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Summary

Introduction
This research analyses the involvement of local communities in the design, development and planning of previously developed land (PDL). Specifically, it seeks to discover if such involvement improves or worsens the built form of and process for PDL regeneration. For this thesis, Previously Developed Land includes vacant or derelict land and land currently in use with known potential for redevelopment and includes ‘brownfield’ and ‘greyfield’ lands but not land that has blended back into the natural landscape. Local community means a ‘community of place’ being those people relating together because they inhabit or work in the same neighbourhood.

The premise of the work is that there is a lack of information about whether or not the built form or process for developed PDL was influenced by the local community. A mixed method is employed that has involved the use of directly applicable or associated literature, case studies in a geographically discrete part of Melbourne (The Maribyrnong River Valley) including an urban design analysis, and comparable international case histories.

The literature
The research initially considers by historic narrative the reuse of PDL from the beginning of the 20th Century when the first statutory city plans were prepared. 20th Century planning shows an increasing awareness of the need for community involvement in planning; the key tipping point being the reaction to the High Modernism freeways and high-rise public housing in the 1960s-70s. The environmental movements also developed affinities with community participation. However, there were also subsequent setbacks to community participation in PDL reuse, including in cases where market-led development was emphasised to the exclusion of community voices (Chapter 2).

Towards the end of the last Century there was greater awareness with all stakeholders of the importance of collaboration with all stakeholders in PDL planning was happening. Participatory Planning with stakeholders including local communities was beginning to be practiced in the UK and many other places. This culminated in the Collaborative Turn in planning practice; while contentious there has been a greater acceptance in the 21st Century that people can become more involved in the planning of their neighbourhood,
and there is now a body of legislated and professional practice that encourages this interaction (Chapter 3).

Current research and practice shows there to be a lot of variability and contradiction about community involvement in PDL plans. Some of the issues raised in current research include the limitations of some communities to relate to the planning process; the internal conflicts between planners’ ideology and their organisation’s public management policy; the impact of ‘unequal pluralism’ in the power politics of land development; and the capability of local communities to plan for transformative change such as for PDL redevelopment (Chapter 4). These impediments point to the difficulties that communities have in exerting their preferences, and their basic inability to achieve urban change that is both in their interests and the interests of the wider community. This leads to the need to research how communities have or have not been able to influence how PDL has been planned, designed and developed through the dual means of investigating case histories in other parts of the world and through carrying out case studies in an Australian city.

**International case histories**

Eight international case histories of PDL developments from Canada, the USA and the UK have been selected to inform the case studies’ findings. These cover the topics of community involvement in site decontamination; strategic planning and urban design; retrofitting places; redevelopment of housing estates; and institutional arrangements for PDL planning. The results of the research (Chapter 6), which included site inspection and participant and literature surveys, are used as comparators for the planning practice applied in the Maribyrnong River Valley case studies.

**The Maribyrnong River Valley case studies**

The Maribyrnong River Valley has been selected by an audit of PDL development in Melbourne that shows the Valley has the greatest PDL transformation in metropolitan Melbourne. Using specific criteria relating to site size; site contamination; planning processes; and land ownership 49 PDL sites are assessed and four chosen on merit (Chapter 5). These four sites- Lynch’s bridge-Kensington Banks (former saleyards, abattoir and ordnance depot), Edgewater (former ammunition factory), Waterford Green (former ordnance factory) and Defence Site Maribyrnong (former explosives factory) are investigated for their planning history and local community involvement in the planning
and design processes (Chapter 7). These developed and developing sites are further analysed using built form visual analysis and urban design assessment (Chapter 8).

The participation survey has been generated using a ‘snowball sampling’ technique. Participants have been selected from three broad groups- Residents (the ‘community of place’), planners and developers. The majority of the interviews were face to face and then audio-recorded and transcribed (Chapter 5).

The analysis of the participant survey (Chapter 9) has been conducted under the themes derived from the data analysis. The broad findings are about local communities’ involvement in broad scale and detailed strategic planning and design; the relationship with development/planning partners; decontamination of sites; and what people thought of the design of the estates. Chapters 7 and 8 are used to verify and discuss the survey evidence.

**Findings**

The findings based on the literature, international histories and the participant analysis show that:

1. Intensive community collaboration is associated with higher levels of community satisfaction and *vice versa*.
2. Community involvement can lead to both ‘good’ and ‘bad’ built outcomes.
3. When a community is engaged from the start of planning, this produces the most consistent good outcomes.
4. The continuation of community engagement through implementation of PDL redevelopment and into subsequent place making also produces additional community benefits.
5. Local community engagement in urban design is more critical for some parts of PDL redevelopment than others.
6. Along with community engagement, contemporary market conditions are also strongly associated with PDL redevelopment outcomes.

These findings have their limitations due to the initial selection process and further study, particularly of smaller PDL sites and those in private ownership needs to be carried out.
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Chapter 1 - Introduction

1.1 The scope of the research

This research aims to answer a fundamental question of whether or not public participation influences the development of our cities in one of their most critical places - land that has been previously used for urban purposes. It is the intention of the research to concentrate on the way that the planning and subsequent urban design and development has involved the public and what end results have eventuated. The research has therefore been restricted to urban renewal, considering what the literature says about this and whether specified examples can assist in the answering this research’s central research question, as set out below. To achieve this, a mixed method of research has been employed including a literature review, an investigation of overseas exemplars and an in-depth case study of PDL sites in Melbourne Australia.

1.2 Initial definitions

This research analyses the role of local communities in the design, development and planning of previously developed land (PDL). PDL is found in all major cities in countries with advanced economies. Once sites of slum clearance, most current PDL is now a result of deindustrialisation, arising from economic restructuring of manufacturing industry, institutional reform of government services, underutilisation of urban lands or port and transport reform. For the purposes of this research the following definition of PDL shall be used:

“PDL. . . includes both vacant and derelict land and land currently in use with known potential for redevelopment. It excludes land that was previously developed where the remains have blended into the landscape over time.” (ODPM 2005, p.77)

For a full definition and discussion see Appendix 1.1. This definition not only includes potentially contaminated land usually associated with former industrial sites but also disused commercial sites as well as underutilised residential areas. It encompasses both ‘brownfield’ and ‘greyfield’ lands as commonly used or statutorily defined in the United States of America, Canada and other countries.
While the term ‘local community’ is discussed and more specifically defined later in the research in Chapter 3, its general meaning for this research is that of a ‘community of place’ or those people bound together by inhabiting or working in a neighbourhood. This is the initial depiction of local community despite the complications that are evident through the complexity of urban society in the post-industrial economy and its multiple communities that are not necessarily geographically defined.

1.3 PDL and the future development of cities

The redevelopment of PDL has become important to the revitalisation of cities. There are numerous notable international examples including: Boston and Baltimore in the USA; Vancouver and Toronto in Canada; and Manchester and Glasgow in the UK. In Australia, Sydney’s Darling Harbour, Woolloomooloo and The Rocks (Freestone 2010), and, Melbourne’s Southbank and Docklands (Dovey 2006) are very visible examples. Failure to redevelop PDL can have a major depressing effect on the centre of cities as underuse of urban land affects urban liveability and productivity and can lead to devastation of central city finances and promote unnecessary greenfield expansion. Examples of this devastation are found in St Louis, Missouri and Detroit, Michigan.

Logically, PDL redevelopment has the potential to contribute to the ecologically sustainable future of cities. It provides space for technologically advanced, sustainable housing and employment opportunities in prime locations while contributing to the social capital of a city’s cultural and economic base. PDLs are also places where adaptation of buildings, spaces and cultural institutions can take place, preserving and enhancing elements of the past. Importantly, they are also a substitute for ‘greenfield’ or outwards development, reutilising existing infrastructure and reducing pressure for displacement on agriculture, heritage, tourism, and natural and built landscapes.

As the move to a more sustainable world has become more critical, so follows the need to ensure that PDL is used having regard to the principles of ecological sustainability as generally recognised such as presented in the UN Human Settlements’ Program:

“To make cities more sustainable, urban sprawl is to be minimised and public transport be developed.” (Habitat 2009, p.4)

“On top of suburban densification and sprawl remediation, land use can be intensified through area redevelopment, planning for new areas with higher
densities, ‘brownfield’ development . . . , building conversions, and transit-oriented developments.” (Habitat 2012/13, p.114)

This move towards a more sustainable growth pattern may emerge where cities are naturally constrained or where the advantages of greenfield development are offset by distance from employment and central activities. For example, between 2005/6 and 2009/10 the number of houses built within the established urban area of Sydney ranged from 77-89% of total unit production (NSW Government 2012, Table p.12). The academic literature tends to support the concept of urban consolidation as being a normative goal for future urban settlement; for example, Burchell in the USA (2005), Banister in the UK (1997) and Kenworthy (2001) and Dodson and Sipe (2006) in Australia. These views are somewhat tempered by others including Adams and Watkins (2002), who consider that the brownfield (PDL) versus greenfield arguments are somewhat simplistic (pp.76-90) and Frost and McDonald (2011) who suggest the lack of progress in stopping sprawl in Australian cities is because government planners have failed to engage with urban history which embodies an enduring demand for high housing standards (p.9). Nevertheless, the case for further consolidation of cities is a firm one and the implication for PDL is that it will become an ever increasingly valuable asset for the sustainable transformation of cities. The ontological starting point for this research is therefore to consider how PDL can be promoted in a manner that optimises the benefits for the whole urban population, through the quality of its redesign but recognising that local communities have both rights and attributes that need to be taken into account.

1.4 PDL redevelopment and local community participation

The proprietary rights to use and develop land typically lie with the landowners in mixed economies. However, over the past 60-100 years, advanced economies have enacted laws limiting the use and development of land to protect individuals and local and wider communities from inappropriate development by land owners or occupiers. For example, in Australia this occurs through town planning legislation passed by the States and Territories. The extent to which the individual possesses rights to become involved in deciding what uses and development can proceed is the key element to determining the level of influence an individual or local communities may have in deciding the outcome of any proposals. But individual rights to object may result in adversarial rather than deliberative review (Cook et al. 2012, p.1). The starting point for this thesis is that the
right to object to proposed development is the minimum requirement for the involvement of an individual or the community.

The right of a ‘local community’ to influence the long-term future development of its neighbourhood can be accomplished in an incremental way through objecting to development proposals. The approval of development proposals is typically the prerogative of the local Council of a municipality, which is usually an elected representative body. But there is another right which can be provided to individuals and local communities.

The right of individuals, or collectively a local community, to become involved in the future development of their neighbourhood can occur before a fully formed proposal by another party is prepared. Opportunities for such involvement are possible during the preparation of, or amendment to, a planning scheme by a municipal Council. This research considers the effect communities can have on a proposal to change their neighbourhood.

1.5 Characterising PDL

The characteristics of each site for redevelopment and its environs are unique, which means that no prescription about PDL future built form can be made. But, each site is likely to have some characteristics and opportunities that make it suitable for redevelopment including its proximity to existing infrastructure and transportation; proximity to employment or community services; the opportunity to improve its amenity; and lack of community services for the wider area. There can be advantages for the development of PDL for a city, including the ability of well-positioned sites to provide additional housing supply matched to community needs and affordable housing at costs that are equal to or less than greenfield development. However, as there can be advantages for the development of PDL for a city there may be significant downsides for local communities including increased traffic, loss of perceived open space, potential for overlooking, destruction of locally important heritage, undermining of existing neighbourhood facilities, and construction impacts on local amenity.

Some PDL is contaminated from the wastes or fugitive emissions of previous uses. This can make it expensive to remediate for other uses, particularly for housing for which governments generally apply higher clean-up standards. For example, in Ontario, Canada
the development of contaminated PDL is, according to the development industry, complicated by issues relating to liability, high remediation costs, slow regulatory review processes, complex land use policies, stringent remediation requirements and uncertainty related to site-specific risk assessment (De Sousa 2000, p.840) and finally, the local community needs to be satisfied that clean-up protocols will protect it from risks associated with decontamination. Such are the high costs of remediation there are incentives in the United States of America, both State and Federal, and often metropolitan and local levels, which facilitate PDL redevelopment that is or is potentially contaminated, bridging the gap between the cost of development when compared with less constrained sites.

1.6 Rationale for this research

A key distinguishing feature of PDL sites capable of being redeveloped is that they are typically located within or adjacent to well-established communities. In contrast, greenfield development is often near or contiguous to newly-established communities that are part of the same outward growth pattern of a city. It is this quite disparate situation which differentiates the relationship of local communities to PDL development from new communities in greenfield areas. It suggests that any affected local community should and can have a major role in determining the future of a PDL site as much as other stakeholders such as planners, developers, financiers, and infrastructure providers. However, if local community participation is provided for PDL sites, the question remains whether the involvement of a local community is effective in improving the planning, design or development of PDL. This has led to the thesis research question:

*How does the involvement of the local community affect the planning, design and development of Previously Developed Land?*

The question indicates the ambition of the research to establish association and, where possible, causation between community involvement and PDL outcomes. A mixed method approach including in-depth interviews and urban design analysis is adopted to achieve the necessary resolution of local community engagement with urban quality.

The focus for this research is case studies in Melbourne, Australia. International cases are also included. The findings are expected to be generalizable within the limits of regulatory and cultural experience. To achieve this wider relevance, the UK, USA and
Canada are used as international comparisons for this research. The significance of carrying out a case study on PDL redevelopments has been highlighted by Brownill and Parker (2010). When considering the wide range of community participatory and representative models of democracy, within which public participation in planning has taken place in the ‘post collaborative era’, they say:

“Examination of the dynamics of community participation and attention towards micro-focus is important as this helps to see interplays and contradictions on the ground. . . . The micro-focus perspective also leads us to reflect on issues left unexplored by a focus on the ‘bigger picture’. . . . Therefore rather than claim participation is always ‘this or that’, a focus on particular episodes can be useful and interesting to explore contradictory potentials.” (pp. 278-9)

The intention of this thesis is to explore some places as minutely and holistically as possible through researching Melbourne case studies.

The research has been purposefully developed to enable some observations about urban planning and design practices in Victoria and, elsewhere where applicable. In this sense, ‘planning practice’ includes the legal framework for land use planning and the way planning authorities make decisions about PDL projects within that framework. It is therefore embedded in present institutional arrangements of representative municipal and state governance. It does not attempt to make specific observations about other systems of governance such as the exploration of forms of deliberative democracy, although these are reported upon where applicable, for this would lead away from the practical aspects of the research which is to improve Victorian and possibly Australian and international planning practice within the existing institutional arrangements. The research has therefore concentrated on the extent to which local communities have had a say in the future of their neighbourhood within the existing scope of representative democracy. The research is also directed towards the issue of who is being planned for- the existing community or the future community? and what implications there are for the involvement of the local community as well as for the wider community.

1.7 A summary of the research method

The underlying theoretical position for this research was aligned with the Collaborative Turn in Planning whilst recognising that there was a broad schism between the
communicative pragmatists and those who follow a critical approach to planning theory (See 3.2.1).

The literature review was historically based as well as thematic in covering aspects of community participation and more recent attempts to formalise local community participation. It also includes the most recent research into the effect of public involvement in the planning of PDL.

The research design involved selecting case studies in Australia that were reasonably typical of PDL developments that demonstrated some internal variety; were developed over a time span that covered different political regimes; and were physically connected in various ways to the surrounding community. International PDL developments were investigated for their applicability to Australian planning practice and, in particular, to enable direct comparisons with the findings of the Melbourne case studies.

The case study research commenced with a literature survey for each of the Melbourne case study sites followed by a physical urban design analysis. Next, a number of in-depth interviews were conducted with residents and the planners and developers who had an involvement in their planning, design and development. The research method has some limitations relating to the need to select large, government owned PDL sites that have had a known community participation programme, rather than smaller PDL sites that may have had more elementary public processes. There were also limits on how the case study data were collected using a ‘snowball sampling technique’, overcome, in part, by using relevant primary literature sources (Chapter 7).

The data from the interviews were then analysed and correlations made between the literature, overseas examples, and the urban design analysis. This led to the findings that have been briefly described in the summary. The full description of the research method is presented in Chapter 5.

1.8 Organisation of the research

To analyse PDL and community involvement in it, in a systematic way, this thesis first presents a review of PDL planning and of the literature as it relates to community engagement and participation. It also reviews international cases and previous relevant
material and methods to inform its research design. The research question is then addressed through the analysis of case studies and presentation of findings. The program of research is arranged as follows:

Chapters 2-4 are a literature review. Chapter 2 provides an historic narrative about how PDL has been replanned and the extent to which local communities have participated in its planning, design and development. The time scale covers the 20th Century until what has been described by some theorists as the ‘Collaborative Turn’ in planning. Chapter 3 elucidates the meanings of deliberative democracy, community, and community involvement, participation and engagement; and discusses contemporary planning of PDL and the way local communities have become involved in its planning. It then describes tools for public participation and the extent to which various tools can be used to provide participation for local communities. Chapter 4 reports on recent research into the practice of public participation for PDL planning and other related fields.

Chapter 5 outlines the research framework describing the mixed method used to answer the research question.

Chapter 6 centres on selected international case histories for PDL planning in Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom that are examined for their applicability in answering or illuminating the research question.

Chapters 7-9 focus on the Maribyrnong River Valley case studies in Melbourne. Chapter 7 is a literature investigation of the four chosen PDL sites. The estates were studied for the planning design and development processes used and the nature and extent of community involvement. This information was supplemented with an explanation of each site’s physical geography, history, people and decontamination processes (Appendixes 7.1-5). Chapter 8 is an urban design analysis of the case study sites which is used to define the various characteristics of each built estate. Chapter 9 is an analysis of the responses of interview participants who were broadly grouped into residents, planners and developers. Analysis of the case studies’ data obtained from participants is conducted under the themes derived from the method described in Chapter 5. The findings of Chapter 8’s urban design analysis are used to make a comparison with participant responses.
Chapter 10 uses the information compiled from the case studies analysis of Chapter 9, the literature in Chapters 2-4 and international planning practice in Chapter 6. This leads to evidence-based findings for the research.

Figure 1.1 shows the format of the thesis and the flow lines between the field work and literature review and the chapters of the thesis. This is a very simplified model of the research which tended to be very iterative between the field work and the production of the written parts.

Figure 1.1 Flow diagram which shows the layout of chapters and the input of bodies of work completed for the research. Orange boxes are the body of research work and blue boxes denote chapters
Chapter 2 - Planning PDL and community involvement in the 20th Century

It is the purpose of this chapter to review how PDL has been considered since the commencement of modern town planning and how the law and practice of planning and related fields has evolved to accommodate urban redevelopment. Concomitantly, the means by which local communities have become involved is discussed. Prior to this, an account is provided of the origins of urban renewal in the industrial towns of the 18th and 19th Centuries. This discussion is largely based on academic secondary sources though some planning documentation is drawn upon too.

2.1 A historical perspective for the 20th Century

Industrial towns of the 18th and 19th Centuries were places of great poverty and sickness as workers crowded into insanitary houses. However, following a number of health enquiries, the late 19th Century saw major improvements to the sanitation and minimum housing standards for cities and towns. So much reform of urban living conditions happened in this period that it was coined the ‘Century of Municipal Socialism’ (Mumford 1961, p.518). This reform led to much improvement in health and living conditions in both Western Europe and North America during the latter part of the 19th Century. In Australia, health and living conditions in cities also improved, particularly after the reticulation of water to premises made it possible to build comprehensive drainage and sewerage systems (Cannon 1988).

At the beginning of the 20th Century, while the worst insanitary conditions in cities and towns had been resolved in Europe, North America and Australia the condition of existing housing had not improved. People still occupied many dank and dark tenements in cities and towns. The broader problems of industrial town structure with their lack of civic and commercial centres and the dissection of places by railways were yet to be resolved. Pollution abatement was very limited and the effects of unconstrained coal soot endemic. It was in the light of these extreme issues that town planning, housing and related legislation was enacted to resolve the desperate living conditions in towns and cities.
Slum abolition was initiated in the latter part of the 19th and the first half of the 20th Centuries but progress everywhere was slow. For example, in the United Kingdom only 240,000 slums were cleared between the World Wars, while over four million houses were built largely on the sprawling edges of cities aided by increased accessibility through the construction of electric tram and rail lines. However, the Second World War with ‘the blitz’ and evacuations gave an impetus for clearance of overcrowded and unfit houses which accommodated an estimated two million people (Abercrombie 1959, p. 158).

2.1.2 Slum Abolition in Australia

In Australia, the first attempt to remove slums was in Sydney. In 1900 the Sydney Harbour Trust demolished many dwellings deemed to be unfit for habitation after the bubonic plague had left more than 100 dead. In 1905, the Sydney City Council was given the power to resume and remodel whole areas for street widening. This entailed the removal of several thousand houses which displaced 9,000 residents. Whilst these attempts of slum removal were beneficial for the whole city, they were largely directed at traffic problems (Freestone 2010, p. 214) and civic design notions, particularly of the City Beautiful Movement (USA) which had a major effect on Australian design culture. At a strategic planning level, the Royal Commission for the Improvement of the City of Sydney and its Suburbs (1909) emphasised the need for slum reclamation but little was done to redevelop the land not required for roads (Ibid. p. 215).

In Melbourne, the government in 1913 set up the Select Committee on the Housing of the People of the Metropolis, after there had been scarcely a time throughout the previous fifty years when the problem had not been actively discussed (Stevenson et al. 1967, p. 6). This enquiry was the basis for the Local Government Act 1914 that gave powers to councils to reclaim ‘insanitary, low lying or overcrowded areas, abutting on streets less than 33 feet wide’. These powers were extended to building housing on these areas by the Housing and Reclamation Act 1920 that enabled the government owned State Savings Bank (SSB) to provide loans and Councils to borrow funds for ‘people of small means’ (Metropolitan Town Planning Commission 1929, p. 248). During this period there were several small schemes
built, as well as the larger and notable SSB Garden City estate at Fishermans Bend (Freestone 2010, p. 179).

The Metropolitan Town Planning Commission’s (MTPC) ‘Plan of General Development 1929’, recognised the importance of tackling the problem of slum reclamation but saw that this would be done as a measure separate from town planning (MTPC 1929 p. 247). The Commission noted that voluntary slum removal was taking place by the redevelopment of house sites for industry and commerce and this process of renewal for a higher and better use would remove slums from inner areas. It considered that the proposed zoning arrangements would hasten this progression (Ibid, p. 248).

