e nearby schools, accommodation and medical facilities)	Low (negative)
Improved access to local healthcare facilities	Accessibility Way of Life Health and Wellbeing	Residents in the social locality and broader LGA	Na
Construction noise, causing amenity disruption for nearby neighbours.	Way of Life Health and Wellbeing	Nearby neighbours and businesses	medium (negative)
Changes to the visual landscape, including potential shading of adjacent properties due to construction of an additional level of the hospital	Way of Life	Neighbouring properties (Tahitian Court)	low (negative)

7 Recommendations and Conclusion

One of the aims of SIA is to promote better development outcomes through a focus on minimising negative social impacts.

Overall, this SIA considered the Proposal to be in the interest of the public and is assessed as providing significant benefits to the local community related to the increase of accessibility to health care services. The flow on benefits include:

- Increasing social capital
- Increasing access to, and use of, social infrastructure related to health care
- Livelihood opportunities.

It is acknowledged that the proposal may have a level of social risk primarily relating to amenity as experienced by nearby neighbours in the form of traffic changes and construction noise. Targeted engagement should be implemented that aims to mitigate and respond to any negative impacts resulting on nearby neighbours, including those vulnerable groups such as the elderly.

8 References

- ABS (2021). Australian Bureau of Statistics 2021 Census Data. <https://www.abs.gov.au/census/find-census-data/search-by-area> (Accessed February 2023).
- BOCSAR (2023). Local Government Area Excel tables. <https://www.bocsar.nsw.gov.au/> (Accessed February 2023).
- DPE (2021). NSW Department of Planning and Environment Social Impact Assessment Guideline. <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/-/media/Files/DPE/Guidelines/Policy-and-legislation/Social-Impact-Assessment/SIA-Guideline.pdf> (Accessed February 2023).
- EP&A Act (1979). Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 No 203. NSW Government Legislation. <https://legislation.nsw.gov.au/view/whole/html/inforce/current/act-1979-203#statusinformation> (Accessed February 2023).
- DPE (n.d.) NSW Department of Planning and Environment Hunter Regional Plan 2041. <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Plans-for-your-area/Regional-Plans/Hunter/Hunter-regional-plan-2041>
- Intersect Traffic (March 2023) Parking Management Plan
- Maitland City Council website <https://www.maitland.nsw.gov.au/> (Accessed February 2023)
- Microburbs, (2023). East Maitland <http://www.microburbs.com.au> (Accessed February 2023).
- Moir Landscape Architecture (March 2023) Visual Impact Assessment
- Muller Acoustic Consulting (April 2023) Noise Assessment Report
- Remplan (2023). www.remplan.com.au (Accessed November 2023)
- SLR Consulting (2023) Maitland Private Hospital Redevelopment - Traffic Impact Assessment

Appendix A. Information Sheet



PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO MAITLAND PRIVATE HOSPITAL, ASHTONFIELD

About the proposal

Maitland Private Hospital offers a comprehensive range of specialist health services and is a leading healthcare service in the Maitland and greater Hunter region. Some of Maitland Private's key services include leading orthopaedic surgeons, in-patient mental health unit, inpatient and outpatient rehabilitation services and oncology.

Health Care Surgical Pty Ltd is preparing a Development Application (DA) for lodgement with Maitland City Council to help both improve and increase the day time oncology services provided at the Hospital. If approved, the proposal will provide additional oncology consulting rooms, three additional beds, increased parking and up to 12 additional staffing positions.

No changes to operating hours, deliveries, and waste collection are proposed.

What is the approval process?

A DA is a formal application for a development requiring consent under the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act). Detailed planning for the site is being completed in preparation for the lodgement of the DA. It will be available for consideration during the public exhibition stage of the DA process. The DA must consider and investigate the potential impacts of the proposal and the opportunities that may result.

Key features of the proposal

The proposed development includes:

- Addition of a second-floor hospital ward for day time oncology services including:
 - nine consulting rooms
 - eleven patient bays
 - support rooms including treatment room, reception, storage rooms, staff base and room, cleaning rooms, and amenities
- Expansion of existing upper deck car park to provide:
 - an additional 36 car parks
 - two motorcycle parks
- Some minor realignments to the lower level existing car parks
- Some demolition works
- Increase in staff positions (up to 12 additional positions)

Appendix B. Social Impact Risking Methodology

The following tables are derived from the SIA Guidelines (DPE, 2021) and were adopted as the risking methodology for this assessment.