The 1930s also saw public concern raised about slum living, notably through the efforts of Oswald Barnett (Barnett 1965). He and his group eventually convinced the Victorian Government to take more direct action in the removal of slums by establishing the Slum Abolition Board (Australian Dictionary of Biography n.d. pp.74-82), whose recommendations finally resulted in the Slum Reclamation and Housing Act 1938. This Act gave very broad powers to a newly-formed government agency, the Housing Commission Victoria (HCV) to reclaim designated areas and build new housing on them (Victorian Parliament 1938). This was a key piece of legislation that would provide a firm foundation for urban renewal of PDL in the post-World War II years. Similar authorities were set up in New South Wales and other states.

Housing legislation in Australia preceded planning legislation but, by its nature of abolishing slums, it encouraged the clearance and redevelopment of land. The actions under housing legislation were not intended to be participatory as it was seen that both residents and the general public would benefit by the abolition of the worst slums. Neither was it comprehensive in its nature, nor founded on the principles for thorough town survey as laid down by Patrick Geddes and others.
It was another 15 years before planning legislation was brought in by State parliament.

2.1.3 City planning before World War II and public involvement

The earliest planning legislation in the United Kingdom was in 1909 when the *Housing Town Planning, etc. Act* was passed. Limited in its scope to town extensions, it was a very cumbersome piece of legislation, particularly in its requirements for procedures devised by the Local Government Board to give all interested parties:

“full opportunity of considering all proposals at all stages” (Cullingworth & Nadin 2006, pp.16-17)

This included ‘securing the co-operation with owners and other interested persons by means of conferences and other such means as may be subsequently provided’ (Shurtleff 1910 n.p.). Subsequent planning legislation, including the 1932 Act, maintained the right for affected persons to object to exhibited plans.

Public participation was indirectly applied in the United States to the Plan for Chicago of 1909 through the need to raise a bond issue for its implementation but this participation was after the plan was prepared. Public involvement was also a prerequisite of the *Standard State Zoning Enabling Act 1926* and the *Standard City Enabling Act 1928*, two model acts for a State to adopt, circulated by the USA Department of Commerce. These acts provided for public hearings and, as a consequence, the need to give notice to members of the public of their rights to submit changes to plan proposals and be heard before newly created comprehensive planning commissions. Between the 1920s and 1950s the notification of planning proposals became common throughout the country (Goodspeed 2008a, pp.2-3).

In Canada, Harland Bartholomew’s plan for the City of Vancouver (1928) was based on the City Beautiful Movement and was clearly influenced by the Chicago Plan. The plan had a lot to say about the design of roads and of zoning bylaws. However, it fell silent on how people would participate with its adoption with the exception of the need to raise public debentures to pay for the public works (Bartholomew 1928). The plan was never formally adopted by Vancouver City Council although some aspects, including some road schemes, were implemented.
In the case of Melbourne, the recommendations of the Metropolitan Town Planning Commission of 1929 were very similar in their composition to Bartholomew’s plan for Vancouver. They also included an outline of legislation that was modelled largely on the British 1925 planning legislation, although it also borrowed from much other legislation throughout the world. The recommended outline would have permitted the responsible Minister to prepare regulations for the hearing of objections to a planning scheme, but there was no further detail for public participation offered by the Commission (MTPC 1929, p. 293). A bill was never presented to the Victorian Parliament and it would be several years before Victoria had planning legislation in the form of the Town and Country Planning Act 1944.

2.1.4 High density housing and freeway development: the community reaction

The post Second World War planning policy response in the 1950s throughout the westernised world was to increase urban densities in cities where possible. This, in turn, led to using new typologies of development for slum abolition and blitzed areas, the high-rise point and slab blocks and elongated mid-high rises called ‘streets in the sky’. These developments were strongly influenced by the international style of architecture promoted by Congrès Internationaux d'architecture Moderne (CIAM), an international movement that promoted modern architecture (Scott 1998, pp.103-5). This appealing notion was applied liberally as an international style in many parts of the world. Today it is described as ‘High Modern’.

The powers of the Housing Commission Victoria (HCV) were extended under the Housing Commission Act 1958 where, within a designated reclamation area, on either land purchased or compulsorily acquired, the Commission could:

“demolish, repair or reconstruct any houses buildings or erections, maintain in good repair similar structures, close whole or parts of streets, and open new ones.” (Freestone 2010, p. 222)

This legislation provided for similar powers to the United Kingdom’s far-reaching Town and Country Planning Act 1947 and associated housing and planning legislation. These new powers gave the HCV an opportunity to redevelop more urban land in Melbourne than any other Australian city with 5-30 storey buildings of load bearing pre-cast panels manufactured at its own factory. In all, 47 high-rise
residential blocks were built almost exclusively by this prefabricated construction system.

In Sydney, major redevelopment activity occurred about the same time as Melbourne culminating in high rises in The Glebe, Sydney and Waterloo (Ibid. pp. 221-2). In other major Australian cities the need for slum reclamation was not as pressing and there was less slum reclamation activity.

Victorian planning and slum renewal practices were being reassessed in the 1970s after seminal work in the United Kingdom and the United States. In 1959 Young and Willmott had published a qualitative study of people relocated to an outer metropolitan estate from Bethnal Green, London. This demonstrated some of the upsides but mostly downsides of disturbing kinship ties. Later, the work of Jane Jacobs: The Death and Life of Great American Cities, also exposed the myth that people would lead a better life, by replacing the brownstone tenements of New York with high rise public housing (Scott 1998, pp. 132-140). Jacobs argued for principles that would retain the city as safe, interesting and economically viable, as well as a place that people want to live in (Jacobs 1961, pp.5-34). Jacobs’ work was a shock to the planning profession around the world which was deeply embedded in ‘high modernism’ architecture modes and in planning for the separation of land use categories and pedestrians from motor vehicles.

Thus in the 1970s a change occurred in Victoria about how the public and government and its housing and planning institutions viewed urban regeneration. There were several causes for this (including the physical failure of some box frame construction flats in the UK, similar to those built in Melbourne) but these generally revolved around the almost universal movements of conserving the heritage of cities’ urban areas. In Melbourne, the National Trust and local residents associations such as the East Melbourne Association started agitating against the wholesale removal of Victorian housing and precincts in inner areas of arguably one of the world’s finest Victorian era cities. Ross King describes the issue of high rise development built by the HCV in social and economic terms for Melbourne:

“By late 1971 the HCV was in full retreat. . . . First . . . it had produced a sub-market of housing quite unsuited to the intended occupants [lower income families with children] . . . ; they [the flat developments] progressively became
a dumping ground, denigrating both physically and socially, and stigmatised. Secondly, the sheer bulk of the high rise blighted neighbourhoods physically, the prejudices against their occupants soured neighbourhood relations, and property values fell relative to those more distant from the estates. The [ensuing] anti high-rise battle catalysed local community opposition to both public sector and private sector flats investments in many areas.” (1987, p. 250)

Regarding the social dimension of the flat dwellers, Stevenson, Martin and O’Neil (1967) investigated the high rise HCV Hotham Estate in North Melbourne and found that a major issue about open spaces at ground level that were inadequate for their intended functions including secluded sitting space and playing space for children, because:

“they belong to everybody and therefore belong to nobody.” (p.146)

The effect of public agitation in Melbourne was to cause a halt to large urban renewal schemes. The slum reclamation program in Melbourne ceased in 1973 and the last high-rise was completed in 1974. The HCV found other avenues to provide public housing including mixed public/private medium density housing initiatives and spot purchase of existing dwellings. The private high rise development industry also fared badly against the pressures of strong local lobby groups in places like Middle Park and Toorak where just a few large apartment blocks were built. The private housing market continued to produce the ‘six pack’ of cheap walk up flats which provided for low-cost rental demand in the 1970s. The same building activity was also taking place in Sydney, in places such as Randwick, where row after row of similar walk up flats were being constructed (Lewis 1999, pp. 90-91).

In Sydney, the stakes for planned urban renewal went higher when the Builders Labourers’ Federation (BLF) placed a ‘green ban’ on the redevelopment of The Rocks, preventing a rather large and unimaginative office precinct development which would have swept away a lot of early Sydney heritage. The Whitlam Australian Labor Government also aided in recasting the renewal of inner urban areas. Its action to acquire The Glebe in 1974 led to the rehabilitation of the historic neighbourhood rather than its planned wholesale destruction (Freestone 2010, p. 229). Later, strong heritage preservation pressure affected the way that government
approached urban renewal and in particular the initial Woolloomooloo urban renewal scheme that would have destroyed the character of the neighbourhood’s heritage architecture and intimate spaces. The urban renewal scheme was substantially modified after another BLF green ban had been applied.

Large urban renewal projects did not entirely cease. Private enterprise projects were particularly common, consisted of redeveloping Victorian housing on large allotments in limited locations such as St Kilda Road, Melbourne and in Sydney and Brisbane where planning schemes specifically provided for high density development along parts of Sydney Harbour, at selected locations such as Bondi Junction, Chatswood and Parramatta and along the Brisbane River. The 1970s and 1980s also saw a booming office market, and many ‘skyscrapers’ were built including Australia Square, Sydney and the Rialto Towers in Melbourne. These became striking examples of very dense developments creating a public domain at street level which added significantly to the fabric of the central city at a time when planners and architects were beginning to recognise the importance of the street, as urban space, for their early urban design initiatives.

While the high-rise flats program of the HCV and NSW government came to a close there remained another threat of public urban renewal. The Metropolitan Transportation Study (1969) prepared for metropolitan Melbourne by Wilbur Smith and Associates proposed that significant parts of what now constitutes the City of Yarra and other inner and middle ring suburbs would be bulldozed for a six kilometre grid of freeways (Melbourne Metropolitan Transportation Committee 1969). This generated a lot of reaction from local residents including the Fitzroy Association and from the Centre for Urban Research and Action (CURA) an advocacy group headed by Brian and Renata Howe, later to become high-profile public figures (eMelbourne n.d.). The end result, partially attributable to CURA acting as an advocacy planner with other adversaries, was that some freeway routes were never built and others were deferred indefinitely.

Similar issues, sometimes of a much greater scale, were being felt in many other parts of the western world. In the UK, planning authorities availed themselves of the *Civic Amenities Act 1967* to protect large areas of inner towns and cities that could have otherwise been earmarked for urban renewal (Ward 1994 pp.135-6,
Cullingworth and Nadin 2006, p.299). Also many public housing estates were beginning to fail socially. The Gorbals in Glasgow, Scotland was a serious example of social dysfunction brought about by a design that was not only poorly constructed but had destroyed much of the tight knit social infrastructure (CABE 2008). See also 6.4.2. In the USA, many public housing estates had begun to both physically and socially fail, for example, in St Louis, Missouri, the Pruitt-Igoe Estate comprising 33 eleven storey slab high-rise buildings built in the 1950s was progressively demolished because of the estate’s poor condition, lack of amenities, poor design and inhabitant lawlessness (Von Hoffmann n.d., Goodman 1972). Many other cities in the nation also began to demolish public housing towers and by the end of the 20th Century many had been demolished, including 79 in Chicago, and 21 in both Philadelphia and Baltimore (Internet archive). This aversion to high rise was also felt in other places, including Canada.

In Toronto in the 1970s, several neighbourhoods began to form alliances against the potential of further incursion of high-rise development resulting in a reform council being elected that passed bylaws to limit the density of high-rise development in the city centre. (Klemek, 2011). The integrity of many inner suburbs was also protected. There was a swing away from high-rise development to more sensitive mid-rise, mixed-income, mixed-use housing, epitomised by Saint Lawrence, a large public and cooperative housing redevelopment built next to the city centre (Ibid.). The 1970s also saw high levels of citizen action to prevent the extension of the freeway system and protect the tramway system (Ibid.). In these respects a strong correlation is found between the citizen movements against high-rise and freeway construction in the inner areas of Toronto and Melbourne.

**Community involvement in planning in the 1940s to 1970s**

The period after the Second World War till the late 1970s was typified more by the public’s reaction to projects than by their participation in the planning processes for these projects. But there were changes that enabled more participation, for example, an enlightened Whitlam Australian Government established a principle of local community participation with the Glebe redevelopment. A residents’ committee, chosen from surrounding communities, was established to guide the plan (Cook 2011, p.3). However, the extent to which legislation embraced the idea of public involvement was still quite
patchy. In England the need for greater community participation was first recognised by the Seebohm Committee (1967), which looked into personal and family social services. It argued if area action was to be carried out with the wishes of inhabitants in mind then:

“. . the participants may wish to pursue policies directly in variance with the local authorities; participation provides a means by which further consumer control may be exercised over professional and bureaucratic power.” (Cullingworth & Nadin 2006, p.361)

A little after Seebohm, the Skeffington Committee, reporting on participation in planning to the UK government, made some specific recommendations about more public participation, but a key finding was that, despite any amount of public participation, the final decision on plans and proposed development lay with the planning authority. In this context participation was primarily consultative rather than a community empowerment to make decisions (Taylor 2005, Delafons 2010). As a result of these recommendations, the Town and Country Planning Act 1968 was amended in 1971, to provide greater involvement in earlier stages of plan preparation such as the ability for people to comment on the survey material of the plan. Local authorities would be required to:

“Take steps as would in their opinion secure adequate publicity and ensure that people ‘who may be expected to want an opportunity to make representations’ were made aware of their rights and be given opportunities to make those representations.” (Dillon & Fanning 2011, p.14)

However, this was a long way from individuals or groups gaining any empowerment. Councils, being part of a representative democracy tradition, still retained power to make decisions. An outcome of the new legislation was, unfortunately, so much complexity that planning authorities moved away from plan preparation, preferring to administer development control through informal policy making (Cullingworth & Nadin 2006) that, if necessary, avoided any exposure to public comment.

The USA had an even more complex set of approaches to public involvement in the preparation, amendment and administration of plans that varied from State to State and this led to a great number of different outcomes, both legislatively and in planning practice. Collectively, it can be said that, as a result of the USA Constitution’s 5th Amendment and people’s general cultural disposition for local communal consensus, as
epitomised by the New England Town Meeting, there was a strong move towards open types of democracy where individuals were given a right to put their point of view. An example is California’s Ralph M Brown Act 1953 which requires the public posting of notice of meetings by every government agency, and the right to record such an event over radio or television (Toker 2012). In the USA, citizen participation was mandated in the 1954 Urban Renewal Program and expanded in the Model Cities program and the war on poverty in the 1960s (Brody et al. 2003). But this participation was generally encased in a high-modernist mode where professional elites designed first and asked the community’s views last. (For an explanation, see the beginning of this part) The failure to engage the public in the Model Cities Program was studied by Sherry Arnstein who saw how these elites manipulated federal programs to avoid proper citizen participation, resulting in her developing the Ladder of Citizen Participation (Arnstein 1969), discussed in 3.3.1.

Towards the end of the 1970s, a number of larger cities in the USA began to take citizen participation seriously by creating autonomous local planning organisations. One such city was St Paul Minnesota, discussed as a case history in 6.5.1.

In Victoria, the Town and Country Planning Act 1944, when initially enacted, provided for notification to the public and affected owners that a planning scheme had been prepared; for objections to be received within a three month period; the hearing of objectors; all objections to be considered by the planning authority; and the adopted planning scheme to be passed through to the Minister for approval together with objections not agreed to (Victorian Parliament 1944, Ss.13-14). The Act borrowed heavily from the UK 1932 Town and Country Planning Act and had the same effect of making the primary role of an individual or organisation as an objector to a prepared plan. The original 1944 Act was amended on several occasions. Some improvements were made to the public participation process, including the instigation of independent planning panels appointed by the Planning Minister to hear objectors to draft planning schemes and scheme amendments.

The practice of planning in Victoria often went much further than the law required. In the 1970s, Regional Planning Authorities and the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works (the planning authority for Metropolitan Melbourne) began to practice consultative processes that aimed at involving the public at the early stages of plan preparation through
technical advisory committees and by inviting public submissions on background studies including those aimed at establishing the principles behind a future plan. Freeway routes were recommended with alternative routes assessed and exhibited. Planning proposals were well advertised and explanatory materials produced. In some cases, members of the public were interviewed about their opinions on specific matters that would inform the planning of the area. But these efforts fell short of providing a basis for communities to debate the planning of their town or region in a deliberative manner.

Advocacy planning was beginning to arise in Victoria through local citizen associations and organisations such as The National Trust of Australia (Victoria) and Centre for Urban Research and Action (CURA) but the planning system still remained embedded in a high modernist culture where professional elites, mainly professional planners, reported making recommendations to municipal councils, Regional Planning Authorities and State Government.

2.1.5 Role of environmental awareness and action in planning and developing PDL

The 1960s saw a progressive enlightenment of people about the loss of the quality of both natural and human-generated environments. The loss had been manifested in many ways but two that caused very substantial concern were the impact of agricultural chemicals on the complexity of natural systems (Carson 1962) and the smog, noise and grime of large cities by excessive discharges from cars and industry (Lewis 1985). The body of writing about environmental planning was also beginning to increase and there was concern about the careless exploitation of natural systems through human settlement (McHarg 1971). Concern about governments lack of action on the environment allied with reaction over unpopular interventions such as the Vietnam War mobilised much dissent against governments. In 1970 the first Earth Day attracted 20 million people in the United States (Lewis 1985).

In yet another move away from high-modernism, many in the planning profession were beginning to take interest in the dynamics of modern cities. Complex urban
systems were being slowly understood through the application of modelling made possible through improved computing capacity using systems and control theory\(^2\). In 1969, Professor Brian McLoughlin produced his theory on systems planning applying the principles of cybernetics to urban areas as a means to preparing plans relating to ‘urban ecology’ (McLoughlin 1969).

**Environment protection**

While there had been an effort made over many years to redress environmental issues this had been done in an uncoordinated way through various enactments relating to clean air, water quality, waste disposal, nuisance and poison control. It was not until the 1970s that environmental bodies were established to comprehensively study and resolve the issues occurring through a rapidly expanding human population and its effects on natural, rural and urban areas. The earliest environmental legislation was enacted in 1970 when, in the USA, President Nixon introduced the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) that created the United States Environment Protection Agency (USEPA) (Lewis 1985). A number of disparate environmental agencies were brought together under the auspices of the USEPA, which was provided with a strong policy and enforcement base to regulate air, water and ground pollution. At about the same time, many States also legislated for pollution control commissions and similar agencies to complement Federal law.

Also in 1970, the Environment Protection Authority Victoria (VEPA) was established. Its remit included the control of solid waste and soil pollution (Victorian Parliament 1970, Ss 44-45). *The Environment Protection Act 1970* introduced a system of licences to be issued to emitters subject to conditions. Licences were issued if the emitter was compliant with *Statements of Environmental Protection Policy*, which specified the emission standards for regions (areas, often river catchments) or elements of the environment (ground, water, air, etc.). This licensing system was independent of the planning system, however while the licensing system was successful in preventing excessive pollution from existing or new industry, it did not initially involve the clean-up of land contaminated by past storage and dumping practices or fugitive emissions.

\(^2\) An interdisciplinary branch of engineering and mathematics that deals with the behaviour of dynamical systems with inputs. Not social control theory.
Heritage protection

Some five years after the *Civic Amenities Act* (UK) the *Town and Country Planning Act 1961* (Victoria) was amended to allow planning schemes to provide for the ‘conservation of areas of architectural, cultural, and environmental interest’ (Victorian Parliament 1972, Schedule 3). Subsequently, the first development controls started to be incorporated into planning schemes that protected not only individual buildings but their environs and later whole neighbourhoods. Heritage protection was strongly reinforced in Victoria when the *Historic Buildings Acts* of 1974 and 1981 provided for the protection of buildings on a register that prevented their destruction or alteration without State Government permission. The 1981 Act also provided for funding arrangements to help preserve these buildings (Victorian Parliament 1981, Ss. 43-51).

Environmental impact assessment

A further measure of environment protection was introduced in the 1970s. Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) is:

“A systematic process for the examination and evaluation of the environmental effects of proposed activities that are considered likely to significantly affect the environment.” (Bates 2006, p. 313)

An EIA process uses both scientific qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate a proposed development so that its impacts on the environment can be assessed prior to planning and other approvals being granted. The EIA was first introduced as a federal law in the USA in the *National Environmental Policy Act 1969* (NEPA). In 1974 the Government of New South Wales and the Australian Government made legal requirements for EIAs. In 1978 the *Environment Effects Act* was proclaimed in Victoria.

These actions to both conserve heritage and protect the environment, marked a fundamental change in the way that the development of cities was managed through rational planning and other specific regulatory processes. The use of a scientific approach to assessing and remediating potential pollution of the ground, protecting and adapting heritage of places and other aspects of environment protection became key themes when developing PDL in cities.
Public involvement in environmental planning

The need for public involvement in environmental planning has developed with the science. In several Australian states the planning legislation is the vehicle for environment assessment such as New South Wales where it is mandatory for certain types of development to provide an Environment Impact Statement report and for its public notification (advertising) under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (Bates 2006, p346). In Victoria, planning and environmental assessment are actions taken under separate legislation- The Environment Effects Act 1978. The exhibition of a prepared Environment Effects Statement (EES) is at the discretion of the Minister, who is not always the Planning Minister. The duplication and confusion caused by this separation in the assessment processes were later partially overcome through statutory guidelines which allow the Minister to conduct an enquiry into an EES concurrently with any planning scheme amendment or other statutory draft approval (DSE Victoria 2006b). For the most part, the EES process has followed a path that did not involve the community except for making submissions after a prepared EES was notified. In Victoria, this process is almost identical in effect to the statutory processes under the Town and Country Planning Act. As with planning schemes, several EES preparations have included the public, usually in the form of an invited committee that the proponent assembled, but which is not required by the Environment Effects Act 1978. This will be discussed in the background to the case studies (7.3.2-3). Public involvement in the remediation of contaminated sites appears not to have been practiced in Australia and this is in contrast to the USA where Restoration Advisory Boards (RAB) with local community representation is common place for large PDL sites (6.1.1).

2.2 Development of PDL after 1980

The 1980s saw a new approach to urban renewal. Slum abolition and comprehensive redevelopment of neighbourhoods had generally ceased in Australia, the United Kingdom and North America by the mid-1970s. This had been due to community pressure and because the worst slum areas had been cleared or remediated. In addition, the inner areas of many cities had become valued by wealthier people who carried out improvements to the old run-down building stock in a process which is known as ‘gentrification’(Smith & Williams 1986). This process was partly aided
by the use of heritage controls that were gradually applied to older urban areas. But while old residential areas stabilised with new, largely private, capital being spent on residential refurbishment, the world economy was beginning to change and now dereliction was happening through the process of ‘deindustrialisation’.

Deindustrialisation is a loosely defined term which can refer to a nation’s overall loss of industrial production; to a broad shift in employment opportunity to other sectors of the workforce; and to effects on the balance of imports to exports (Lever 1991). There is also a closely related term ‘disurbanisation’ that refers to the relocation of people and jobs to the periphery of large cities (Ibid.). In the context of this thesis deindustrialisation means the restructuring of urban economies so that there is a greater reliance on service (tertiary) sector for employment than for manufacturing (secondary) sector employment. This phenomenon can be traced back for over 30 years in Melbourne and, similar to most advanced economies, the number of manufacturing jobs declined from 350,000 in 1971 to 265,000 in 2001, representing an absolute decline of about one third or 17 per cent of the total workforce. This decline in the manufacturing workforce continues. This is not to say that production efficiency has declined with a declining workforce; to the contrary, increased efficiency in the manufacturing sector has often meant that manufactured goods have become less expensive without overall loss of production (Rowthorn & Ramaswamy 1997). But these efficiencies have also caused structural changes in urban areas. In Australia the effects of deindustrialisation were quite drastic from the 1980s onwards when the Hawke Federal Government began to remove tariff barriers on some parts of the manufacturing sector such as clothing and footwear.

Deindustrialisation and disurbanisation were, in part, a result of major structural changes in the ‘political economy’ in the cities of economically advanced nations. They had major land use effects. First, older Victorian and early 20th Century industries, usually located in inner urban areas, closed down to be relocated into city edge industrial estates where new production lines could produce more goods and more efficiently, often with less people employed. Alternatively, goods were imported from industrialising countries, where they could be manufactured more cheaply because of lower wages and overheads, lower environmental management and occupational and health standards, and through economies of scale. Second,
offensive and dangerous industries, such as abattoirs and ammunition factories, were decentralised into greenfield sites remote from encroaching urban development. Finally, the use of shipping containers and their handling in new port facilities eliminated manual handling and enhanced modal interchange to rail and road transport thus leaving many old docklands, rail yards and rail lines vacant or underutilised. See Appendix 2.1 for more detail about the evolution of PDL developments in Melbourne.

Deindustrialisation led to what is termed the ‘post-industrial’ period of urban renewal. This wrought structural changes in the cities of advanced economies so that some urban lands in very central or environmentally advantageous locations, now derelict or underutilised as PDL, became available for urban renewal. But where industrial development had sprawled or was associated with now defunct transport systems (such as rail lines) the lands were abandoned or underutilised with little hope of an early urban regeneration.

The first areas to attract attention in the new political economy were the abandoned general cargo areas of major cities. The outstanding example of this is the London Docklands which became almost totally abandoned for shipping when Tilbury, Felixstowe and other North Sea ports commenced containerised operations (Edwards 1992). Similar situations occurred at major ports on the eastern seaboard of the United States including Baltimore and New York. There were many more examples across advanced economies, the most significant in Australia, being the port-lands around Sydney including Darling Harbour and Woolloomooloo; the Brisbane River edge including its Southbank; Victoria Dock, North and South Wharfs in Melbourne; and the ports of Newcastle, Fremantle and Port Adelaide. The abandoned docks and surrounds contained much redundant infrastructure and warehousing such as town gasworks, stevedore sheds and rail yards. By 1990, a number of old port areas and their surrounds were redeveloped or under development. In Australia, these included Southbank in Melbourne, Sydney’s Darling Harbour and Southbank in Brisbane. The international examples described for this thesis in Chapter 6 include London Docklands (6.5.2) also described below with regard to community involvement, and Waterfront Toronto.
The other major source of PDL redevelopment since the 1980s is from old inner area manufacturing sites. These have been used for a range of urban renewal solutions from total renewal after clearance of buildings or works to adaptation of buildings for new uses. The case studies fall into the former category. The international examples described for this thesis are in Minneapolis St Paul (6.5.1) and Vancouver (6.2.2).

A further category of PDL renewal after the 1970s has been the regeneration of non-industrial areas that include old public housing estates and major institutions no longer required by governments. The Kensington public housing estate adjoining Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks case study site is a local example. The International examples for residential areas, described later, are Crown Street Glasgow, Scotland (6.4.2) and Regent Park, Toronto, Ontario (6.4.1). Failed commercial enterprises including car-transport dependent malls have also transformed into more intensive mixed-use developments.

**Public participation in PDL site redevelopment after 1980**

Opportunities for public involvement in the preparation of plans appeared to be increasing during the 1970s through more specific participation requirements such as under the English *Town and Country Planning Act 1968* (Cullingworth & Nadin 2006) or through more conscious involvement practices by planning authorities in Australia. However by 1980, in England and later in Australia, and specifically 1992 in Victoria, there was a political turn which threatened the movement towards open planning practice with the public; the return of conservative governments. While there are other examples in other parts of the world the effect of the political turn is now examined for its effect on PDL Dockland developments in the UK and in Victoria, Australia.

The Thatcher Government of the United Kingdom was elected in 1979. There was consternation that the new government would dispense with planning regulation, however the Government retained the development control system. There were attempts to streamline planning through permitting more change of use within the Use Classes Order, providing delegation to planning officers and introducing the Enterprise Zone which, when applied, suspended the provisions of some structure plans and effectively permitted development as-of-right. Planning policy, in the form of circulars, also made it clear that only in conservation areas (such as green belts) was market-led development to be
discouraged (Ward 1998). Despite this move towards allowing market driven development there was little overall change to the planning system. The main effect of this appears to have been a loss of local community power through more development occurring without the need for permission and the centralised power of the appeal system overturning locally made decisions (ibid.). The most significant change in the planning system was the establishment of Urban Development Corporations (UDC) over areas of PDL created by deindustrialisation.

The effect of creating a UDC was to give special powers to a Government appointed board charged with the redevelopment of a defined area of PDL. Powers of land acquisition and amalgamation, and most importantly planning, were given to the Board. Also, special arrangements were made for access to central government funds and taxation relief. In this way, the development of a UDC was given priority and marketed to the private sector to stimulate its redevelopment (Brownill in Desfor et al. 2010).

The impact of UDC designation on participation of local communities was considerable. While borough councils normally had a seat on a UDC board, the board was composed largely of business interests. The loss of planning control was also a bitter pill for local authorities. Nowhere else was the difficulty of UDC imposition on local planning so keenly felt as in London Docklands where the Labour held boroughs in the designated area rebelled politically and virtually cut ties with the London Docklands Development Corporation (LDDC). This disassociation was severe as 39,000 people resided in the designated area and was not corrected until the late 1980s (Hillman 1998). London Docklands is further discussed in 6.5.2.

On the other hand, in Victoria the State Government was progressive during the 1980s introducing strategic programs such as the Western Suburbs Planning and Environment Action Program (WSPEAP 1984) which was region-based and largely funded through the State Government with some moneys from the Australian Government, specialised funds such as for the Australian Bicentenary, and leveraged funds from industry and local government. The program was inclusive, with members of the public, together with industry and local and state government representatives, sitting in task groups to determine what progress could be made, either to re-regulate land and other elements of the environment, or to initiate small projects with beneficial or instructive merit (MPE 1983b). Associated with this program were more specific strategies one of which,
Lynch’s Bridge Redevelopment Strategy 1984, was directly associated with the formulation of the basic strategy for Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks, one of the PDL case studies (7.3.1). A synergy with the Australian government and state government on this project was later generated through the Commonwealth Better Cities Programme (1991-6) whose aim was to:

“Promote improvements in the efficiency, equity and sustainability of Australian cities and to increase their capacity to meet the following objectives: economic growth and micro-economic reform; improved social justice; institutional reform; ecologically sustainable development; and improved urban environments and more liveable cities.” (Neilson n.d.)

With respect to the later discussed Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks, the program provided moneys for flood mitigation and land rehabilitation work (7.3.1).

The Victorian Government was also instrumental in preparing an inner urban strategy. A taskforce was established, again of mixed community, business and government interests, to guide the strategy. One of the action areas was Lynch’s Bridge; others included Southbank and Docklands. Urban design became a major aspect in the Government’s policy towards Melbourne becoming a great city: with major redevelopments of PDL including the Lynch’s Bridge project (7.3.1); with boulevard improvements; and reconstruction of city laneways as a demonstration about what could happen to improve the city centre for pedestrians (MPE 1983b).

Despite the progressive nature of the Victorian Government’s strategic reforms, the new Planning and Environment Act 1987, while it was a much simplified and enhanced version of the Town and Country Planning Act, was little different in its substance about public participation. The only form of statutorily required participation remained the ability to object (or make a submission) to a planning scheme amendment or planning application (Victorian Parliament 1987, Ss. 19 & 52). Thus there remained no provision for the public to become involved in the preparation of a planning scheme in the formative ‘front end’ of the plan preparation process, or to be involved with private development proposals prepared for planning permission. In the 1990s, the Government amended the Act to enable third party objection and appeal rights to be removed for uses and developments as specified in planning schemes, thus greatly increasing the potential to
reduce citizen third party rights. This situation remains to the present day (Cook et al. 2012).

The development of Melbourne’s docklands was based in a similar approach to the British UDC model with the ‘Docklands Authority’ established in 1991. Under the progressive approach by the Labor Government, the design of dockland areas namely Southbank and the formative stages of Docklands, was generally well planned involving community consultation (Dovey 2005, Oakley & Johnson 2011). However, with the election of the conservative Kennett Government in 1992 a marketing model was adopted for the fledgling Docklands project through the ‘parcelation’ approach of the LDDC (Dovey 2005 pp. 138-9). The City of Melbourne’s planning responsibilities were removed and this generally excluded consultation (Ibid.). No planning permission was generally required, in similar vein to the English Enterprise Zone.

While the development of PDL in inner areas was gaining pace throughout the developed world, another issue arose, a result of the neglectful use of industrial land for waste dumping. It was the contaminated land issue that raised public concern about the health of communities and future communities on reclaimed PDL.

**Contaminated land: Its effect on the renewal of PDL**

The effect on the health of residents through contaminated land was vividly illustrated in what is called the Love Canal Tragedy, which occurred in New York State in 1978 when evidence of the USEPA clearly pointed to life threatening poisoning of humans from a land fill. This tragedy induced US federal legislation that created funding arrangements to bring contaminated land back into productive use (Beck 1979). Potentially contaminated derelict land was eventually referred to as ‘Brownfield’. For this thesis Brownfield is synonymous with PDL whose soil or groundwater is potentially or actually contaminated. Appendix 2.2 shows how the countries and their states, researched here, have developed policy for remediating PDL. They have all taken different legislative and policy pathways.

The link between environment protection and town planning has often been complex and in Victoria did not exist until 1988 until a potential disaster was averted, when the Ardeer lead battery episode occurred. This involved the discovery of buried lead batteries on a previous industrial site on land rezoned and subdivided for housing
(Environment Australia 1999). The episode prompted the Victorian Government to amend the *Environment Protection Act 1970* to establish environmental auditing by qualified scientists and engineers when land was to be rezoned from industry to a zone which would permit ‘sensitive’ uses (housing, schools, hospitals, etc.) to be established. The Minister for Planning also issued a direction that all land of this status could not be used for a sensitive use until the land had been audited and found uncontaminated or that appropriate conditions could be applied to safeguard people’s health (Minister for Planning 2001).

In the case of Australia, each state has used a different environmental regime to achieve somewhat similar results. However, the standards to be applied in reaching the soil contamination conditions appropriate for various types of development has been agreed by all states and territories in the *National Environmental Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure 1999* (NEPC 1999). There is a general expectation that the community will be involved in the cleanup planning process or, at the very least, be advised about a cleanup process. It states:

“Where there are reasonable grounds to expect an impact on the community, the community has the right to be informed of, and to be consulted on, the decision-making process from an early stage in the assessment of site contamination.”

(NEPC 1999a, p.6)

This statement does not enlighten the reader about what sort of impact would initiate the local community being informed of and consulted about the decision-making process or what is envisaged as the ‘decision-making process.’ However, taken as a statement of intent, it is clear that the ‘decision-maker’ needs to test any proposal by, in the first instance, having a view about the extent of remediation as indicated by preliminary assessment of the contamination and what form of remediation is likely to be required for the intended use and the processes to be applied. Victoria EPA’s response has been muted, by proposing that the public be made aware of ‘contaminating activities and land use’ (VEPA 2002b, p.54) which is much less direct than the NEPM intent. Guidelines do exist from the Department of Human Services where it is stated:

“Members of the public with an interest in potentially contaminated sites need to be included early in the process that is at the *planning stage* of a site assessment; inform interested parties of any potential risks identified, and what has been, or will
be, done to mitigate such risks. This will help avoid unnecessary alarm and possible outrage at a later stage. Therefore engagement will often commence before risks are identified and management options developed.” (DHS 2006)

The Potentially Contaminated Land Advisory Committee in 2010 for Victoria did not address any question related to public involvement in planning scheme amendments where site contamination could affect final rezoning outcomes (DPCD 2011b, pp. 4-5). The public’s right to become involved in decision-making about contaminated or potentially contaminated land, whilst partially defined, thus remains unresolved in Victoria.

Much PDL in Australian cities is being decontaminated and consequently redeveloped. As land planning and decontamination law is a responsibility of State and territory Governments there are differences in the way land is both decontaminated and land use proposals are regulated. Appendix 2.3 is a brief explanation of the statutory regulation for the larger States and the planning of PDL in their metropolitan areas.

2.3 The role of urban design in PDL planning design and development

Urban design is generally regarded as the design of spaces and places, particularly as it relates to public space such as roads and squares and the interface of private with public space between a street and the front of buildings. The Urban Design Taskforce (Australia 1994) describes it as:

“Urban design is concerned with the arrangement, appearance and function of our suburbs, towns and cities. It is both a process and an outcome of creating localities in which people live; engage with each other; and the physical place around them.” (p.5)

When developed as policy or regulation, an urban design is as a layer of detail superimposed on the broader planning strategies that have been laid down for a part of an urban area. Urban design may vary from being very specific design of spaces expressed as development controls to broad design policy that will guide approval of buildings and works. It can also vary in scale but is likely to be practiced as a physical design response
for parts of a town, although it has broader application to structuring towns and regions (CABE 2005, Katz 1994).

In one construct or another, urban design has influenced city development for the whole of the 20th Century. ‘Civic Design’ was a more important aspect of town planning than zoning under the Chicago School of the City Beautiful Movement, as exemplified by Burnham’s plan for Chicago 1909, that had later reflections in a number of places including the Burleigh Griffin Plan for Canberra, and the Vancouver and Melbourne plans of the 1920s. After World War II, urban design, in the form of High-Modernist urban renewal schemes devised by architects, made significant changes to the image of the city and its traffic and land use patterns. These major urban sculptures of space, in many instances, were blind to people’s needs and engendered loss of community; and, as previously discussed, in some cases even lawlessness that led to murder, injury and destruction of property (Von Hoffmann n.d., Goodman 1972). However, it is only in the last two decades of the 20th Century that Urban Design has been coined more comprehensively as a separate discipline, and has been increasingly taught and publically accepted as such. In Melbourne, urban design was established as a government activity in the 1980s as described earlier in this chapter (2.2).

An urban design is considered to be ‘responsive’, in a technical sense, if it achieves seven types of performance: permeability; legibility; variety; robustness; visual appropriateness; richness; and personalization. (Bentley et al. 1985)\(^3\). There are many variations of this schema including the 12 urban design principles set down in Victoria (Appendix 8.1).

Urban design advocacy in the United States is exemplified by the New Urbanism movement. New Urbanism was coined in the early 1990s with the dual aims of preventing sprawl and providing a sense of community. Estates designed under its banner are more compact, diverse in land use and permeable than normal suburbia (Katz 1994). The Charter for the Congress of New Urbanism 1996 defines the purpose of New Urbanism (CNU 2007). In the most part, this definition is a restatement of some of the physical objectives of urban and regional planning. Linked to New Urbanism is Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND) whose design differs from suburban design in its preference for pedestrians, narrow non-hierarchical rectilinear streets, narrow houses with balconies, rear access for

---

\(^3\) These terms are explained in Chapter 8 and the Glossary at the end of the thesis.
vehicles and encouragement of heterogeneous small-scale uses (Sands 2006). New Urbanist thinking has a direct bearing on how the case study estates were designed. It is, however, the public participation processes used to achieve urban designs prepared by New Urbanists that have the greatest interest for this research. These processes include ‘charettes’ (3.3.4).

Urban design has a particular place in the planning of PDL, as it can be the vehicle for ensuring that the development is ‘responsive’ to making good places and spaces and, importantly, to ensure that development coalesces and is contiguous with existing compatible land use (Bentley et al. 1985). It may require some detailed regulatory end products to ensure that the prepared design is implemented. In the United States, some municipal regulations (by-laws) use a very detailed prescription known as a Form Based Code (FBC) that is distinguished from normal zoning approaches such as density and land use (Katz P 2004). The Code builds on the idea that physical form of a neighbourhood is its most intrinsic and enduring characteristic and seeks to design codes in a way that all stakeholders, including citizens, can appreciate. Its creation can be interwoven into the community visioning process through a public design workshop (Katz, P 1994).

It has already been noted that the objectives of New Urbanism are very similar to those of town planning. However New Urbanism has its detractors as Jill Grant (2006) explains:

“New Urbanism co-opts the language of New England self governing communities as it generates post-modernist private management (after Marshall 2000, and McKenzie 1994). It employs the terminology of consensus building as a means of its designers’ preferred ends. It adopts the rhetoric of sustainability even as it promotes an agenda of growth. Its intellectual honesty may be suspect.” (p.77)

Grant also asserts that, at the same time that new urbanism welcomes a level of citizen participation, its adherents fear of local opposition to projects is palpable, and its ability to accommodate diversity may be quite limited (after Day 2003) the rhetoric of local control encounters the reality of slick graphics, romantic watercolors, and celebrity designers. Difficult policy or environmental issues are set aside as participants focus on design questions (p.183). Grant therefore expresses the view that a strong authoritarian streak permeates New Urbanism. It positions architects/designers in a central place in the process

---

4 A design-based, accelerated, collaborative project management system that spans the entire pre-construction period (National Charette Institute).
of shaping cities and their culture, which is a type of ‘traditionalised modernism’ (Ibid. pp.76-77).

In the 1980s, urban design became an integral part of the planning and development philosophy for some major PDL developments. In the United Kingdom the urban development corporations were in an excellent position to prepare urban design layouts in their designated areas, but in some cases this was not adequately achieved. As noted previously, Urban Development Corporations, with private enterprise controlled boards, were more eager to promote development and keep a ‘flexible’ approach to its location, bulk and purpose that meant that they kept all possibilities for site development negotiable. The London Docklands Development Corporation also used a ‘parcelation’ approach that created large blocks of land for tendering purposes (Edwards 1992). This crude design approach led to some negative urban design consequences, including lack of greenery and effective open space; confusion about fronts and backs of buildings; lack of a macro urban design framework that missed opportunities for development to relate to surrounding places including Greenwich; and lastly the massing of buildings which missed opportunities to create good spaces. It is indicative of this lack of good urban design for London Docklands that Gordon Cullen’s urban design for the docklands was quietly archived (Ibid.). Despite these concerns about urban design, London Docklands was by the late 1990s an economic planning success as it provided for a massive increase in office space that maintained London’s World City status and took the pressure off the redevelopment of its West End (Fainstein 2010).

Much of the variability in urban design is caused by the absence of urban design as a describable professional discipline. It is only in the last 25 years that it has been recognised as such in the United Kingdom (Loew 2012).

Australia in the 1980s, witnessed urban designs for Darling Harbour, Sydney, Brisbane’s Southbank initially for World Expo, and the first stage of Melbourne’s Southbank. In Melbourne, the Labor Government’s Department of Planning and Environment, under the leadership of Evan Walker (Minister) and David Yencken (Minister’s Secretary), took a proactive stance to urban design, setting up a small but effective urban design unit in the Ministry. This unit concentrated on some demonstration projects in the CBD as well as developing key strategies for linking
boulevards in Central Melbourne; designing and building the first stage of Southbank; and starting Lynch’s Bridge project (Central Melbourne Taskforce 1983). However, the Kennett Government of the 1990s set about overturning the Southbank concept by permitting the casino project to sprawl along the river edge without providing for the framework plan’s road network:

“Crown Casino had not only displaced waterfront housing, but had closed access completely to a half kilometre of riverfront, virtually killing off the urban design potential to the south.” (Dovey 2005, p.83)

Likewise, the Southbank to Port Melbourne boulevard plan was diminished when the Melbourne Exhibition Centre was built to back onto the City-Port Melbourne axis.

The 1980s and 1990s therefore saw some advances in integrating urban design into major PDL proposals but New Right marketing practices had placed urban design as a secondary consideration only worthy of adding value to the marketing of development and not as a principal goal of city building.

Urban design has become relevant in more recent times. This has been encouraged by the design professions and academia making a more concerted effort to progress knowledge. In Australia, the spur was through Prime Minister Keating establishing the Urban Design Taskforce in 1994. It was charged with reporting on the state of urban design in Australia, and the enduring result was the annual Australia Award for Urban Design (Loew 2012). In both North America and Australia the New Urbanism movement developed the art of urban design especially in its publications, and land developers started using qualified and experienced practitioners to produce places where the public domain created liveability and identity for future communities.

In Victoria, urban designs are incorporated into planning schemes through various overlays and the Comprehensive Development Zone that allow detailed regulation of land use and development but, like any other planning scheme amendment in Victoria; the initial preparation stages of these overlays do not require a statutory public participation process. Therefore, unless an informal public engagement process is put in place, the local
community is not involved until the urban design is prepared although guidelines for urban design do recommend it (See 4.3.3).

Place making, is a somewhat broader concept than urban design that is now becoming a major consideration in any new development. This involves not only the creation of spaces within the public realm, but also promotes how they become used through micro design and management measures such as organising street furniture and structured activities for new or existing communities. It also covers initiatives with landowners to revitalise existing places, through seeking out organisations and uses that pay lower rentals for the temporary use of space. An example of place making is ‘Renew Newcastle’ (NSW) which is a complementary place making program that dovetails with the redevelopment and rehabilitation of the city centre (Finney 2012).