Defining magnitude levels for social impacts

Magnitude level	Meaning
Transformational	Substantial change experienced in community well-being, livelihood, amenity, infrastructure, services, health, and/or heritage values; permanent displacement or addition of at least 20% of a community
Major	Substantial deterioration/improvement to something that people value highly, either lasting for an indefinite time, or affecting many people in a widespread area
Moderate	Noticeable deterioration/improvement to something that people value highly, either lasting for an extensive time, or affecting a group of people
Minor	Mild deterioration/improvement, for a reasonably short time, for a small number of people who are generally adaptable and not vulnerable
Minimal	No noticeable change experienced by people in the locality

Defining likelihood levels of social impacts

Likelihood level	Meaning
Almost certain	Definite or almost definitely expected
Likely	High probability
Possible	Medium probability
Unlikely	Low probability
Very unlikely	Improbable or remote probability

Dimensions of social impact magnitude

Dimensions		Details Needed to Enable Assessment
Magnitude	Extent	Who specifically is expected to be affected (directly, indirectly, and/or cumulatively), including any vulnerable people? Which location(s) and people are affected? (e.g., near neighbours, local, regional, future generations).
	Duration	When is the social impact expected to occur? Will it be time-limited (e.g., over particular project phases) or permanent?
	Severity or scale	What is the likely scale or degree of change? (e.g., mild, moderate, severe)

Dimensions		Details Needed to Enable Assessment
	Intensity or importance	How sensitive/vulnerable (or how adaptable/resilient) are affected people to the impact, or (for positive impacts) how important is it to them? This might depend on the value they attach to the matter; whether it is rare/unique or replaceable; the extent to which it is tied to their identity; and their capacity to cope with or adapt to change.
	Level of concern/interest	How concerned/interested are people? Sometimes, concerns may be disproportionate to findings from technical assessments of likelihood, duration and/or intensity.

Social impact significance matrix

Likelihood	Magnitude Level				
	Minimal	Minor	Moderate	Major	Transformational
Almost certain	Low	Medium	High	Very High	Very High
Likely	Low	Medium	High	High	Very High
Possible	Low	Medium	Medium	High	High
Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	High
Very unlikely	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Medium

Appendix C. Community Profiling

Indicator	East Maitland – Metford SA2	Maitland LGA	NSW
People - Demographics and Education (Source ABS 2021)			
Total population (2021)	17981	90,226	8072163
Male	48.8%	48.7%	49.4%
Female	51.2%	51.3%	50.6%
Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people	6.9%	7.5%	3.4%
Age Structure (Source ABS 2021)			
% Population under 14 years	18.9%	21.4%	18.2%
% Population over 65 years	17.4%	15.6%	17.7%
Median Age (years)	39	36	39
Social Marital status (Source ABS 2021)			
Registered Married	44.4%	46.7%	47.3%
De facto marriage	12.1%	13.5%	10.6%
not married	43.5%	39.8%	42.1%
Education (Source ABS 2021)			
Pre-school	6.8%	8.8%	6.8%
Infants/Primary	29.6%	31.6%	26.5%
Secondary	23.6%	22.8%	20.9%
Technical or Further Educational Institution	10.3%	9.8%	8.5%
University or other Tertiary Institution	11.9%	11.4%	15.3%
Other type of educational institution	2.4%	2.3%	3.0%
Not stated	15.5%	13.4%	19.0%
Level of highest education attainment (Source ABS 2021)			
Bachelor's degree level and above	15.8%	15.4%	27.8%
Advanced Diploma and Diploma level	9.4%	9.4%	9.3%
Certificate level IV	5.5%	5.9%	3.3%
Certificate level III	16.9%	18.8%	11.7%
Year 12	12.1%	11.8%	14.5%
Year 11	4.2%	4.0%	3.2%
Year 10	16.0%	15.6%	10.6%
Certificate level II	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Certificate level I	0.0	0.0	0.0
Year 9 or below	9.5%	9.8%	7.4%
No educational attainment	0.4%	0.3%	1.0%
Not stated	7.3%	6.3%	8.3%
People - cultural and language diversity (Source ABS 2021)			
English ancestry	43.6%	43.1%	29.8%
Australian ancestry	42.7%	44.3%	28.6%
Irish ancestry	11.3%	10.7%	9.1%
Scottish ancestry	10.3%	10.5%	7.7%
Australian Aboriginal	6.6%	7.2%	3.2%