Advocacy groups exist for place making, the most extensive being the New York based Project for Public Spaces that uses William H Whyte’s Street Life Project as its theoretical basis (Project for Public Spaces n.d.). Its method of place making relies on observation of places, and direct engagement of people as existing or future users of spaces. In particular, it advocates the concept of the ‘third place’ which is both the public and private realm (internal and external) where people are at ease, but not at home (first place) or at work (second place). In Oldenberg’s definitive work in 1991 he posits that it is in these places where gregarious relationships can take place which foster broad and creative interaction, and raises the human spirit thus increasing people’s wellbeing.

2.4 Coordinating the planning of local areas

The coordination of public infrastructure development in Australia was considered to be a key aspect of progressive urban growth at both a state and metropolitan scale over the latter part of the 20th Century (Neilson n.d.). At a local level, municipal councils in 1993 instigated what was to be called Integrated Local Area Planning (ILAP). The guidelines for ILAP expect planning for local areas to be holistic and have a range of inputs including those from various units of council, for example, dealing with recreation and health through to town planning itself. The main aspects of ILAP required councils to change internally to a ‘whole of council’ approach to implement local planning which, in those days, suggested structural adjustment to accommodate the planning process.
ILAP was also to involve a partnership with state infrastructure delivery agencies such as the education departments and main roads bodies and other infrastructure delivery organisations including private education organisations. The local community was also part of the planning process through consultative approaches (ALGA 1993, Thompson and Maginn 2012).

Since ILAP’s instigation, there have been two key shifts in local governance in Victoria. First, under New Public Management regime of the Kennett Government, councils were obliged to prepare three year rolling corporate plans. This ensured an amount of internal coordination that allowed the interactive tasks of council projects to be more effective in both timing and funding terms. The Labor government in 2003 made further changes reinforcing the central position of councils to prepare four year corporate plans for their municipality. Later, the Planning and Environment Act was amended to ensure that Councils reviewed the Municipal Strategic Statement, a local strategic planning policy incorporated into a planning scheme. This, once again, led to greater coordination of infrastructure planning. ILAP as it affects community planning and its role in collaborative planning at a local level is discussed later (4.3.4).

2.5 Implications for this research

For there to be any equity in a planning system, people living close to land proposed to be developed should at least have the right to know what is proposed and if negatively affected, some rights to voice their concerns and, ideally, some influence over what is finally built. Without such rights, a community can have no effect on development of PDL and the research question is not capable of being answered.

The notion of community involvement in town planning is not new. As far back as 1909 in both England and the United States public involvement was an accepted practice (Cullingworth & Nadin 2006, Goodspeed 2008a). But it was many years before there was a greater planning practice acceptance that communities should have an opportunity to be engaged in the evolution and preparation of plans. The environmental movements of the 1960s-70s were the starting points of more systematic consultation with communities. However, in many instances, the pendulum swung back again in the 1980s-90s in the interests of commercial gains more than community benefit. The effect of political philosophies on the extent and nature of public participation in the planning of PDL is
further researched in this thesis in Chapter 9 and raises the issue that external circumstances, such as political beliefs, can promote or repress community response and therefore the extent to which local communities might be encouraged or be made responsible for planned change.

The major concern about urban design approaches, especially New Urbanist design, is whether it adequately takes into account the effects of design on the environment. Moreover, the need to coordinate PDL planning and development both from a ‘bottom-down (centralism) and a ‘bottom-up’ (localism) perspective raises the question of how to coordinate its planning, design and development processes. The ILAP model is one approach but there is a need to examine other models to aid in this research.

The next chapter will deal with the current era that, in planning theory terms, has been dubbed the ‘collaborative planning turn’. Such a turn has been heavily contested by planning academics but, in its perceived course, it has important implications for the way people directly affected by a planning process are involved in that process. The next chapter examines this proposition in the context of the redevelopment of PDL.
Chapter 3 - Defining Public Participation in Planning

Chapter 2 considered the origins of the development of PDL from the legacies of the 19th Century industrial city, through to the end of the 20th Century. It also considered two themes which are important to the planning and design of PDL, namely urban design and planning coordination. It investigated how the public was or was not involved in the planning, design and development of PDL in the context of the practices and theory of town planning in the countries being investigated: The USA, Canada, the UK and Australia, with particular regard to the State of Victoria.

In this chapter some critical concepts relating to the meaning of participatory planning and community are examined to provide a firmer basis for the research. Collaborative Planning Theory (CPT) is considered including the controversy and uncertainty it has caused in the post-modern era. The tools available to planners to engage the public in PDL plans are reviewed and how these tools provide a spectrum of involvement from non-participation to empowerment of local communities.

3.1 Definitions for public participation in planning

3.1.1 Deliberative Democracy and Participatory Planning

The research for this thesis is situated within present institutional structures of a representative democracy, where decision-makers are elected by the people of the municipality, state or country. There are however, different means by which the elected representatives, acting as a collective decision-maker can be informed. These include deliberative discussion by the public at large, often called deliberative democracy. One characterisation of deliberative democracy is provided by Carmen Sirianni:

“Deliberative democracy rests on the core notion of citizens and their representatives deliberating about public problems and solutions under conditions that are conducive to reasoned reflection and refined public judgement; a mutual willingness to understand the values, perspectives and interests of others; and the possibility of reframing their interests and mutually acceptable solutions.” (Sirianni n.d.)
Deliberative Democracy has a long tradition in the United States where the 5th Amendment of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights spell out an individual’s right to be involved in public decision-making, and where there has been a traditional grass-roots involvement in collective decision making. Gastil and Keith (2005) note that deliberative democracy is one of two forms of contrasting models of democracy- the adversary mode or representative democracy and the unitary mode:

“In the Unitary mode, a public engages in respectful deliberation, weighs conflicting evidence and sentiments, and arrives at enlightening understanding of the general will” (p.7)

They go on to say that in the United States, there was a flowering of deliberative democracy in the earlier part of the 20th Century through public forums and outreach programs but after the Second World War this was diminished by anti-communism, the rise of complex technologies, urbanisation, and rational leadership as exemplified by taking expert advice. However, the move towards a more deliberative democracy has recently regained strength when there are differences over faith, value, culture, or life experience:

“Sometimes this means the discovery of an overlooked consensus position, but more often it means arriving at an informed, reflective accommodation of conflicting cultures, or it means parties finding provisional solutions that work within continuing disagreements.” (Ibid. p. 16)

A similar approach is shared by Patsy Healey in the U K working within the theoretical framework of ‘social institutionalism’ and in the context of both complexity and deliberative democracy:

“In encounters between actors and institutional sites of collective action, those involved not only bring into the arena their prior knowledge and values. They also change their understandings of themselves and their interests through the social learning which takes place in such encounters. Such learning processes generate the socio-political energy through which policy agendas and programs and the design systems and practices may, in favourable circumstances transform. Good institutional capacities, in this viewpoint, are those which generate the transformative power to imagine and adapt creatively to new situations.” (Healey 2005, p. 326)
Where Deliberative Democracy exists it clearly includes the possibility of deliberative planning sometimes expressed as ‘participatory planning’. Places where deliberative democracy has been practiced include the Canadian Provinces of British Columbia and Ontario (Sintomer 2010, Herath 2007). The outcomes of deliberative democracy in these two provinces have been plebiscites. The USA has a similar system when important issues are often resolved at the ballot box in the form of citizen ‘initiatives’ to change State Constitutions. (Internet Archive) A further example at a local scale, is Plateau-Mont-Royal, a second tier government of the City of Montreal, that is practising deliberative democracy through ‘Comités aviseurs’ (expert citizen advisory committees). The research here indicates that there are challenges and opportunities with institutionalising participation. Amongst the challenges are the limited staff resources that affect the committees’ work (Landry & Angeles 2011).

Some participatory processes also enable local communities to deliberate on issues. The Australian example is Geraldton 2029 and Beyond where about 10% of the citizens of this large regional centre participated through a number of small scale deliberations on the town’s sustainability program in discussions led by 40 trained ‘community champions’. This enabled decision-makers to enact more far reaching plans than originally thought possible (Hartz-Karp & Meister 2010). There are numerous other examples of participatory exercises and these will be considered in both this chapter and in Chapter 4.

While there has been an interest in deliberative democracy and its offshoot of participatory planning, there is a hanging question about who is the participating community. The post-modern realisation of ‘multiple publics’ some who can be unequally heard makes for greater complexity in the public participation process (Gleeson and Low 2000, Marshall et al. in Thompson & Maginn 2010). This leads to a need to define what ‘local community’ means for the purposes of the case study research.

### 3.1.2 A definition of ‘local community’ for this research

A wide range of definitions for community exist. Over 90 definitions were analysed (Bell and Newby 1973 as cited in the Encyclopaedia of Community (Christenson & Levinson 2003) and the only common element in them was ‘man’ as in mankind. On the other hand, Etzioni considers that community can be defined with reasonable precision as:
“First, a web of affect-laden relationships among a group of individuals which often reinforce one another and; second, a measure of commitment to a number of shared values norms and meanings.” (ibid. p. 226)

The dictionary goes on to describe a number of other types of community including ‘Communities of practice’ that learn through ‘situated learning’. Such communities of practice centre on two key groups of people- namely Planners and Developers who are also central to this thesis’ case studies.

The Charette Center (USA), the country’s primary advocacy group for the charette, defines ‘community’ as:

“Those who inhabit a neighborhood are a community. They share a physical environment and a common interest in its future condition, as well as their own well-being. When neighbors communicate effectively about these interests, they may be referred to as a ‘community of place’.” (Charette Center n.d.)

The term local community in this thesis refers to a ‘community of place’; in other words they are the residents and businesses of the case studies or their environs. It does not relate to other forms of community including communitarian groups (Christenson & Levinson 2003 p. 225) and communities of opposition (Ibid. p. 228). In this research ‘resident’ is generally the dominant individual of a community of place. The ‘communities of practice’, when referred to, will be distinguished as ‘planners’ or ‘developers’.

3.1.3 Meaning of community involvement and similar terms

Commonly used words when describing how a planning authority interacts with a local community and other stakeholders are often not clearly understood. These words include participation, involvement, engagement and consultation. Standard definitions are used here, as defined by the Royal Town Planning Institute (the professional association for town planners in the UK) in association with the Consultation Charter of the Consultation Institute, that follows:
Participation can also be viewed in a relative light when compared with information giving and consultation:

“The etymology of participation conveys a strong sense of being an active agent, beyond being a mere responder or passive follower. . . . It reserves its highest accolades for deliberative participation which is information rich, unhurried, rationally-grounded but attentive to values, providing genuine opportunities for learning, and for individuals’ re-thinking of their positions.” (Holmes 2011, p.14)

According to Holmes the literature of ‘participation’ suggests it to be a ‘good thing’ and permits preference formation rather than mere preference assertion. It is therefore the dynamic of changing parties’ views with collaboration that is the key to improving the resolution of issues where there are disparate initial views.

With these basic terms defined, the thesis will return to an examination of current planning practice in the 21st Century.

3.2 The collaborative turn in contemporary planning

The previous chapter followed the historic narrative of public participation in the various phases of planning in the 20th Century from the earliest days of slum abolition and the
City Beautiful to urban renewal of PDL. The period was one of changing underlying planning philosophies of Modernism (City Beautiful) before World War II, High Modernism of Post-war advanced economies, the environmental movement and Rational Planning, Advocacy Planning and finally market liberalism under Conservative governments. None of these turns in planning theory were discrete and there is evidence of them being still practiced today. But a ‘turn’ was about to take place in the 1990s that would more effectively locate the importance of the community in partnership with government and business. The ‘collaborative turn’, was by no means accepted by all planning theorists.

3.2.1 The move towards collaborative planning

Two key philosophical positions are important to the evolution of Collaborative Planning Theory. First Giddens’ theory of *Structuration* relates to the phenomena of how people understand and change their environment. Healey expresses Giddens’ contention which is based on, but is different from, Marxist theory that:

“As structural forces work through the relational webs within which we live, we both use and consume the structures which surround us.” (1998, p.46)

This ‘reflexive’ concept indicates to Healey that:

“It is possible to imagine that through the attempt to recognise and respect our cultural differences we have the potential to make sense together.” (ibid p.48, after Forester 1989)

Second, Habermas’ (1979) theory of *Communicative Action* speaks of comprehensibility: the ability to communicate something; the sincerity of the communication; and the seeking of understanding by the other person through discourse (Taylor 1998, Forester 1989).

Communicative planning techniques were originally proposed by John Forester. He postulates that, in order to both achieve democratic goals and get things done, planners must be effective communicators, not only with powerful development interests but also with other groups such as community groups (e.g. a ‘local community’ as defined for this thesis). Forester proposes a consensus approach involving the various affected parties, including the developers and the local community who would establish a plan. The planner’s role would be as a ‘critical friend’. Thus a plan would be more capable of implementation as it can take into account all stakeholders views (Forester 1989). The
pace of change towards more participatory planning approaches gathered momentum in the 1990s.

Following Forrester, Judith Innes asserts a move should be made from rational analysis and synthesis (systematic thinking about planning) to planning becoming an interactive, communicative activity where planners are directly embedded in the fabric of community, politics and public decision-making. Communicative action theorists find out what planning is by finding out what planners do, rather than postulating what planning ought to be (Innes and Booher 2000). In a similar vein, Patsy Healey (1992) had claimed that of the five possible governance forms of planning models, a communicative conception of reality arrived at by inter-subjective effort of mutual understanding is the most progressive. This model would lead to collaboration between affected parties including institutions and the community to arrive at a commonly understood and acceptable plan through a process of discourse. To attain communicative planning, a systemic institutional design needs to be locally developed (pp. 266-293).  

Watson notes that at the Third Planning Theory Conference in Oxford 1998, there was a distinct division between two groups: the ‘communicative pragmatists’ who included Healey, Innes and Forester and those who followed the ‘critical’ approach including Fainstein, Friedman and Flyvbjerg,. The communicative pragmatists made the central assumption that:

“No act of communication is often purely technical and neutral: ‘all technical knowledge is inevitably technically infused with biases reflecting particular interpretive predilections and normative values’.” (Watson 2002, p. 145 quoting Healey)

On the other hand, those taking the ‘critical’ approach brought a range of different understandings to the exploration of planning practice:

“The interpenetration of all inter-action by power; the institutional and politico-economic context of planning; the need for greater recognition of diversity; and the theoretical situation of discourse were some of the arenas followed by these writers.” (Ibid. p.146)

---

5 ‘the sharing of subjective states by two or more individuals.’ Scheff 2006.
Clearly the above descriptions indicate a high level of contestation about the robustness of Collaborative Planning Theory (CPT) given the range of socio-political environments within which planners work. An example, of a differing view of planning, from that of the collaborative planning theorists, is given by Professor Bent Flyvbjerg. Using a major case study of the plan for central Aalborg, Denmark, he defined ten propositions that flowed from the power battle that ensued after the original plan was adopted to when it was implemented in favour of vested interests rather than the citizenry. He argues that power distorts rationality:

“Proposition 2: Rationality is context-dependent. The context of rationality is power and power blurs the dividing line between rationality and rationalization.” (1998, p. 227)

The Aalborg case study evinces that, beyond normal communication, there are powerful political undercurrents which can sweep away the fruits of collaboration. This is a particularly difficult proposition for communicative pragmatists to accept, who assert a consensus or transformative resolution of the issues relating to a plan can be found through the collaboration of all affected parties. Thus the theory of collaborative planning has its critics, who consider the concept of collaborative planning as idealistic and neglecting the realities of power (Huxley 2000, McGuirk 2001). Others suggest that collaborative processes are overly concerned with consensus-building rather than working with the energy of conflict and contestation (Healey 2005, p. 320). Susan Fainstein (2010) states that:

“In its reliance on goodwill, communicative planning theory typically passes over structural conflicts of interest and shrinks from analyzing the social order that blocks consensus building.” (p.28)

Furthermore, by its obsession with communicative participation, collaborative planning diminishes the rational planning process which is often utilised by planners to achieve consistent and supportable outcomes that rely on precedent and a developed skills base rather than the product of a collaborative dialogue that may become a localised view of the future without adequate context (Ibid. p.28). But as Healey points out, there has been a gradual movement towards promoting collaborative policy-making. In particular, the moves towards ‘participatory planning’ in England are seen as a move towards collaborative planning (1998 p. 318).
Recently and locally, Alan March has analysed the problems of using collaborative planning in practice, using the Victorian planning system as an example. He suggests CPT relies on several external devices for successful planning to be realised, such as rules to progress information assessment; decision making and problem solving; and the resolution of intractable disputes through external institutional arrangements. Thus, although planning appears to be moving towards a more collaborative position, planning practice within CPT is still problematic (March 2012). Other theoretical models of rational planning, advocacy, and modernism may still be quite valid and could be utilised in varying degrees and combinations depending on the type and scale of planning involved.

3.2.2 International moves towards collaborative planning

A landmark move towards collaborative approaches in planning was the Aarhus Convention of 1998 a United Nations environmental initiative involving the EU including the United Kingdom (United Nations 1998, Articles 6-7) See Appendix 3.1. While the Convention does not directly imply collaborative planning should be always be followed in environmental planning, it gives a very clear indication that it is essential for effective public participation input to occur at an early stage in the planning process.

Australia is a member of Agenda 21 which is a voluntary code to govern and implement sustainably. Originating at the first World Summit on Ecological Sustainability at Rio de Janeiro in 1992, Agenda 21 created an action agenda for all levels of government. Local Agenda 21 effectively produced ground rules for local planning frameworks (Jerram & Kvan 2008, p.1). Significantly, it recognises the importance of involving communities in the implementation of sustainable policy that affects the way cities develop and are therefore planned and designed. Several Councils in Victoria are members of Agenda 21, including the City of Melbourne.

3.2.3 Participatory planning in England: Towards collaboration

In England, the Labour Government of 1997 under Prime Minister Tony Blair initiated an enquiry chaired by Lord Rogers. Its report ‘Towards an Urban Renaissance’ (DETR 1999) prompted a Government response, in a White Paper entitled ‘Our Towns and Cities: The Future’ (DETR 2000). This became the blueprint for much government action. In particular, the regeneration of cities was to be seen as a partnership with local
communities and business engaging with government, often referred to as ‘The Third 
Way’ (Giddens 1998). Projects that would lead to ‘urban renaissance’ included the very 
definite policy of using PDL for over 60% of all new urban housing development (Cherry 
A 1999, pp.28-33). Plan preparation was to become more socially inclusive. John 
Prescott, the then Deputy Prime Minister, expresses this concept in the white paper’s 
foreword:

“Our policies, programmes and structures of governance are based on engaging local 
people in partnerships for change with strong local leadership. This inclusive 
approach is at the heart of our work on tackling social exclusion and it is central to 
achieving sustainable economic growth.” (DETR 2000)

The conclusions of the White Paper pointed to local and regional planning becoming 
more engaged with local communities through reformed planning legislation. The Blair 
Government in 2004 discussed how to strengthen community involvement as part of its 
planning reforms that, amongst other things, was seen to be a form of participatory 
democracy:

“The envisaged new planning system:
- leads to outcomes that better reflect the views and aspirations and meet the 
  needs of the wider community in all its diversity
- is valuable as a key element of a vibrant, open and participatory democracy
- improves the quality and efficiency of decisions by drawing on local 
  knowledge and minimising unnecessary and costly conflict
- educates all participants about the needs of communities, the business sector 
  and how local government works
- helps promote social cohesion by making real connections with communities 
  and offering them a tangible stake in decision making.” (ODPM 2004, p.4-
author’s emphasis)

While participatory planning or participatory democracy is referred to above, the same 
document also states that:

“Participation cannot substitute for proper decision making through the accountable 
institutions.” (Ibid. p.6)

In this sense, the term participatory democracy in the list above means open public 
participation and discourse potentially leading to group consensus or definition of group
viewpoints before a decision is made. Therefore, public participation is viewed as part of
the exploratory process towards making a decision by a representative democratic
institution such as a local council. Brownill and Carpenter (2008) nominated the
Government’s approach to representative democracy with open participation as a ‘hybrid’
model, one which is still:

“underpinned by democratic elitism through a system of representative democracy
that ensures that decision making is kept within the hands of elected members
supported by planning officers.” (p. 234)

This position is similar to that of the Skeffington Committee (2.1.4), however New
Labour did increase citizen benefits by mandating *Statements of Community Involvement*
(SCI) for local plans and development proposals as the means of uniformly engaging the
community and stakeholders in a timely manner (DCLG 2008). The anticipation of the
Government was that planning authorities would engage early with local communities.
Thus, in planning for housing, the Government said that collaborative working with
planning bodies as well as the early engagement with local communities, stakeholders
and infrastructure could provide the key to successfully implementing housing policy
(DCLG 2011a, p.7).

### 3.2.4 Localism: England’s new approach to Town and Country Planning

The current UK coalition government passed the *Localism Act* in late 2010. The Act aims,
amongst other things, to reduce the effect of central government on the planning of local
areas by the abolition of Regional Strategies and increasing local communities’ autonomy
by providing an ability for Parish Councils and smaller identified communities to prepare
‘neighbourhood plans’. These plans are to be approved through referenda and would then
be put into effect by the planning authority.\(^6\) The new system of local plans, as envisaged,
paves the way for much more local empowerment. The Department of Communities and
Local Government says of them:

---

\(^6\) The Localism Act is also in fulfilment of the Conservative Party’s 2010 platform that opposed the centralist, nation-wide
planning approaches of the Labour government and proposed a new form of bottom up and localised planning it dubbed
‘Open Source Planning’. This, in turn, is connected to Prime Minister David Cameron’s ‘big society’ speech to the EU.
‘Rather than have one planning structure determined centrally and then applied unvaryingly across the country, we want to
create a planning system where there is a basic national framework of planning priorities and policies, within which local
people and their accountable local governments can produce their own distinctive local policies to create communities
which are sustainable, attractive and good to live in’. (Conservative Party 2010, p.1).
“These plans can be very simple and concise, or go into considerable detail where people want. Local communities will be able to use neighbourhood planning to grant full or outline planning permission in areas where they most want to see new homes and businesses, making it easier and quicker for development to go ahead.” (2011b p.12)

The whole tone of the legislation and its supporting guidelines is towards economic and social liberalism, that means relatively low legal constraints on individuals on income and personal actions). However, there is some reservation of power for central government and local authorities in that neighbourhood plans have to accord with recent National Planning Policy and comply with the strategic vision of the municipality.