Indicator	East Maitland – Metford SA2	Maitland LGA	NSW
Country of birth			
Australia	85.2%	86.9%	65.4%
Languages (Source ABS 2021)			
English only spoken at home	88.8%	90.6%	67.6%
Employment Type (Source ABS 2021)			
Worked Full Time	56.4%	57.0%	55.2%
Worked part-time	31.7%	31.4%	29.7%
Away from work	6.7%	6.9%	10.2%
Unemployed	5.2%	4.7%	4.9%
Labour force participation (15-85 years) (including those are unemployed looking)	61.6%	64.0%	58.7%
Occupation (Source ABS 2021)			
Professionals	18.3%	17.0%	8.0%
Technicians and Trades Workers	15.9%	16.2%	11.9%
Community and Personal Service Workers	13.0%	13.4%	10.6%
Clerical and Administrative workers	12.6%	12.5%	13.0%
Labourers	10.6%	10.3%	8.2%
Managers	10.2%	10.4%	14.6%
Sales Workers	9.4%	9.1%	8.0%
Machinery Operators and Drivers	8.3%	9.4%	6.0%
Industry of employment (Source ABS 2021)			
Other Social Assistance Services	4.2%	4.0%	2.4%
Hospitals (except Psychiatric Hospitals)	4.0%		4.2%
Coal Mining	4.0%	5.1%	0.6%
Takeaway Food Services	3.2%	2.9%	1.8%
Supermarket and Grocery Stores	2.9%	2.6%	2.5%
Income (Source ABS 2021)			
Median individual income	\$763	\$802	\$813
Family	\$1990	\$2088	\$2185
Households	\$1590	\$1766	\$1829
Method of Travel to Work (Source ABS 2021)			
Car, as driver	58.5%	59.0%	43.1%
Walked only	1.1%	1.1%	2.5%
Worked at home	17.6%	17.0%	31.0%
by car as driver or passenger	62.7%	63.3%	47.2%
Unpaid work (Source ABS 2021)			
did unpaid domestic work	69.3%	70.8%	66.5%
cared for child/children	29.5%	32.0%	25.3%
provided unpaid assistance to a person with a disability	13.1%	13.1%	11.5%
did voluntary work through an organisation or group	11.5%	11.1%	13.0%
Family composition (Source ABS 2021)			
Couple family with no children	37.2%	36.5%	37.9%
Couple family with children	42.0%	44.0%	44.7%
One parent family	19.2%	18.1%	15.8%
other family	1.5%	1.4%	1.6%

Indicator	East Maitland – Metford SA2	Maitland LGA	NSW
Employment status of couple families (Source ABS 2021)			
Both employed, worked full-time	22.5%	23.0%	21.7%
Both employed, worked part-time	3.9%	4.0%	4.7%
One employed full-time, one part-time	22.8%	23.8%	18.2%
One employed full-time, other not working	12.8%	12.1%	12.3%
One employed part-time, other not working	5.7%	5.1%	22.9%
Both not working	21.3%	19.7%	22.9%
other (includes away from work)	6.5%	7.6%	10.3%
Labour force status not stated	4.4%	4.6%	3.7%
Dwellings			
Occupied private dwellings	95.1%	94.9%	90.6%
Separate house	81.0%	87.3%	65.6%
Semi-detached, row or terrace house, townhouse etc.	13.8%	9.6%	11.7%
Flat, unit or apartment	5.1%	2.3%	21.7%
Other dwelling	0.0	0.7%	0.7%
Average number of bedrooms per dwelling	3.3	3.4	3.1
Average number of people per household	2.5	2.7	2.6
Owned outright	29.1%	28.0%	31.5%
Owned with a mortgage	34.2%	39.1%	32.5%
Rented	34.0%	29.8%	32.6%
tenure type not stated	1.1%	1.1%	1.5%
Family households	70.3%	75.3%	71.2%
Single (or lone) households	26.8%	22.2%	25.0%
Group households	2.8%	2.5%	3.8%
Less than \$650 gross weekly income	17.9%	15.2%	16.3%
More than \$3000 gross weekly income	19.4%	21.8%	26.9%
Median weekly rent	\$350	\$370	\$420
Households where rent payments are less than 30% of householder income	52.6%	55.2%	56.1%
Households with rent payments greater than or equal to 30% of household income	38.8%	35.5%	35.5%
Median monthly mortgage repayments	\$1733	\$1829	\$2,167
Households where mortgage payments are less than 30% of householder income	78.9%	78.3%	71.9%
Households with mortgage payments greater than or equal to 30% of household income	10.4%	10.7%	17.3%
Car ownership per dwelling (Source ABS 2021)			
None	6.5%	4.5%	9.0%
One	33.5%	30.9%	37.8%
Two	37.9%	40.7%	34.1%
Three or more	20.9%	22.8%	17.5%
Not stated	1.2%	1.1%	1.5%
Population mobility (address) (Source ABS 2021)			
Same address as one year ago	82.3%	80.4%	79.4%
Same address as five years ago	58.3%	51.9%	53.9%
At risks and vulnerable groups (Source ABS 2021)			
Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander people	6.9%	7.5%	3.4%
Provided unpaid assistance to a person with a disability (last two weeks before Census night) (%)	13.1%	13.1%	11.5%

Indicator	East Maitland – Metford SA2	Maitland LGA	NSW
Highest Educational attainment: Year 9 or below (%)	9.5%	9.8%	7.4%
Population aged 65+ (%)	17.4%	15.6%	17.7%
With need for assistance (person's need for help or assistance in one or more of the three core activity areas of self-care, mobility and communication)	6.6%	6.7%	5.8%
% Learning or earning at ages 15 to 24 (source PHIDU 2021)		85.1%	85.0%