Localism has been a topic for both left and right wing politicians in the United Kingdom. It is defined as:

“A strategy aimed at devolving power and resources away from central control and towards front-line managers, local democratic structures and local consumers and communities within an agreed framework of national minimum standards and policy priorities.” (Stoker 2004, p.117)

It has antecedents in place-making that go back to the 1990s when Village Design Statements and Market Town Plans were introduced by the Countryside Commission; and is focussed on the principle of subsidiarity. By and large, these plans that can be described as ‘community-led’, have been applied in the countryside for small, clearly identifiable communities. Bishop (2010) explains that while these plans were generated in a grassroots or ‘bottom up’ manner, they were generally unhelpful to professional planners preparing spatial plans as they often dealt with non-spatial concerns such as street lighting. They also covered some of the ‘softer’ issues such as poverty and isolation, that planners were loath to become involved in as they were often qualitative and within other areas of competence (pp.617-8). Despite the mismatch between community-led plans and planning schemes, the evidence points to local communities being satisfied with the local planning process (p.618).

The collaborative principle relies on both local communities and other stakeholders in the future development of a place become engaged with one another. Bishop considers that
the ‘neighbourhood plan’ as prepared by a local community may well lead to a non-
collaborative approach as:

“This totally contradicts the collaborative planning principle whereby people should
not move into collaborative processes with their own predetermined outcomes. . . .
This could be not so much ‘bottom-up’ planning but ‘bottom-only’ planning.”
(p.621)

Such emphasis on local interests is likely to mean the local community will resolve
matters in its own interests rather than accommodating other interests.

The effect of Neighbourhood Planning, as enabled by the Localism Act, cannot be fully
determined at present, certainly not until a number of test cases are completed, however
some evidence is starting to come to light such as case studies conducted in the Yorkshire
and Humber area showing that localism is an idealistic vehicle for community
involvement and that real world application is slow, less engaging than envisaged, and
may cause internal community disputes as well as tensions with Parish and Town
Councils (Poulter 2013). Also, the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England
(CPRE) has expressed concerns about the National Planning Policy that, in the absence of
neighbourhood plans, developers rather than communities are likely to benefit from the
new planning arrangements through a default ‘yes’ to development (CPRE 2011). Neither
can its value in bringing back PDL into economic and valuable community use under
localised actions be assessed at present. How localism will work in major cities where
communities of interest rarely coincide with any geographic demarcation of a community
of place is also an unanswered question. Likewise, the ‘right to build’ concept that can be
applied in ‘neighbourhood plans’ is hard to assess. It may be a contraction to the forgotten
and generally unsuccessful Enterprise Zones of the 1980s (2.2), based on the view that the
failure of the past to provide adequate and affordable housing requires ‘permission free
zones’ (Bishop 2010 p. 623).

The general theme of localism is very much a full empowerment of people at a local
level. However, the key issue for this research is whether local communities can produce
plans that envisage major change such as significant redevelopment of PDL producing

---

7 The Localism Act in England does not define how a ‘neighbourhood’ will be established for urban areas, although there
have been attempts to do so such as at Bristol where the average size of the unit is a population of 30,000 (Bishop 2010
p.922). Such a large population would be far and above what ordinarily would be considered a neighbourhood.
increased population and employment, or will they opt for the status quo to protect their own interests.

3.2.5 Local localism: Neighbourhood Environment Improvement Plans (Victoria)

Victoria’s own brand of environmental localism was facilitated in 2001 by amendment to the Environment Protection Act 1970, thus enabling a Neighbourhood Environment Improvement Plan (NEIP) to be drawn up. A NEIP is a means to correct environmental problems for a defined area. A sponsor agency, such as a water authority, applies to the Victorian Environment Protection Authority (VEPA) to prepare a plan and initially an environmental audit or report is prepared that VEPA assesses before agreeing to the plan being prepared. After a plan is prepared and submitted by the sponsor and approved by VEPA, its actions become binding on stakeholders which include the polluters. VEPA describes the preparation of a NEIP as a highly-collaborative process with the residents of the affected neighbourhood and other stakeholders. It is defined as:

“An open process with public and inclusive participation and consultation is essential when establishing a NEIP. When VEPA is asked to endorse a proposal [for a NEIP], the proposal needs to clearly demonstrate an effective community engagement process. It must also identify the partners in the proposal and that they have agreed to participate in developing the NEIP.” (VEPA 2002a, p.4)

Plan development is also to include those people or groups who may be required to carry out ‘works’, or contribute substantially to the implementation of the final plan (p.4)

Despite the legislation now being more than ten years old, while some NEIPs have been prepared, none have been approved. Commenting on the NEIP program’s lack of success, Gunningham et al. (2007) point out that:

“The potentially tortuous process of developing the NEIP, the failure to provide incentives for reluctant NEIP partners to ‘buy into’ the process, the heavy resource burden placed on the community, and the privileging of sponsors and of the EPA itself, all seem destined to create tensions between many of the NEIP objectives and their successful implementation.” (p.10)

VEPA are currently evaluating the NEIP program and legislation in the light of the failure of NEIPs to achieve any real improvements to the environment. It is salient that providing
the legislative power to achieve localism may not be an adequate response to preparing a plan, whether this is in a planning or the overlapping environmental context. Other influences, including the threat of enforcement and government support through funding arrangements, may also be required for the preparation and implementation of plans through the ‘bottom up’ or localism process. Also, there may be a need to provide more engagement with the broader community and for the chair of any steering committee to be a member of the local community (Ibid. pp.20-22). Nevertheless Holley (2010) states with respect to the pilot projects:

“All programs included representation from a wide variety of affected individuals. . . organisations. . . and interests in numbers that appear significantly more ‘participatory’ than traditionalised regulation.” (p.387)

3.3 Public Participation in Planning

3.3.1 Modes and levels of Public Participation

Is public participation a means of obtaining information from individuals or community and other stakeholder groups; or is it to allow people with different interests to interact so that transformative behaviour brings greater consensus or definition of differences? Is it to permit a community to decide its future by itself? This range of possibilities was succinctly developed in 1969 by Sherry Arnstein with her *Ladder of Citizen Participation*:
The ladder highlights the width of the spectrum of community participation from no involvement to full control by the local community described above as ‘citizens’. She depicts this as a struggle for power as ‘nobodies’ (citizens) trying to become ‘somebodies’ (p. 218).

The Arnstein ladder of Citizen Participation, while still a respected model of participation, has its critics who say that it overemphasises power and ignores the existence of different forms of knowledge and expertise. It also ignores that participation may in itself be a goal and that the model is too simplistic (Titter and McCallum 2006). Alternatives consider having multiple ladders, better evaluation processes, the education and recruitment of users and the understanding that user involvement is part of a larger system. (ibid. p168). For example, Connor’s 1988 ‘New Ladder of Public Participation’ surmises a process of public education followed by information feedback from a community and if dissent or concern continues, further consultation will be required which solicits the creation of alternative proposals and their evaluation. Connor points out that:
“There is no best way to design and manage a public participation program; there is a cumulative relationship between the rungs on the ladder- each successive one builds on the previous one; and a complex situation will require a systematic process that must be designed and implemented appropriate to the specific situation.” (pp.256-257).

In a representative democracy, elected persons make the decisions on behalf of a geographic area or for a purpose for which they are elected. Unless required by law, they may make decisions without advising the local citizenry. In contradistinction, in a pure deliberative democracy each franchised citizen votes upon each matter requiring a decision. However, in almost all liberal democracies, a form of representative democracy is practiced as embodied in constitutions, acts of parliament or other actions of government. In some cases, state governments legislate for and delegate responsibilities to other groups that are more representative of local communities such as local governments. Of course, delegation implies that responsibilities can be withdrawn at any time at the discretion of the delegator. Also, the extent of further delegation is often regulated through common law including the doctrine of delegatus non potest delegare (a delegate may not delegate) which serves to curtail the extent of further delegation. An example of this is the Victorian Planning and Environment Act 1987 that allows delegation of plan preparation to a committee of council, which could include non-elected members of the public, but does not allow a plan to be adopted except by the council acting as a planning authority under the Act. Thus, in Victoria, the redistribution of power to others for plan preparation cannot pass the sixth rung on Arnstein’s model which is described as ‘partnership’. Here there is a sharing of the power of a representative body with local people and other interests subject to conditions prescribed by the delegator.

3.3.2 Principles for public engagement

Unless the legislation specifically requires, it is at the discretion of the planning authority to prepare a program to engage the public for each specific change to a planning scheme, including major PDL projects. This program needs to be carefully devised in order to avoid circumstances where significant communities or stakeholders are unintentionally omitted from engagement. Sarkissian (2008), in the Australian context, recommends a number of principles for effective community engagement. These form the basis for deciding what participatory tools should be applied, how and when they should be
applied, and how their outputs are recorded, reported and utilised. These principles are summarised as:

- Give access to the plan preparation to those less able to express themselves including Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CaLD) communities and special groups such as school children;
- Build community capacity using education options and creative visualisation tools;
- Ensure that people’s views are recorded and used to refine a proposal;
- Have clear relationships with advisory groups; and
- Use a wide range of engagement tools employing expert facilitators (Sarkissian 2008, pp. 18-19).

An abridged version of these principles is attached as Appendix 3.2.

This listing above is clearly useful when contemplating a large PDL project but is also appropriate, with adaptation, for much smaller projects. It suggests that community involvement processes are complex and clearly recognises that local communities can in the post-modern construct have multiple identities. A professional field of consultants that facilitate community engagement in projects has emerged which planners, developers and communities often use to optimise participation amongst the stakeholders of a proposed PDL redevelopment.

Planning Institute Australia’s National Position Statement on Public Participation contains supporting principles for public participation:

- “The promise that the public's contribution will be factored into the decision-making process;
- the promotion of sustainable decisions by recognising and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers;
- seeking out and facilitating the involvement of those directly affected, and those with less confidence in public participation who tend to be excluded, potentially affected or having a less direct vested interest in a decision;
- seeking input from participants about the methods used to obtain information and enhance flexibility and responsiveness to varying needs;
- providing participants with the information and support they need to participate in a meaningful way; and
communicating back to participants as a part of the process of consultation and giving information about how their various inputs have been incorporated into the decision making process.” (PIA 2013)

These principles point to the need for professional planners to be inclusive of all who are likely to be affected, and to create feedback loops with the community about how consultation should be carried out and how the communities’ views are to be used. It also indicates that citizens need resources to respond to proposals. This shows that the profession in Australia is moving towards ensuring local communities are heard and their views considered and thus is participatory and collaborative in its context. The policy invokes a spectrum of Public Participation called IAP2.

3.3.3 IAP2’s use in Victoria

While there are few statutory requirements in Australia that require public involvement in early stages of plan development, there are a number of guidelines that have been prepared and these exist under most jurisdictions. Most are based on the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Spectrum of Participation Model (discussed below) which ensures that there is a sound and knowledgeable approach to engage the community. In Victoria, the official guideline is: A guide to planning your community and stakeholder engagement strategy. It states that the stages for a successful engagement are:

1. Clarify your engagement objective;
2. Identify your stakeholders;
3. Analyse your stakeholders and select your level of engagement;
4. Select your activities and decide on your message;
5. Consider any engagement risks;
6. Review your plan and celebrate successes; and
7. Evaluate your engagement strategy.” (DPCD 2009a,)

There appears to be no clear policy links to the Department’s engagement strategy and Victorian planning legislation or its subordinate documents. The closest link is through the Department of Planning and Community Development’s Activity Centres & Strategic Sites Expert Assistance Program, where a panel of experts provides specialist technical and expert advice to councils about, amongst other things, ‘Community consultation’ (DPCD, n.d.).
3.3.4 Participation tools and the spectrum of participation

The nature of engagement with a local community will of necessity vary by the type of proposal made to the decision maker and the size and location of land to be planned. At the small end of the PDL development scale, an infill block of apartments may require consultation with people directly affected by the proposal and this would include immediate neighbours. But, on the other hand, a review of a city plan affecting PDL will require a more expansive and detailed process that will engage different communities and other stakeholders in stages over a protracted period and across an extensive area. The planning authority must then choose the appropriate strategy to engage communities using principles similar to Sarkissian’s and the PIA’s and a stakeholder engagement strategy as described above.

The IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation has been adapted by the Department of Planning and Community Development in Victoria. The spectrum approximately follows the rungs in Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation (Fig 3.1) and is presented in Table 3.2 below:

Table 3.2- Adapted IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREASING LEVEL OF PUBLIC IMPACT</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION GOAL</strong></td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>Involve</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
<td>Empower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide the public with balanced and objective information</td>
<td>To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or objectives</td>
<td>To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered</td>
<td>To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution</td>
<td>To place final decision-making in the hands of the public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMISE TO PUBLIC</strong></td>
<td>We will keep you informed</td>
<td>We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision</td>
<td>We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision</td>
<td>We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible</td>
<td>We will implement what you decide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXAMPLE TECHNIQUES</strong></td>
<td>Fact sheets</td>
<td>Public comment</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Citizen advisory committees</td>
<td>Citizen juries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web sites</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>Deliberative polling</td>
<td>Consensus building</td>
<td>Ballots</td>
<td>Participatory decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Houses</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Public meetings</td>
<td>Delegated decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(DPCD 2009, p.14)
The adapted IAP2 Spectrum illustrated in Table 3.2 is now used to examine, in more detail, some tools for participation, ranked from very low to very high:

**Notification (Very low participation)**

The public is often informed about projects through written notification to satisfy the statutory obligations of a planning authority or development agency. This constitutes the minimal form of participation, which usually expresses the rights of the individual to submit their objection in writing to the decision maker. This form of notification usually must be given when a detailed proposal has been prepared either as a development application by a landowner or developer or a rezoning proposal is instigated by the planning authority.

Decision makers often inform affected communities by giving notice about a proposal, even though no statutory requirement to do so exists. The information that is given may be at one or several of the stages of a project or plan and may include details about the nature of the project or plan such as the principles behind its development; when there will be meetings; and how a citizen can participate. Different media can be used including a mailed letter, a newsletter distributed in various ways including e-mail, the internet, hand distribution, newspapers and television or radio and increasingly new/social media. Notification made ‘up-front’ at a time when no definite proposal has been defined can prove to be very effective in whetting affected people’s appetites to become participants in a longer process relating to deciding a large development or plan, such as a plan review or the planning, design and development of a PDL site.

**Public meetings (Low participation)**

Some projects have a public meeting as a legal requirement. Public meetings, whilst free, open and disseminate information, are generally not regarded as a good vehicle for public participation as they can become ‘messy’ (Cogan 2000, p.xi). This is because they need to be staged with experts talking ‘at’ people and this can cause angst and sometimes indifference in the audience as well as attract factious demagoguery. They are also inherently adversarial and provide little scope for members of the community to actively deliberate on particular issues (Gurran 2007 p.53). Public meetings are therefore often subject to a range of rules that greatly circumscribe discussion, which if applied, may be seen by those present as oppressive. Like other kinds of fixed events, public meetings
may also exclude some members of the community because of their timing or use of one language. If public meetings are proposed by the decision maker, it is appropriate to include members of the affected community as its chair or as panellists. Meetings conducted using a panel are often called a ‘forum’. Leaders of the community and other major stakeholders can also be part of the meeting preparation process so that some measure of inclusion and management is afforded to them.

**Focus group (Low participation)**

Focus groups are small groups of people who have been usually randomly selected, as a microcosm of the general community, to seek their views through a discursive process. They are often used in marketing of new products but have found their way into use in some arenas of planning, in particular retail planning. They are not regarded as very sound vehicles for researching for land use plans and projects as they are selective with a very limited outreach and therefore are exclusionary of the general public (Somekh & Lewin 2005).

**Speak Outs (Moderate participation)**

This is a forum where individuals can learn about a project and can respond with verbal or written comments. The decision maker will mount an exhibition and supply materials in many forms to elicit people’s views. A ‘speak out’ can be made to be fun with ancillary activities such as face painting and balloon give-aways. It can involve all ages and groups of the community of place. Speak outs are also similar to ‘open houses’, whether this be at the outline or more refined stage of a proposal. Both these types of participatory event are interactive between staff and the public and thus more closely comply with CPT.

**Workshops (Moderate participation)**

Workshops come in various forms and are tailored to the exact needs of a project at a particular stage in its development, the nature of the project/plan and whether the decision-maker really wants the community to express its views openly. Some workshops have been called ‘search conferences’ (Granata 2005).

The essence of a workshop is the way in which everybody is enabled to participate through group activities often around tables and subsequent reporting to plenary sessions. There are various formalised processes used to ensure optimal results from workshops,
but commonly they involve small groups which come to a consensus achieved through various physical aids.

Workshops can be very effective in providing a wealth of information to the decision-maker. An essential part of such an exercise is to properly record the information and have it reported back to the participants and, if appropriate, to the general public. As members of the public and stakeholders are to be the main focus of workshops, it is important that their representatives be involved in planning the workshops.

**Charettes (High participation)**

The alternative name for a charette is ‘design by enquiry’. The National Charette Institute (USA) defines the charette process as:

> “a design-based, accelerated, collaborative project management system that spans the entire pre-construction period.” (NCI n.d.a)

The charette method provides a process that enables urban designers to consider alternatives while engaged with the public. Once background information has been provided, people usually assemble into small groups around tables to evolve a design through a rational design process, starting with principles and objectives then moving onto broad concepts and then land use distribution and finally the structure for the plan. Each group is preferably mixed by age, cultural background, and economic status and usually contains one professional person with urban design experience.

Charettes have been used extensively by the urban design profession where greenfield and PDL development on large sites is proposed. New Urbanists promote the use of the charette as a means of changing the community’s views to urban planning and regulation and provide some measure of citizen empowerment:

> “On-site charettes concentrate most of the work for the project into several days of intense activity, have proven invaluable in building community support. During a charette, the [urban design/architecture] firm confers with local officials, community leaders and interest groups; stages public meetings and presentations; calls in local architects, planners and citizens to collaborate. The focussed program becomes an event, capturing attention in ways that typical planning activities never do.” (Bressi in Katz 1994, p. xxxvi)
Charettes are used and expounded in Australia:

“[The charette] is a cost effective means of envisioning the outcomes at an early stage and assessing the planning proposals at a final stage. It is important that both the consent authority [usually the Council] and the participants in the charette understand its role in decision making.” (NSW Govt. 2007)

This explanation is interesting in the way it sounds a cautionary note about the role of a charette. The implication is that its role is to provide a front-end feed to the professional planner/urban designer and to also act as an evaluation tool for the plan as prepared. So, while there is partnership involved in preparing realisable plans at the charette, the final product, in the case of NSW this is likely to be a Development Control Plan or Development Approval (planning permit), remains in the hands of planners recommending the proposal to the planning authority.

An example of a charette is that mounted for East Fraserlands in the City of Vancouver, British Columbia (6.2.2).

**Citizen Juries (Very high participation)**

While IAP2 (adapted) categorises a Citizen Jury as Very High Participation, there is reason to challenge this status when considering access by all individuals in a local community as discussed below.

A Citizen Jury is not unlike a charette because of its intensive involvement with the community. A small number of citizens, typically, are randomly selected to form the jury. Once the jury is assembled it is provided with evidence. This evidence is usually supplied by experts, and sometimes by experts with differing opinions. After deliberating, the jury gives its verdict, usually in the form of a number of recommendations.

The jury technique requires a decision about whether a jury is empowered to directly affect a final decision or whether it is recommendatory to a representative democratically-elected or established authority. The latter outcome is most likely because a jury, whilst highly participatory for those involved, like the focus group, cannot be truly representative of the affected community and therefore ought not to subvert the powers of an elected body and the rights of other individuals. Woodward (2000) considers the main weakness of a citizen jury is its short term nature whereas there is a need to make changes provide a more strategic and resourced intervention, one coming from a partnership of
committed politicians, officials and citizens (p.240). The same conclusion can be reached about charettes.

Like a charrette, the citizen jury involves a two-way communication. It is deliberative and can provide unexpected recommendations to decision-makers. It can also facilitate a consensus about current policy otherwise not readily achievable because of a lack of capacity or interest in the wider community. But its main drawback is its inability to represent all the diverse views of the community and other stakeholders which is particularly critical in the case of participation in PDL planning. Its findings are thus likely to be challenged in an adversarial situation by opponents of a proposal.

**Participatory Budgeting (Very high participation)**

Participatory budgeting is often practiced in urban renewal schemes where there is an existing community to be re-housed in a PDL site or at a city-wide scale. A proportion of the implementation budget of a public body is set aside for residents to spend on works of their own choosing. This approach involves direct decision-making by residents although there may be rules relating to the extent of discretion the community has over the works. The importance of providing responsibility to residents is through greater autonomy to them, providing a direct input into the development of their area.

Participatory budgeting was first introduced in Porto Alegre in Brazil where it has been practiced since 1989 (UN-HABITAT 2009, p.65). It is said to have successfully raised living and health standards in that city as well as enabling residents to better understand the costing and trade-offs required in the municipal budget (Bhatnager & Rathore 2002). Residents, through a locally elected ‘Municipal Council of the Budget’, make the decisions about expenditure (other than moneys for debt or pension payment). The amount of overall expenditure for the city amounts to 21% of the City’s total budget (Lewit, D 2002). With only the Mayor’s ability to veto the Council of the Budget’s decisions, this is a very high level of citizen empowerment. Similar participatory budgeting approaches are used in St Paul, Minnesota (6.5.1) and by the Toronto Community Housing Corporation (6.4.1).

**Referendum (Very high participation)**

The referendum is the means by which a ‘neighbourhood plan’ is to be adopted by a local community under the *Localism Act 2010*. This is real empowerment although the
deliberative aspects of plan preparation may be restricted to an elected or appointed citizen committee for practicability reasons. It remains to be seen if this type of deliberative democracy will deliver a plan that can comply with broad spatial planning policy of a municipality and be sufficiently resourced to effectively prepare it (3.2.4).

**Other participatory techniques and programs**

The techniques described in Table 3.2 (after IAP2) above are not all likely to be used in planning for PDLs although there is scope for all as part of the planning process with the exception of a binding referendum.

The appointment of a Citizen (or Community) Advisory Committee is sometimes used as part of a public participation process for major planning projects. It is often composed of the major stakeholders including appointed members of the public and land owners. An example of this was the Highpoint Area Structure Plan adjoining the case study estates (Beca 2006, p.14). Another high participation approach is to combine community advice with a community meeting place that brings the community to the site. Such involvement was used in Oatlands in inner Glasgow (UK)\(^8\) and at the redevelopment of the Royal Australian Navy Stores Depot, Kingsford (NSW).\(^9\)

The use of the internet for both information giving as well as for interactive communication can cover the whole spectrum of participation. It, along with other recent communication systems and tools is discussed further in 4.2.6.

### 3.4 Summary of Chapter 3

The early years of the new Millennium show a furthering of the trend for local communities to become involved in the planning of PDL. This is the observation of collaborative pragmatists such as Patsy Healey (2005). However, the debate continues as to whether collaborative planning theory is the most productive and viable approach for underpinning planning decision making.

---

\(^8\) A building on the site of a major redevelopment on the city's south-side adjacent the Gorbals was given over to the community- 'The Blue Hut' (Glasgow City Council, C2008, p.18). It was used by the community to run its own meetings that resulted in keeping the developers in check from the residents' point of view.

\(^9\) This was found when the author visited the City of Randwick in 2003 on a tour of City of Maribyrnong officers of Defence Department PDL redevelopment in Sydney.
The English Government is committed to localism, to be implemented through the *Localism Act 2010*. However there are problems in its ideological commitment to local community empowerment, and it is too early to determine how ‘neighbourhood plans’ will be able to provide for PDL developments, particularly in the larger cities of England where communities of place are not well defined. *Neighbourhood Environment Improvement Plans* in Victoria that rely heavily on local community participation have proven to be unsuccessful and now over a decade has passed with no plans approved.

The movement towards engaging local communities has brought a range of participation tools that can be applied in PDL planning, design and development. Concomitantly many jurisdictions are now committed to providing local and wider communities and individuals a greater say in the preparation of plans. This has made it increasingly likely that there will be more evidence of whether or not the research question will be answered in the affirmative or negative and what nuances, exceptions and principles are associated with the question.

The next chapter will examine recent research about the extent to which the processes of participatory planning are being applied, more specifically to the planning and design of PDL in the 21st Century.
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Chapter 4 - PDL Redevelopment and the Community

This chapter reviews research and current practice regarding community involvement in PDL planning, design and development. It covers both the literature about PDL as well as the broader urban planning context, within which the question is situated. It first discusses how world governance policy affects community involvement in planning including for PDL and then the effect of local governance policy on community planning in Victoria. It also examines the tensions that have arisen in repressing or avoiding collaborative planning by governments and the likely outcomes on the planning and design of PDL.

The actual practice of planning in a collaborative mode is examined through the local example of ‘Honeysuckle Creek’ NSW and the broader examination of how planners have practiced in the face of New Public Management. This theme is continued when studies of European countries and the USA show the complexity of public participation and how it can be affected by a range of variables which include the composition of the communities, the extent to which the decision-maker has been open with a community, and the timing and nature of public participation.

Specialised tools for managing participation of PDL are discussed. Electronic communications are examined as one, but not the only, way to improve public involvement. ‘Outreach’ programs are examined, particularly for communities of lesser social and economic means.

Lastly, the role of community plans and integrated local area planning is discussed, using a local example, and how Victorian urban design policy may foster community collaboration.

4.1 Community involvement in city governance

The United Nations broad manifesto on urban governance is set out in the Global Campaign on Urban Governance (UN-Habitat 2002). It states that ‘Good’ urban governance is termed the ‘inclusive city’ (p.3). A key set of commitments are proposed which address the involvement of children; sustainable management of settlements; equal participation of men and women; eradicating poverty; decentralisation of decision making and resources through the principle of subsidiarity; generating a sense of citizenship; cooperation and:
“dialogue to create equal opportunity to participate in decision-making; and finally to promote transparent, responsible, accountable, just, effective and efficient governance.” (p. 18)

The Urban Governance campaign emphasises that creating opportunities for communities to participate in local issues is an international normative behaviour. The Campaign is influential, although not as binding as the EU Aarhus treaty (3.2.2), across urban and regional planning processes. The position for the forthcoming Habitat III (2016) is that ‘the most functional cities will be the ones that encapsulate the public realm and the people who utilize these places’ (See 4.3.4). This new emphasis on creation of the public realm makes the detailed design of PDL a very prominent issue for urban planning and urban design.

In Victoria, the Local Government Act was amended in the Local Government (Democratic Reform) Act 2003 to provide for four year Council plans. The plans include the Council’s strategic objectives, strategies to achieve them, indicators to monitor them and resources necessary to implement them. The Act acknowledges the central role played by local governments and gives them a clear and strong mandate to undertake broadly based local planning called ‘community plans’ that involve local communities in their preparation:

“This fitted neatly with the notion of ‘joined up government’ 10, building stronger communities and the need to drive innovation from the bottom, connecting top down and bottom up processes.” (West & Raysmith 2007, p.5).

This mandate provides the impetus for local communities to develop local plans through the auspices of their municipal council. More detail is given in 4.3.5 about the findings of community plan case studies researched by West and Raysmith and the complications that were seen in making these plans the vehicle for urban planning where significant change from the local norm is envisaged.

---

10 “Working collaboratively across departments, portfolios or levels of government to address complex issues which cross individual agency boundaries” (State Services Commission- Victoria 2007)
4.2 Participatory planning today

4.2.1 The effect of political positions on urban planning

John Lovering (2010) argues that a basic tenet of the planning of cities is to favour the disadvantaged and protect cultural minorities but the New Right (conservative governance that is skewed towards laissez-faire capitalism) dismisses such deliberation. In the pre-Global Financial Crisis (GFC), emphasis had been towards reinvestment in under-capitalised parts of cities. Lovering sets down what he thinks will be the future macro-economic situation for cities, and comes to the conclusion that neo-liberalism will persist, but any advantages there may be will decline because of reduced public expenditure and increased competition for a now lower, more unpredictable growth. This situation, he claims, will not aid in the development of cities being more equitable. In this context, the growth of cities will continue to be towards unbalanced renewal with private projects favouring visually appealing places:

“The mission of ‘planning’ has as a result of the neo-liberal turn, increasingly, come to be identified with urban design, to the detriment of more traditional modernist conceptions of planning. The ongoing effects of the recession [post GFC] seem likely to intensify this reorientation.” (pp.237-238)

This shift from state-holistic modernist planning to the narrower aims of developer-driven neo-liberal planning has produced many city-centre shopping centres and estates barely distinguishable from one another that are more impressive as profit opportunities than as urban developments (Ibid.p.240).

Lovering’s pessimistic scenario is of the further diminution of planning, becoming ‘less and less a public service and more and more an accessory to special interests’ (Ibid. pp.241-242) and will emphasise the power of market realism over deliberative democratic approaches of government which could control real estate development to produce more equitable results. It leads to the notion of whether governments have the energy to put in place processes to steer private development such as requiring a proportion of affordable housing, when public resources to provide these services are becoming more limited.

4.2.2 Testing Collaborative Planning Theory

McGuirk’s (2001) work in assessing Collaborative Planning Theory (CPT) for the redrafting of a Development Control Plan on a PDL site: the Newcastle NSW old port
area, ‘Honeysuckle Creek’ showed that CPT pays insufficient attention to the practical context of power within which planning is practiced, assuming away rather than engaging with politics and power laden interests. She found that the stakeholders, particularly resident association representatives and developer interests, brought their political arguments to the table and these were diametrically opposite each other. Thus there was little more than a re-expression of existing positions:

“It presented planners with the dilemma of democratically realigning a planning instrument while managing persistent demands for higher density development.”

(McGuirk, p.205)

The Department of Planning had threatened sanctions on the Council if it did not permit higher densities on government owned land. In the end, while the stakeholders were willing to debate the means through which they might pursue their interests, the process did not significantly transform the interests they held. McGuirk therefore attests that CPT fails to deal with the ‘situatedness’ of planning practice because it abstracts ‘doing’ planning from contextual understanding (Ibid. p.207).

The second issue that was uncovered in this case study is the complexity that planners face when trying to resolve competing interests. McGuirk found that, when such competition arises amongst interest groups, the planner is obliged to resolve these in a technological or accepted planning practice manner. In the case of the preparation of Honeysuckle Creek DCP she says:

“Undoubtedly genuine efforts were being made to encourage social collaboration, to build relationships and nurture deliberation. Nonetheless planners’ actions . . . were shaped by their position in a power/knowledge/rationality nexus broadly based on instrumental rationality and its faith in professional knowledge forms.” (Ibid.p.209)

McGuirk concludes that any theory of planning aiming to democratise planning practice must depart from an orientation towards consensus to account for the irreducible nature of power and difference (Ibid p.195). McGuirk’s work thus challenges the work of Healey (1997) and others who support ‘collaborative planning theory’ as the basic paradigm for planning (3.2.1).
4.2.3 The values of planners in NPM organisations

Tore Sager (2009) explored the tension produced because of the predilection of planners for Collaborative Planning Practice (CPP) against the drive towards New Public Management (NPM) by their organisations. After surveying the views of planners in several European countries and the United States, he concludes that the NPM approach that involves the public as clients to be controlled and manipulated by incentives, needs to be shifted to one where the public administrator is a ‘public servant’ to involved citizens. This shift has been coined the ‘New Public Service’:

“New Public Service suggests the direction in which public sector governance should move in order to ease tensions in the role of planners.” (pp.66-84)

His paper points out the difficulty planners may have in conducting collaborative planning practices within organisations which practise NPM. Sager also points out that CPP and NPM have strong orientations towards public involvement (albeit for different reasons), but both have the potential effect of weakening central principles relating to equity so that with greater localism of decision making implied with both practices ‘developers’ are likely to be beneficiaries rather than the general public through playing off one community and their politicians against others (Ibid. pp.74). This is another reason to move away from both CPP and NPM and provides a further cautionary note on localism as ‘neighbourhood plans’ (3.2.4).

4.2.4 Mandating participation in plan preparation

A study of USA practice in citizen participation in plan making showed that six of the ten States investigated had required local planners to pursue objectives in involving citizens (Brody et.al. 2003, p.247). However, only in three instances, such mandating was required at the beginning of the planning process where proposals were being scoped. Despite this fact they reported:

“Planners generally believe that public participation during the early stages of the process is the most effective way to incorporate community knowledge, interests and expertise into the final plan.” (Ibid. p.247)

The objectives of the jurisdictions were compared with Arnstein’s ladder of participation (3.3.1) and the researchers arrived at an average score of 3.8; that is to say, at a point between informing the public and consulting with it (but closer to consultation). This
suggested to the authors that, despite increasing rhetoric on citizen involvement in decision making, planners typically seek to maintain control of the planning process and do not strongly emphasise genuine citizen involvement in drafting specific policies (Ibid. p.250).

The research also showed that planners mostly engaged with four groups of: business, local government officials, development groups and local government departments. Then, in declining significance, came neighbourhood groups, media, environmental groups, special district representatives, affordable housing groups and property owners. Planners rarely targeted less mainstream stakeholders such as disadvantaged people, professionals and older people (Ibid. p. 152). Local governments serving wealthier constituencies as well as larger populations tended to expend more effort on engaging their communities. Those most likely to become engaged were long-term, owner residents (Ibid. p.256).

A conclusion to the case study indicates that while Washington State had a much stronger citizen mandate, it had no greater statistically discernible effort in terms of involving citizens in the planning process than Florida. The reason given is that Florida, with a much weaker citizen mandate, had a strong ‘coercive’ mandate on councils preparing their comprehensive plans on-time and to a consistent quality. In the early part of the century it used a plan appraisal and evaluation report approach where councils submitted these to the State:

“If structured properly to include detailed provisions, strong incentives, and a forceful regulatory stick for failure to comply, a mandate can indeed encourage communities to take creative and progressive action.” (Ibid, p.257)

In Ontario, Canada, Official Plans (OP) are required to be prepared by the local council with the public being given the right to attend one public meeting before adoption (Municipal Affairs & Housing, Ontario 2004). This is not to say that this is the only opportunity made available by planning authorities to communities and practice is different from the minimum requirement. In the case of ‘brownfield’ PDL developments, the Planning Act Ontario 2001 (Ontario Parliament 2001, S28) allows the creation of Community Improvement Plans (CIP). These provide for a comprehensive framework for brownfield rehabilitation that:

“Addresses property rehabilitation, brownfields cleanup and redevelopment programmes; provides for public consultation, which builds public support for
municipal rehabilitation projects; and permits planning and financial assistance programmes, involving lands, buildings, loans, grants and tax rates assistance with the approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.” (MA&H Ontario 2004, p.12)

While no specific processes for community engagement in the Act (other than the mandatory public meeting) have been set down, guidelines make it quite clear that the preparation of a CIP requires a process of open consultation and community information that should lead to consensus in the community and its major stakeholders. Ultimately, in the implementation and monitoring stages of a plan, the guidelines specifically advocate the need for ‘champions’ in the community to foster the plan and achieve its planned outcomes (MA&H Ontario 2008 p.20). Thus, whilst the law does not prescribe or mandate any citizen participation process, the sanction against not doing so is plan rejection by the Minister, a similar situation to the above reference to Florida.

4.2.5 Community involvement in spatial planning

The Advocacy, Participation and NGOs in Planning Project (APaNGO) conducted by the Town and Country Planning Association, UK, for the European Union in nine countries in North West Europe, tested methods and processes for involving people in planning. Its significance is in the analysis of a number of case studies, some being associated with PDL sites. It produced a collective view about various participation processes and recommended a means by which communities are to be informed and how the information from participatory exercises should be used. The recommendations are summarised as:

- Recognise the need to provide independent resources for participation in planning in all major development areas;
- Acknowledge communities’ views, which are generated in various ways in the participation services the responsible bodies support;
- Government bodies should better integrate community input in its different forms in their decision making;
- Maintain statutory rights for the most affected and legally recognise agreements with communities;
- Responsible authorities should set out what can and cannot be changed as a result of the dialogue of participation or involvement; and
- Decision-makers should consider evidence which best represents the variety of interests of current and future communities, including taking into account representations from specific interest groups with particular knowledge.
  (EU Interreg IIIB 2007, p.57-58)

The importance of APaNGO is both its spread, being over a number of countries, and its depth of consideration using a case study method. The results can be seen as a strong pointer to the ways planning authorities should perform in any local community participation processes. The TCPA Chief Executive, Gideon Amos observed:

“The report reveals that across North West Europe there is a clear gap between the possibilities viewed by community participation practitioners and writers and the reality on the ground. The research highlights that the strength of community participation in different countries depends largely on the strength of the community and voluntary sector itself rather than on the kind of planning system adopted.”
  (EU Interreg IIIB 2007, Foreword)

The findings of APaNGO are worthy of consideration in the planning environment of Australia.

4.2.6 Public participation through electronic communication

Almost all planning authorities use the internet as a means to communicate with ratepayers, and the public generally, about the effect of planning controls, received applications for development and so on. Also, there is a large amount of strategic planning data now available electronically, including expert reports leading up to the review of plans and amendment of development controls. This ease of accessibility to knowledge has provided a huge boost in providing information to anyone who cares or is able to browse a local municipal website and, in the case of Australia, centrally-provided data of State Planning Ministries.

Current research shows the valuable nature of the internet in communicating with the public and how it can serve as both a means of providing information as well as receiving public views. In his research into this topic, Goodspeed adopts a framework after Brody, Godschalk and Burby (2003) as follows:

- **Objective:** provide information as well as to listen to citizens; empower citizens by providing opportunities to influence planning decisions;
- **Timing:** involve the public early and continuously;
- **Target:** seek participation from a broad range of stakeholders;
- **Techniques:** use a number of techniques to give and receive information from citizens; in particular, provide opportunities for dialogue; and
- **Information:** provide more information in a clearly understood form, free of distortion and technical jargon” (Goodspeed 2008b, Offenbacker 2004, p.286).

This framework fits with collaborative planning practice described in Chapter 3 and is generally the way most government organisations present themselves through their web sites to the public. However, the framework also fits well with efficiency based New Public Management (NPM) objectives, but it is the way that websites are structured towards eliciting effective community comment on the background information provided that is critical to its usefulness in providing effective and reasoned feedback. It follows that website development needs to be considered as integral for any community engagement processes.

The broader implications of social media for engagement may be much more profound. *Prima facie*, citizens can organise and exchange ideas more efficiently. Nevertheless, Goodspeed in his initial work in a case study of the Austin (Texas, USA) plan gives a cautionary note about the effectiveness of the internet in the type of participants on online participation:

> “These very participants are unrepresentative of the broader city; they are older, better educated, English speaking, and have higher incomes. In order to prevent this from creating bias in the input into a plan, planners attempted to shunt [shift] input into conventional public meetings. As previous studies have shown, these approaches have their own limitations: time costs, record-keeping challenges, and language barriers.” (Goodspeed 2010, p. 28)

Thus the use of the internet both for information giving and comment receipt is very important today but it has its limitations that do not diminish the need for the use of other public participation modes which are likely to be very time consuming and therefore costly.

There are several good examples of using e-communications, including Waterfront Toronto’s website that has very well laid out programs and information about the past,
such as minutes, and about the present, such as forthcoming activities for its draft plans for comment. This is further discussed in 6.3.1.

4.3 Participation in PDL plans and designs

4.3.1 Engaging with affected communities

Open and effective participation in PDL redevelopment often demands a program that has been carefully designed with the affected community always in mind. An example of this is the Minneapolis St-Paul Corridor Development Initiative (CDI) which is a type of expanded charette process. Developers, urban designers and other professionals and members of the community engage in a program which is targeted at the planning and revitalisation of underutilised corridors through the ‘Twin Cities’. These are on and about disused rail lines that are assigned as growth areas by the Twin Cities Metropolitan Council (TCMC 2006 p.20-21). These corridors are ideal for Transit Oriented Developments (TOD). The Initiative is intended to involve communities, culminating in a design process for specific places that includes a great deal of technical and design advice including the costs of development. (Appendix 4.1) This makes the process realistic and valuable as community input has been informed with practical real world constraints and opportunities. Therefore, the final urban design prepared by development interests can be more in line with community input. Most importantly, this process greatly improves the capacity of the local community; firstly by citizens represented on a steering committee influencing community engagement processes; and secondly by the processes put in place for the design exercises. Thus there is less chance of unreasoned opposition to the finalised proposal from a less informed public (Forsyth et. al. 2010).

Visioning and managing PDL projects

The Northeast-Midwest Institute a coalition of 18 States, is the largest advocacy organisation for brownfield (PDL) revitalisation and development in the USA. It advocates the use of a visioning process involving the local community as a first step towards producing a collective understanding of how a neighbourhood, city, or town as a whole should look and function. Bartsch (2003) states that, if brownfield (PDL) project leaders prepare a community vision that affects brownfield sites, it means that developers and investors are more likely to participate in redevelopment partnerships. Visions also provide ‘cohesion and excitement about a brownfield project that can sustain the effort
through short-term changes in organisation, tactics and focus’ thus avoiding serendipitous change (p.2).

The key lessons drawn from the Institute’s wide ranging and long involvement with PDL redevelopment are listed as:

“Broaden stakeholder involvement to avoid old patterns of adverse political behaviour. Community involvement must include the stakeholders whose participation is needed to bring about change, and those who have a direct interest in the issues on the site;

Know the community and leadership at all levels, involving active recruitment of representatives and nurturing them to create a collaborative environment;

Make sure key interactions take place, that are critical to brownfield re-use efforts, leveraging resources, and shaping policies and practices affecting brownfield redevelopment. These interactions also bring about better community understanding of the re-use process and redevelopment opportunities.

Recognise staffing and resource requirements to maintain stakeholder involvement. This is usually underestimated. Appointment of a ‘point person’ [project manager] is often needed to coordinate the project.

Document milestones which can act as a tool to focus tasks, and when to publicise the project. As a project can extend for a long period the marking of milestones is a way to maintain ‘excitement and support’ from the stakeholders and community at large; and

Promote success. Applauding successes, even small ones, ‘helps build the image of trust and comfort in working together that can pay important dividends for future brownfield activity’.” (Ibid. p.12)

This intensely practical list shows the importance of collaborative work among all stakeholders including the affected community, developers and planners. It has practice application for PDL projects in Australia, and especially points to the way a project manager must have regard to: the image of a project to maintain momentum; resourcing a project from often multiple sources; and the recruitment and nurturing of leaders some of whom will be from the local community.
Gillman has investigated the way the Neighbourhood Initiatives Programme in Telford UK, is devised, to allow more people to visualise and therefore contribute to the planning of a PDL site. The ‘Planning for Real’ (PfR) concept is employed, which is a 3D model of a development site. A group discussion approach is taken using the model as a reference. PfR is taken to various places where the community, or sections of it, congregate such as school playgrounds and supermarkets, thus the program has a positive outreach to potentially affected people. Wilkinson, an organiser says about empowerment of people:

“To empower a community you must get involved as early as possible with a clear, open and honest message about why it is being engaged. Real local involvement generates greater social cohesion, democracy and better services. . . . It will help to make communities vibrant again.” (Gillman 2006, p.13)

This is possibly a statement of belief which contrasts strongly with what has been found to actually happen when projects are conducted (as discussed in 4.2.5). There are also a number of practical challenges as now discussed.

**Practical challenges for public participation outcomes**

The challenges for public engagement in planning in Australia have been concisely laid down by Marshall, Steinmetz and Zehner in Thompson and Maginn (2012). They are:

- “Dealing with ‘unequal pluralism’;
- Evaluating public involvement and measuring involvement outcomes;
- Balancing local community and expert output;
- Using state powers on ‘significant projects’ over the need to consult local communities;
- Dealing with ‘overload’ on the part of government processes, private industry proponents, the demands put on the public, and data overload generated within individual processes;
- Valuing electronic technologies and their place in engagement processes.” (p.285)

The obvious complexity for ‘balanced’ local community engagement is shown in this list, particularly the difficulty of dealing with powerful groups, state government overrides and in the measurement of public involvement outcomes. These practical issues make a planner’s role in producing an acceptable outcome using collaborative planning
approaches quite daunting and points to the need for planning offices to have, or be enabled to deploy, a number of community engagement skills.

4.3.2 Community participation in PDL planning

Beierie with Konisky (2000) succinctly lay down the attributes of a successful participation process after researching community participation for environmental plans in the Great Lakes Region of the USA. They see them as: the quality of the deliberative process; the quality of the communication with government; commitment of the lead agency; and the degree to which jurisdiction over the process is shared (p.560).

Later Beierie and Cayford (2002) analysed 239 case studies dealing with public participation in planning and environmental issues many being on PDL concluding that:

“Involving the public not only frequently produces decisions that are responsive to public values and substantially robust, but it also helps to resolve conflict, build trust and educate and inform the public about the environment.” (p.74)

A key factor in the success of projects is seen to be giving participants a degree of control over the process even in the most challenging and contested contexts (Ibid. p.74).

The work of Laurian (2004), on the public participation in the cleanup of US superfund brownfield sites (PDL), showed that the participation of local residents near the sites was dependent on a number of factors but that higher income and long term residents were more likely to participate. Also, participation was recorded through less informal devices such as community group meetings and petitions rather than public meetings (80% of all people interviewed had not heard about the public meetings). Less participation was recorded where people had greater trust in public bodies doing the cleanup. Her findings include: public agencies must find ways to publicize meetings more effectively; planners should reconsider their understanding of public participation in order to broaden its scope; reaching out to low-income segments of the population will likely lead to their empowerment and help them overcome feelings of resignation; and lastly government agencies need to foster trust while emphasising and encouraging participation (p.61). This work has importance for application to the planning of PDL sites but particularly where site decontamination is likely.
Offenbacker further elucidates on how public participation in brownfield (PDL) planning should take place. His contributing factors in public participation engagement design are:

- “Defining the stakeholders
- History of the site and its relationship to the stakeholders
- Communication styles of the stakeholders
- Languages spoken
- Meeting location to be safe and neutral to the stakeholders
- Meeting times having regard to working, commuting and childcare
- Meeting Structure appropriate to each stage of the process
- The timeline to be expressed for both planning and public participation
- Technical Knowledge. Familiarity by stakeholders and availability of experts to explain it.
- Information consumption habits of the stakeholders including what media and community organisations are used and literacy levels.” (2004, p.287)

In Seattle, Washington State USA, much of the site clean-up work is done by Community Development Corporations (CDC) as a prelude to redevelopment. Spiess (2008) found that residents did not have deep concerns about the level of environmental cleanup but were much more concerned about the type of development being proposed by the CDC. The reason for this was the high level of trust in CDCs that the cleanup would be carried out effectively but that CDCs, by having to work with clients and developers, could not represent local people with respect to their concerns such as loss of affordable housing and the density of proposed development. This raises two points: first that the decontamination of land is not an issue with residents if a trusted body is carrying out the remediation works (as Laurian also noted) and, second, that the community may not be adequately represented by a community-based organisation which has to deal with commercial interests.

The Clinton Administration in the United States organised Empowerment Zone (EZ) legislation in 1994, aiming at the revitalisation of the poorest urban and rural areas of the country. Whilst initially considered a success for open community participation through Community Based Organisations (CBOs), the program was eventually seen as a failure as it neither improved the welfare of EZ residents nor involved them as much as was originally intended. Gittell (2001) describes the failed model which saw limited funds for
poor communities funnelled to traditional city elites for short-term programs designed by outside planners. These programs disregarded strategies that would enable poor communities to restructure themselves. These findings echo Arnstein’s work (2.1.4) when investigating the Model Cities Program over 30 years earlier.

Bailey (2010) in his research into community empowerment using the Stockwell Partnership’s, Urban II Project (England) analysed the extent of empowerment given to the local community. He develops his thesis using the five core objectives of:

1. “To provide information and enable people to express opinions about policies which will affect them;
2. To improve the quality of local decision-making by drawing on tacit knowledge;
3. To improve the quality and responsiveness of local services by engaging users in management decisions;
4. To re-engage local people with local democratic processes and renew civic society; and
5. To transfer to residents and recipients direct or indirect powers to manage assets or deliver services for themselves.” (pp.2-3)

Despite this very conclusive list of engagement objectives, Bailey deduces that community power is always likely to be partial and contingent on local circumstances and the wider context (Ibid. p.1). While these objectives cover the broader field of urban regeneration, these often overlapping objectives are suitable to enable communities to participate better in the planning and development of PDL and are therefore relevant to this research.

The US and UK experiences in empowering communities in broad regeneration/revitalisation schemes shows this to be a complex subject unlikely to achieve all goals of local communities. The evidence for Australia with respect to community plans as discussed below appears to be similar.

4.3.3 Community Plans and Urban Design in Victoria

Community planning in Victoria

Community plans in Victoria were briefly discussed in the context of a continuing move towards localism and greater community involvement in plans (3.2.3-3.2.5). A study by
West and Raysmith (2007) for the Victorian Department of Planning and Community Development undertook seven case studies of community plans. The findings were that community plans had been valuable but there were a large number of issues and variables associated with them. These, within the scope of this research, are summarised as:

- "The level of community participation varies with the size of the community ranging from the ‘Township Plan’ (500-3000 persons), to a whole of municipality or region (12,000-144,000). The larger the population the less direct is community participation. Conversely, the amount of evidence-based information used reduces as the size of the community becomes smaller so that it was usually non-existent at the township scale;

- There were real problems in converting the first stage of planning when a visioning process was carried out to the next stage of implementation. Then the use of the community plan for preparing the council corporate plan became a challenge and a potential source of dispute as fiscal planning and other external imperatives had to be factored in. This meant changes or delays to the original plan that led to disaffection of local communities;

- An equally big challenge was using the outputs of a community plan. This was particularly difficult for town planning when it was reported: ‘Community planning did not sit well with land use planners. It was more problematic in fringe municipalities and other growth areas where the needs of the newly arrived and yet to arrive residents might be very different from existing residents wanting to hold on to the past; their vision for the future might be what used to be and to hold back growth.’ (p.33) Councils needed to take into account the ‘top down’ policy of state government and its departments as well as the ‘bottom up’ policy of community plans. This also proved difficult to integrate into the council corporate plan;

- Only at the ‘township’ planning level was the extent of community engagement seen as ‘consult to empowerment, collaboration’. At all other larger areas, community engagement was defined as ‘inform, consult with a desire to move more into collaboration at the implementation phase’." (p.19)

One of the main reasons why ‘community plans’ have been found to be hard to implement is their emphasis on a broad vision which does not seek to place values on each part of the vision and so when this is required at the second, implementing stage, what West and Raysmith call ‘bringing it all together’, it becomes a massive task and, as
listed above, the outputs and their timing may not be in line with the aspirations of local communities. As planning a PDL will inevitably require value judgements to be made on such things as heritage protection, housing type and density and traffic increase it is hard to see that local community planning for a small area with a small population as investigated in 2007 is an effective vehicle for involvement in planning PDLs.

An example of municipal-wide community planning is the *Port Phillip Plan 2007-2017* where a close examination shows that the only definitive land use input is the community’s tenet that car parking for new development is to be totally provided on-site. On the other hand, the plan promotes affordable housing which creates the paradox of waiving the provision of car spaces to reduce building costs. All other policies would require further assessment of their relative importance to allow translation into land use planning terms. This complexity is partially recognised by the disclaimer:

“The Community Plan does not replace council’s normal strategic planning or the decision making role of democratically elected Councillors. However the Community Plan does play a pivotal role in influencing Council’s decision making, planning and allocation of resources.” (2007 p.6)

**Integrated Local Area Planning**

*Integrated Local Area Planning* (ILAP) is related to community planning as it seeks to involve local communities in its deliberations. It has been used to good effect where the aim is to integrate council roles and actions with State Government infrastructure responsibilities and the interests of the private sector such as in education services. An ILAP model was utilised and evaluated by the Department of Victorian Communities (DVC) in 2005 for the new greenfield development of Caroline Springs. Planned for 24,000 people, the estate is located some 15 kilometres west of the case study sites in Melbourne’s Western Region. A partnership was formed between the Shire of Melton, Delfin Lend Lease (the developer) and the Department of Victorian Communities (DVC) that trialled a new way of planning and delivering infrastructure and services in the new estate. This model employed a ‘broker’ (titled Director) whose role was to build and mediate relationships between the partners and set up and run planning working groups which focussed on community assets, and education and health infrastructure. One of the working groups was a community organisation, the *Caroline Springs Community* 11

---

11 This issue was raised in the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT) 2010a, *Australian Affordable Housing Association Inc. v Maribyrnong City Council*, VCAT 302. It is reported in 7.3.3.
**Development Association** (composed of business and resident groups). See Appendix 4.2 for the ILAP structure. A main outcome of the working groups was to facilitate the funding and management of joint facilities thus reducing overall costs of development and service delivery:

“While it is likely that many of the resources created by the partnership would have been delivered anyway, all partners felt the model had meant services and facilities were delivered faster than in any other large-scale developments. They felt this was because the partnership expedited decision-making, minimised duplication of effort, was better able to locate additional funding sources, made speedier application for funds and was able to pressure organisations to keep deadlines.” (Pope 2007, p.19)

The Caroline Springs ILAP initiative is different from a pure bottom up process as seems to be the case with community plans for smaller settlements as described by West and Raysmith above and as depicted by Bishop for Localism in England (3.2.4). Although there was community representation on the Caroline Springs Community Development Association, in other working groups there were NGOs, *ad hoc* authorities and government departments represented as well as the partners. But the main effort was to make the delivery of local and government services more effective. In this respect this ILAP project did not increase local empowerment, but rather it fostered open processes of communication with, and capacity building of, the evolving local community.

The ILAP model as applied at Caroline Springs has potential application for all large PDL developments including the planning and development of the undeveloped case study, the Defence Site, Maribyrnong:

“The partners felt the lessons they have learned provide a framework for success in other sites, not only in new developments, but in other place-based initiatives such as urban renewal sites. They felt, however, that the detail has to be localised to meet local needs.” (Ibid. p.20)

ILAP, or similar coordination functions of government is not new and was introduced at a state level with the short lived Victorian *State Planning Council* of the 1970s. But what is relatively new is the emphasis given to coordination at a local level which attempts to achieve a synthesis of ‘bottom-up’ localised policy with ‘top down’ centralised policy. Its relevance to the proper planning of large PDL sites is clear because many large PDL will require the funding and delivery of state and local government facilities such as schools.
and libraries. In the context of Victoria, it is appropriate for local governments to take the
initiative for this work, although with large area proposals state ad hoc agencies such as
the Places Victoria may also be a partner. If land is owned by the developer, the
developer will also be a partner, such as at Caroline Springs.

**Community involvement in urban design**

The Department of Planning and Community Development guidelines on urban design,
*What is Urban Design*, state that organisations and individuals can focus on
various approaches to suit their purposes and capabilities. The objectives which involve
the community are:

- “Raise awareness among the public, the development industry and at all levels of
government, and promote attitudes likely to result in good urban design;
- Develop public-private partnerships with developers, professional associations and
community groups;
- Consultation to represent everyone’s interests. Maintain dialogue with interest groups
and undertake stakeholder and community consultation; and
- Invite public comment and debate of plans and designs.” (DPCD 2012)

These objectives, if applied to PDL projects, will improve the capacity for the local
community to become involved and to understand the urban design issues of the
particular project. This policy is only a guideline and therefore cannot be construed as
being a requirement of every urban design exercise, but it does provide benchmarks to be
attained, especially in significant PDL developments that will affect the surrounding
community.

**Place making and its future importance to Victoria**

Place making, is an overlapping discipline with urban design which has gained recent
prominence at a global level through UN Habitat III to be held in 2016. Habitat III has
been preceded by the first of three major conferences held in Stockholm in June 2013. Its
main theme is explained here:

“The world has a choice. Cities can continue to grow chaotically without regard to
human social needs and environmental consequences or we can embrace a
sustainable and equitable process which builds community, enhances quality of life,
and creates safe and prosperous neighborhoods. We are convinced that in the future,
the most functional cities will be the ones that encapsulate the public realm and the people who utilize these places [sic: provide a good public realm for their people to use]. This is a people centered vision for cities – one that enables a transformative shift in the traditional planning and management of cities, a shift that benefits everyone, specifically those at the bottom of the economic ladder.” (UN Habitat 2013)

The conferences will provide for a special emphasis on public space and place making with the object of creating a Charter on Public Space which will influence the three year development of The Declaration on Future Places which will find its way into the final document for Habitat III. The significance of Habitat III is its emphasis on making places out of urban space. It has significant consequences for the development of PDL as the strong implication is that communities will be actively engaged in place making of new developments.

4.4 A Summary of Literature Findings: Chapters 2 to 4

Planning for the first part of the 20th Century shows much influence on the City Beautiful Movement in Canada, Australia and the USA. In the UK there were the first ineffectual attempts to ensure that those affected by prepared plans could be heard during the plan preparation process. Generally the public was only given a chance to react to prepared plans till the late 1960s. In the USA, there was more scope for members of the community to be involved in the preparation of plans due to constitutional arrangements and cultural preferences (e.g. the New England Town Council model) and advocacy by government to set up planning commissions. Australia generally followed the UK planning processes leaving individuals and stakeholder groups to react to prepared plans.

The ‘high modernism’ turn in planning saw the large cities of the English speaking western world embrace urban redevelopment. This period of the architect/planner produced much urban fabric in inner areas of cities that became despised by the local communities and was often unsuitable for those needy of accommodation. Alongside this issue was the development and planning of urban freeways that had, or threatened to remove, large parts of inner urban areas. A strong resident reaction set in which produced the first changes to the way planning was conducted relative to the involvement of local communities in the processes of urban planning. People began to have a say in the
preparation of plans. Concomitant to the reaction to planning proposals was a gradual awareness of the environmental impact that urban development was having on the environment. First, heritage protection became a prominent issue and then the impact of industrial production and pollution became key issues resulting in changes to development approvals through the control of emissions and the preparation of plans having regard to a proposal’s impact on the environment. Rational planning processes became the mode of preparing plans which opened up greater possibilities for local communities and other stakeholders to participate in defined stages of the planning process.

The deindustrialisation of cities had a major effect on their fabric with much wasteland created. Called Previously Developed Land (PDL) or ‘brownfields’ and ‘greyfields’, these places were often in advantageous positions close to city centres that were now being favoured for the bourgeoning service industries. The redevelopment of PDL became a partial substitute for ‘greenfield’ or outwards expansion (often called sprawl). But it was in the redevelopment of PDL that a form of autocratic modernism began to be practiced by conservative governments. This generally excluded community engagement and the ability to improve the lot of existing residents. Examples of this can be seen in England during the 1980s and later in Victoria in the 1990s.

At the turn of the 21st Century, planning theorists began to consider how all stakeholders could be better involved in plan preparation. Collaboration was seen by some to hold the key to achieving transformative behaviour that would lead to consensus or clarification of values held by stakeholders. Collaborative Planning Theory (CPT) was not embraced by some theorists and it is still a contested theory today. However, much has already been achieved to improve the capacity of communities to become involved in planning their local area. For example, the Blair Government in England clarified the public interest in preparing plans and considering proposed developments. Also in England, the concept of a local community planning its own destiny has been recently introduced through the Localism Act 2010 and in Victoria there is a localised version of collaborative environmental planning called the Neighbourhood Environmental Improvement Plan (NEIP). Whilst the effect of the Localism Act is still unknown, although there is scepticism about it, the NEIP system introduced in 2002 appears to be a failure.
Understanding the involvement of local communities and their level of empowerment was concisely illuminated by Arnstein in 1969 during the environmental turn in planning. This was later formalised in the IAP2 spectrum of participation that has been adopted by many organisations including the Victorian Government. There are now many clearly defined community engagement tools available but, in terms of providing community empowerment, they are limited by the ability for a planning body to delegate and other factors such as the nature of government policy.

This chapter has considered the practice of planning for PDL and the research that has been conducted in the 21st Century. Some of the key observations are:

- The rights of communities to be included in and engaged with the planning of their area is implicit, as expressed at both a world and local scale;
- The outcomes of planning are less predictable in a largely private economy and hence there is a need for gumption from governments to require development proposals to produce more equitable results for the less privileged and the general public;
- Where stakeholders’ views are opposite and formalised there is little likelihood of a collaborative consensus being reached;
- There are internal contradictions between planners’ beliefs about inclusion of the public in planning and NPM. Beliefs of planners are also contradicted by their practice which is to elevate their involvement with developers above that with the local community;
- Not all communities or individuals are equipped to become involved in the planning of the community. Older, richer and longer settled people are more able to become involved and therefore more outreach is required in places where the population is more mobile or has a lower socio-economic standing;
- Community involvement is also affected by the relationship of community organisations with constituents and the level of trust engendered;
- The issue of who is the local community is difficult to resolve and, in Victoria, the community plan when conducted in a small area, which is likely to be the case for PDL proposals, a community ‘bottom up’ plan is not likely to be appropriate. This may be resolved by the use of an ILAP model where both the immediate local community and other representatives from the wider community up to the scale of State Government are involved in an inclusive and transparent manner. This is the so
called model of ‘joined up’ planning that is more compatible with collaborative planning practice.

- Place making will be a highlight of Habitat III ensuring it will be a central concept for the next decade for PDL planning and design.

4.5 Implication of the literature on the research question.

The research question is: *How does the involvement of the local community affect the planning, design and development of Previously Developed Land?* The literature survey has not uncovered any specific answers or discussion about the research question, making it most suitable for research. However some direction can be taken from the literature. It raises several issues:

1. Intensive involvement of the affected community leads to community satisfaction (and potentially to actual physical improvement);
2. External political and economic circumstances negating or repressing community response thus reducing or increasing community impact;
3. The importance of the stage at which community becomes engaged in the PDL planning process
4. The importance of the methods of engaging the community in PDL plans; and
5. Aspects of the planning, design and development process in which the community are critical participants and most interested.

These are returned to in Chapter 10: Findings.

The next Chapter sets down the methodology for conducting and analysing the case studies in Melbourne, Australia, and subsidiary case histories carried out in the USA, UK and Canada. These case studies and histories cover the next five chapters, until in Chapter 10 they are synthesised with this literature review to establish the findings for the research question.
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Chapter 5 - Research Method

5.1 Research Design

The rationale for the research question is given in Chapter 1. In brief, the redevelopment of PDL is sufficiently distinctive to warrant independent research from ‘greenfield’ urban developments because it is often:

1. in close proximity to existing communities;
2. close to or possesses existing infrastructure;
3. close to major centres and employment;
4. of heritage or natural value; and/or
5. situated in places which could satisfy existing local or regional needs.

Characteristics 1, 4 and 5 imply that existing local communities would have a significant interest in the planning, design and development of PDL while government (representing the wider community of Melbourne and Victoria) would be interested because of points 2-5. So the question evolved to be:

How does the involvement of the local community affect the planning, design and development of Previously Developed Land?

There is much literature about PDL site development as well as for public participation in planning generally. However, early scoping of the literature showed that, there appeared to be little specific research centred on this research question. To maximise the ability to answer the question a mixed methods approach was adopted through:

- obtaining information from literature pertinent to the question;
- investigating comparable international examples of PDL developments; and
- researching, in depth, four case studies of PDL in the Maribyrnong River Valley. The case studies were to be investigated through reading available literature, physical urban design analysis and lastly, and most importantly, participant analysis.

In effect triangulation techniques were used.

Chapters 2-4 have discussed the pertinent literature, set first in an historic narrative, then as recent planning practice, as regards available participation tools, and finally current
research and practice into PDL planning and design. This methodology chapter sets down how the research was conducted and the data collected, analysed and synthesised.

5.2 The case studies

5.2.1 Choice of the case study method

As to a case study approach, Yin (2009) proposes five defined research methods applicable to a research question: experiment, survey, archival analysis, history and case study. He defines a case study as:

“... an empirical enquiry that:
- Investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real life context, especially when
- The boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.” (p.18).

A case study approach was chosen as one critical aspect of this research because it is trying to answer what can be described as a ‘how’ question (Yin 2009 p.8). There are no specific case studies for Australia or elsewhere in the literature that relates to the research question and therefore to answer the research question demands a case study approach.

5.2.2 Case studies selection process

The Maribyrnong River Valley in Melbourne was chosen when a search for PDL in Melbourne showed that of the thirteen stages of PDL development, half of the types of PDL redevelopment in Melbourne were either specifically located in the Valley or associated with it. This description of the planning and development of PDL in Melbourne is provided in Appendix 2.1. From this research it can claimed that no other part of Melbourne has this variety and concentration of sites as also shown in Melbourne’s Urban Development Program (DPCD 2009b). The rest of Australia was also scoped for possible sites as shown in Appendix 5.1. It was necessary to confine consideration of these other sites to brief enquiry with the possibility of investigating them later in the research when considering if the case studies’ findings would apply to other parts of Australia.

The Maribyrnong River Valley, within the urbanised part of Melbourne, has an area of about 100 square kilometres most of which lies within two kilometres of the river’s banks. In its course through the urban area it has only one major tributary in Steele Creek.
To simplify the search for appropriate case study sites, the top end of Steele Creek more than 2 kilometres distant from the river was excluded from the search leaving a search area of 80 square kilometres.

To select candidate PDL sites for research, the Valley was physically surveyed and historic and current information gathered from maps and literature, including the Urban Development Program for Melbourne and Geelong (DPCD 2009b). Very small sites such as replacement of a single industry on a site less than 0.5 hectare were excluded from the search as these were regarded as minor infill and unlikely to require a design with a public domain or have an effect beyond the street where they were located. The search included sites that had been redeveloped since 1945, are being developed or proposed to be developed or have a potential for being redeveloped.

The site identification criteria were:

1. The site should be large enough to have had or could have had a real possibility of creating a new community as well as affecting existing communities;
2. Site contamination and remediation should have been, or should be, a consideration in the release of the land for the intended purposes;
3. Planning processes would have enabled, or could enable, people to participate in the planning or development of the site, albeit sometimes within formalised processes that enabled only objection or submissions rather than involvement in preparing a plan;
4. The site was, or is, in Government ownership or control which would add to the possibility of involving local communities in the early processes of planning.

In all, 49 sites were found to be Previously Developed Land within the Valley and these included a range of uses including industry, commercial uses and housing estates that could be, are being, or have been redeveloped.

Each site was ranked where each criterion above was scored 1 (Not at all suited) to 5 (Very suited) then divided by 4 for an average. Four sites were found to have a score of four and a half or greater and these were duly selected for this research as follows: Edgewater (the former Ammunition Factory Maribyrnong); the proposed estate on the Defence Site Maribyrnong (the former Explosives Factory Maribyrnong); Lynch’s
Bridge-Kensington Banks (the former City of Melbourne’s saleyards and abattoirs and a Defence Department ordnance depot); and Waterford Green (the former Ordnance Factory Maribyrnong). The case study sites are described in more detail in Chapter 7. A list of all PDL sites in the Maribyrnong River Valley and their assessment scores is attached as Appendix 5.2.

5.2.3 Selection of International case histories

There are a vast range and number of PDL sites in the world, particularly in Europe and North America, where economic and cultural conditions have generated deindustrialisation and disurbanisation. It would be an enormous task to even log all the examples of PDL redevelopment in the world, and this was not attempted. Instead, the method was to investigate several places which had a degree of similarity to the context of the case studies or which, because of their standing as exemplars of local involvement in planning and design could be used to answer the research question in combination with the Australian case studies. The search for sites was limited to the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States for reasons relating to cultural and language compatibility.

The search for comparable PDL development started with seeking advice from a range of individuals in Australia who had been involved with PDL site planning and also by finding contact people referred to in the literature, both primary sources and secondary peer-reviewed sources. Some cities were selected and then further reading and personal contact made with significant people in these cities. In the case of the United States, arrangements hinged about the American Planning Association’s annual congress which, in 2009 was held in Minneapolis-St Paul, where one of the themes was ‘brownfields’ which PDL encompasses. In 2009, visits were made to London, Manchester, Glasgow, Toronto, and Minneapolis-St Paul having arranged discussions with key people beforehand.

A monograph for each of the cities visited which discussed the investigated PDL projects was prepared. It described the pertinent political, environmental and cultural arrangements for each city, and the nature of the planning for each selected PDL project. This resulted in determining the usefulness of PDL community involvement processes for answering the research question and is reported in Chapter 6.
During September and October 2010, more detailed research was carried out after culling the number of previous overseas research sites. More key people involved in the planning and design of the specific PDL sites were interviewed. Data collection for the international examples tended to be skewed towards planners because the investigation was mainly on planning process, however evidence was adduced for some sites from residents and developers. One additional monograph was prepared for a PDL site in Vancouver BC, not visited in 2009. A list of the international research sites, the reasons for their inclusion and the method of obtaining data, is shown in Appendix 6.1. In all, 23 international interviews were conducted (66,000 words for 13 taped interviews were transcribed) and a conference workshop on a PDL venture was attended (April 2009).

5.3 Selecting and interviewing the case study participants

Four groups of participants in PDL planning, design and development were identified through establishing that the main ‘communities’ were:

1. Residents who lived on the site or in the neighbourhood when the plan to develop a PDL was announced. (the Community of Place at the time)
2. Residents who now live on redeveloped PDL. (the Community of Place at the time of researching the question)
3. The planners and urban designers who were involved with or knew about the planning and development of each site. (a Community of Practice)
4. The developers of each site. (another Community of Practice).

While there are potentially other communities or individuals who have been recognised, such as historians and politicians, reading and initial discussion showed that the above four groups were seen to cover most people who had an interest in and information about the research question.

The participants were selected by using a non-probability snowball sampling method (chain referral sampling). This involved contacting potential participants for interview, who were people who had been read about or recommended by others. International participants were contacted predominantly, in the first instance, through letter or e-mail.

People in the four stakeholder groups were selected, covering each of the four case studies in the Maribyrnong River Valley. Interviews were organised by telephone.
preceded by a brief letter explaining the purpose of the interview, the nature of the research and the rights of the interviewee as required by conditions of RMIT University’s ethics approval. An addressed pre-paid envelope was supplied to each potential participant, allowing them to return the declaration which sought the use of audio-taping. There were only two failures to respond to the declaration and these individuals were therefore not interviewed although one mailed some useful published information.

Interviews for the Maribyrnong River Valley case studies were undertaken, generally over the period February to July 2010 with 25 face to face interviews. In addition, there were, in total, twelve telephone interviews. One face to face interview and one record of a public meeting were written as memorandums. Some email correspondence was received, largely as a follow up to transcribed interviews which resulted in some transcript modification.

The Table below shows the spread of participants who could comment on each case study. This meant that, on average, respondents were able to comment in depth about two of the case studies. Whilst the responses for each estate were limited in numbers, the research was qualitative relying on ‘in depth’ interviewing to establish the findings. Some of the participants were in two of the groups.

Table 5.1- Distribution of Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Type of participant</th>
<th>Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks</th>
<th>Edgewater</th>
<th>Waterford Green</th>
<th>Defence Site Maribyrnong</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner/Urban Designer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner/developers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of suburb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of suburb/planner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents in estate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Participants have been counted more than once when major material has been provided for two or more estates. Unclassified above were records for 2 urban designers, and 2 planners who provided a general overview of the case studies area. * Maribyrnong Defence Site has not been developed and therefore there are no residents on-site or persons in the development industry who could provide useful comment.
Interviews were generally held to elucidate:

- The participant’s knowledge about the strategic planning aspects of the case study estate at the time of it first being planned;
- The extent to which the participant was involved with or understood the plans for the case study estate, including contamination and remediation of land and their understanding of community involvement in their planning, design and development;
- Knowledge of the statutory planning issues for the land (including Planning Scheme amendments and approvals);
- The view of the participant about the urban design of the case study estate as it has been developed;
- What could have been done better relating to the planning, design and development of each case study?

A set of questions was distributed to the participant and served as a guide to the interview. These are attached as Appendix 5.3. The line of questioning rarely followed the set questions as there was much variability in a participant’s ability to respond to some questions either because of their lack of knowledge or interest. More particularly, it was appropriate to follow up with questions that supplemented an initial response, and thus a dialogue was entered into between the participant and interviewer, which tapped the interest of the respondent, and provided a smooth passage of discussion whilst still covering the questions able to be responded to. This type of discourse with participants is described by Holstein and Gubrium (1997) in the recognition that the output of the research is dependent on a collaborative effort between the interviewer and the participant:

“Meaning is not elicited merely by apt questioning, nor simply transported through respondent replies; it is actively and communicatively assembled in the interview encounter. Respondents are not so much repositories of knowledge- treasures of information awaiting excavation, so to speak- as they are constructors of knowledge in collaboration with the interviewers.” (p. 114).

The questions in the interview, while often basic to determine the respondent’s level of interest and of extent their knowledge of the points above, were primarily directed towards determining an understanding of what was the nature and scope of community
involvement in the planning, design and development of the estates and whether the respondent thought the result was adequate. This gave a rich insight into the research question.

Each recorded interview was transcribed. Where there was extraneous information collected it was not fully transcribed but a note was made of it as a means of data reduction. On the occasion when the audio taped answers of the respondent were indistinct, a note was made about its remembered meaning. The audio records were retained for further examination. At times, the mood and physical expressions of the respondent were noted as a means of interpreting the significance of statements made by them. Other notes were made about the environment where the interview took place and any peculiarities of the interview which would help in future referencing of the discourse. Some draft transcriptions were posted to interviewees for additions or editing, if it was considered that some more data could be obtained and if confidentiality was assured. A full list of those interviewed, contacted or who corresponded is attached as Appendix A.

5.4 Case study data collection

Data were collected through, statistical data analysis, and urban design survey, and participant surveys.

Statistical data for case study sites

Some statistical data were derived from the 2006 Australian Census. Data were collected at suburb level for a brief overview of the people in the Valley and are presented in Appendix 7.1. Small area [Census Collection District (CCD)] data were collected for the case studies and their surrounds and shown in Appendixes 7.2-5. Notes relating to the CCDs and suburbs were made, noting boundary anomalies with case study sites or land use effects to ensure the validity of the data for each estate and its surrounds. Data were collected to provide general information about a site and its surrounds’ broad social and environmental characteristics. The rest of the research centred on the use of qualitative methods.

Urban design survey

A field survey, using urban design techniques of recording space and place was conducted. The purpose of the work was to verify (or otherwise) the opinions given by interview participants, on how places and spaces were functioning. The analysis relates
only to the three developed/developing estates, as the Defence Site Maribyrnong has not yet been planned, designed or in any way redeveloped.

The survey was carried out using notes, photography and mapping using Geographic Information Systems (GPS) from Google Earth and Land Victoria. Recognised concepts and survey methods of urban designers including Lynch (1960), Bentley et al. (1985) and Watson et al. (2003), and for Australia, McMahon (in Thompson and Maginn 2012) were adapted to analyse the case study estates. The adaptation ensured that the finally selected characteristics were rigorous having regard to the purpose of answering the research question. The urban design analysis has been carried out in two ways: a Visual Form Analysis after Lynch; and a tabular analysis that relies on the specific characteristics derived from other urban design methods.

The Visual Form Analysis was conducted using a planimetric approach that plotted key elements and pathways which characterise places. These include Paths, Edges, Districts and Nodes.

The broader Urban Design Analysis was a description of each estate that provided a comparative analysis through first a table and then a discursive response. There appears to be no internationally defined set of characteristics although there is some similarity in the above authors. The characteristics selected for analysis were Place- its integration with the surrounding area, Place- its internal integration, Permeability (Connectivity within the estate); Legibility (including character and landmarks); Access to buildings (location of fronts and backs); Variety (adaptation of buildings and places and careful attention to detail); Spaces for unstructured and active pursuits (recreational use of the public realm); and Activity centres (gathering and meeting in central spaces).

The Visual form Analysis and the Urban Design Analysis used in combination give a good appreciation of the existing redeveloped estates. They are, by the nature of Urban Design practice, subjective as different individuals will put alternative values on different aspects of the designs. Nevertheless they are reasonably exhaustive in their coverage. The urban design survey analysis is reported in Chapter 8.
5.5 Analysing the Participant data

The data were compiled into one volume to provide ready access through read or electronic means. In all, 260,000 words were recorded or obtained from memoranda and transcriptions of which over 190,000 referred to the case studies in Melbourne. Ninety per cent of the words in the interviews were responses from the interviewees. The interrogation of the data proceeded in five steps:

D Step 1- Word search

The data (both international case histories and case studies) were first searched for key words that were synonymous or associated with a word of the research question and these were bundled into six groups: community involvement; participatory tools; planning; development approval; urban design; and development. Appendix 5.4 provides more detail about how the word search was carried out. The frequency of the key words was tabulated to ascertain if there were any specific patterns which could be derived from this. This allowed a superficial review of all the collected data and was used as a guide to locating text in the transcriptions in Step 2.

Step 2- Key passage selection

The next task was to read the whole text through and make comments about what were perceived to be key passages which could be utilised in answering the research question. This served to reduce the data. Initial notes on potential questions to interrogate the data were formulated and pasted against selected passages.

Step 3- Coding data (developing themes)

The coding of all the data was then made using the questions in Appendix 5.3 as a broad template and using knowledge gained from the key passages that the interview data revealed. This produced a set of themes that would eventually form the basis for discussing relatively discrete aspects of the research.

Step 4- Selection of key passages for discussion

This step was the selection and discussion of key passages from the interviews, preliminary to analysis. These were regrouped in under the themes discussed above.
Step 5- Analysis

The analysis was designed to examine what was said about the research question. This was clearly not analysed in a simplistic manner but segmented into the general themes established in the general pattern predetermined by the interviews as developed in Step 3. The themes included participants knowledge of about the strategic planning of the estates, the strategic issues that the community was able to change and support, the local community’s involvement in detailed planning and design; the relationship between the Council and the developer proponents, decontamination of the land, and what people thought about the design of the estates. The analysis included; any differences between participants or participant groups (broadly residents, developers and planners); and what was detected as possible underlying causes for the differences (Chapter 9). The observations of participants were also compared with the findings in the urban design analysis of Chapter 8 and the background information of Chapter 7.

5.6 Limitations of this research framework

The research question was directed at interviewing individuals who knew about or were directly involved in the planning, design and development of each case study estate. It was not designed to elicit the views of the current residents of the estate (although a limited number were interviewed) or neighbouring residents. This generally limited the research to discussing the case studies with people who had been initially part of the planning of the estates or who had been involved in their recent development.

The recovery of data from interviews while attempting to be sufficiently robust to answer the question has some limitations: First, in order to get a range of answers needed, the case study sites had to be large sites that were previously government owned. These sites may not be representative of smaller, privately owned PDL which may have different modes of community involvement because of their more localised effects. Second, the number of case study interviews was limited for practical reasons as each interview had to be ‘in depth’. The same limitation applied for the international case histories. Third, interviews were chosen using a snowball sampling technique which may have introduced a bias in the data collection. The author tried to counter this by ensuring that there was evidence elicited from the three key groups of residents, developers and planners. Last, as it was over twenty years ago that much of the definitive planning and design work had been carried out, people’s memory had faded about the exact circumstances surrounding
the planning and design of the case studies. The use of written accounts of the time to identify the extent and nature of community involvement (Chapter 7) overcame this problem in some instances.

In addition to the above points, there have been many changes since the initial planning for the completed estates. These include: greater potential involvement by communities through ‘e-communications’; changed statutory requirements and government guidelines such as for the assessment of potentially contaminated land in Australia; more effective and accepted planning tools to engage local communities; and as the Inner West of Melbourne attracts more people of higher socio-economic status, the likelihood of changed social and political circumstances for community involvement.

Thus far the research has been set in the context of the history of the development of PDL and public involvement in them; and the tools, research and practice surrounding the planning, design and development of PDL. The following chapters address the International Case Histories and the Maribyrnong River Valley case studies, finally concluding with answers to the research question through a synthesis of the literature, international case histories and the case studies.
Chapter 6 - International case histories of community involvement in planning PDL

The case histories below have been analysed for their comparative use with the findings for the research question (Chapter 10). Each of the case histories, developed from unpublished monographs, have been researched in some depth using both primary and secondary literature sources as well as data from participant interviews. These interviews were based on the same questions that the Australian case studies; that is, how the PDL had been planned, designed and developed with or without community involvement. The projects were chosen because of their compatibility with the case studies (Chapters 7-9) or that they show some aspects of PDL developments that can be applied to considering community involvement in the case studies (such as in site decontamination processes). Some fill a gap that the case studies have not been able to address (such as PDL redevelopment of housing estates).

These histories of projects are not put forward as defining examples, for there are many other projects that can be singled out, but as developments that can demonstrate what can be achievable with public participation in the planning, design and development of PDL. The discussion and findings were compiled through visiting each place and interviewing people involved in its planning and development as described in Chapter 5. The research was also bolstered with references from written material for each project much of which is included in unpublished monographs.

Some of the places investigated are not described below, but all are listed in Appendix 6.1.

6.1 The decontamination of PDL

PDL sites may require a number of site preparation processes to take place before the land can be utilised for other use. The most important of these is to remediate the land to remove, process or contain any contamination which is a health hazard to existing and future occupants of the site or surrounding area and to the environment. The example below discusses how local communities have become involved in site remediation.
6.1.1 Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, Minnesota

Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant (TCAAP), Minnesota USA is located at the northern fringe of Minneapolis-St Paul about 20 kilometres from each city centre. It was a Second World War small ammunitions production facility for the US Army. Covering an area of 963 hectares, it employed 26,000 at its peak production. It remained largely unused in the post-war period reopening briefly during the Vietnam War. In 1994 the ‘Department of Defense’ displayed its intention to declare the facility surplus to military needs.

In the same year, Congressman Vento set up the TCAAP Revitalisation Committee to recommend the site’s future use (FPTSPRC, n.d). The committee comprised a number of stakeholders including some from the local communities surrounding the site. The plan, which was drawn up, sought to include most of the site in regional parkland to be managed by the local Ramsay County. Some land with an area of 273 hectares was to be set aside for urban development of a mixed use kind but predominantly for housing. The local municipality, the City of Arden Hills, where TCAAP is situated, was later offered the purchase rights to the land set aside for urban development but recent attempts to form a public-private partnership have failed due partly to the housing market downturn caused by the Global Financial Crisis.

Photo 6.1 Vacant buildings at TCAAP. Most of the site is totally abandoned. This building is in a part of the site nominated as Army Surplus (or capable of development) (Google Earth™ 2009)

The site was severely contaminated by Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) which had leached into the water table and aquifer system. This polluted the water supply for the nearby suburb of New Brighton. VOC removal has been employed, both on-site and at point of extraction, to overcome the problem. Remediation of the site has occurred over several years, generally to an industrial land use standard, although, with further clean-up
of ‘Redspots’ (small defined areas still with a contaminant levels above high standard clean-up), some land will be usable for residential purposes.

The site was decontaminated as a Superfund site (CERCLA Act). A requirement of remediation by USEPA at Superfund approval is for a citizens committee to be established known as a Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The RAB advises the US Army and the regulators about the remediation process under the *Installation Restoration Program*. Its mission is to provide community involvement in the remediation of the former plant. The community members consist of local citizens who live in the area that is affected by contamination from the TCAAP facility. Non-community members consist of representatives from the Army, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, the USEPA, and the remediation consultants (TCAAP n.d.).

The RAB has met consistently for 15 years during the restoration period and has been fundamentally successful in its mission. Some of the members were derived from groups with an antipathy towards the Army however; this disappeared as committee deliberations progressed:

“They came from more of a political position; an anti-military, anti-defence standpoint. And that is because we saw some of the people coming from anti-military organisations. But we were willing to work with these people and when we expounded the details of the project they found that their own concerns were not as deep as the clean-up concerns. They realised that, if you want to stage a protest, this was not the place to do it. You should go to Washington for that.” [Project administrator- co chair September 2010]

The RAB’s considerations were assisted with technical data and engineering programs and designs which provided sufficient information for the Board to make sound decisions.

**Contribution to answering the Research Question**

The establishment of early contact of the community through a RAB was successful in improving the relationships between the local communities, US Army and remediation experts, when preparing land for future development of PDL. It reinforces the view that a collaborative approach can succeed even to resolve contentious and emotionally charged issues such as decontamination of defence sites if an ‘open’ approach that includes local communities is employed. However, this success is likely to be dependent on the purpose
of the work being well specified and aided with good technical information. Thus collaborative planning can be achieved despite what appears to be some original hostility, reinforcing the concept that collaboration in the early stages of a project can be transformative.

6.2 Strategic Planning

The preparation of guiding strategies can deeply involve local communities and, in doing so, a strong ‘bottom up’ consensus can evolve. The examples given below show the usefulness of involving local communities in different ways early in the planning process when basic strategies are prepared. They are at a key point in the planning process when wider planning policies are to be applied to PDL; a time that local communities may find themselves imposed upon and may feel their opinions have been discarded or under-valued. The following examples from Canada have attempted to overcome these issues and show that local communities can be both involved and effective in affecting the planning and design of PDL in their neighbourhood.

6.2.1 Community action resolving strategic issues- West Don Lands Toronto

West Don Lands is the name given to a former industrial area in Toronto that was a part of Cork Town, an early settlement in Old Yorktown, the original township of Toronto. Low lying and partly flood-prone from the adjoining Don River, it became disconnected from the lake shore in the latter part of the 19th Century by railroad development and then in the 20th Century by the Gardiner Expressway.

The City of Toronto, in 1987, acquired the land (32 hectares) for a public housing estate to be called ‘Ataratiri’ and commenced its remediation. This proved to be very expensive and ultimately the Province of Ontario bought the land partly for the prospect of it being used as a sporting complex for the Summer Olympic Games. When the Games bid failed, the future use of the land became uncertain, but finally it was proposed as a harness racing facility (Waterfront Toronto a. n.d.). This proposal was opposed by the residents of Cork Town. Residents and the local Business Association formed a coalition with other local associations called the West Don Lands Committee. Cynthia Wilkey, present Chair of that committee describes the situation as follows:

“And we quickly approached other neighbourhood associations and other organisations and people who were interested to form a coalition; first of all to
oppose this sale [to the harness racing organisation] which fell through anyway and
then to develop a positive program for what we felt the Government should be
doing with this land. So when Waterfront Toronto came on the scene we were way
down a path of visualising and gathering consensus around what should happen on
the West Don Lands. As a matter of fact it is partly our work that resulted in the
West Don Lands becoming one of the priority projects.” (September 2010)

The local community became influential in 1999 by holding a three day workshop which
was like a charette where, by open community and specific invitation of key stakeholders,
plans, supported with economic analysis, were prepared for a residential community and
recreation lands in the flood-prone parts of the site. The workshop was made possible
through a Federal grant of C$100,000 by Human Resources Canada. Robert Fung the
chair of the Toronto Waterfront Revitalisation Taskforce was present to absorb the work
being done [Wilkey September 2010].

The advent of Toronto Waterfront Revitalisation Corporation in 2001 (now marketed as
Waterfront Toronto) changed the impetus for the development of West Don Lands. The
Corporation is charged with improvements to infrastructure, environmental assessment
site cleanup and street reconnection to the CBD and is managing the development of the
site. This impetus was further promoted when plans for an athletes’ village on the land
were proposed for the 2015 Pan American Games. These are now under construction,
bringing forward the 10-12 year completion date originally based on open market
conditions (Waterfront Toronto b. n.d.).

Cork Town and other nearby communities were not only able to collaborate with
statutory bodies and other major stakeholders but lead in the development of the area’s
planning. When Waterfront Toronto was established, the local community through the
West Don Lands Committee had been functioning for three years and had demonstrated
that it could prepare, with expert planning, public relations and economic help, a viable
concept for the land as a residential area with recreation areas on a floodway. The concept
was not intended to be set in stone as a land use plan but it was a demonstration of
practicality that had not been carried out before [Wilkey September 2010]. However, it
did point to a reliance on external financing for flood mitigation works which were finally
agreed to as a guard against, not only floods on the land but also the lower parts of
Toronto’s CBD.
When Waterfront Toronto was established, the West Don Lands Committee was able to persuade and even pressure Waterfront Toronto to continue its communications:

“So once the waterfront corporation did get set up we started agitating for a place at the table. Then John Campbell was hired in, I think 2003, as the CEO which was really when it got off the ground. In his very first week on the job he came to a public meeting to introduce himself. And someone stood up and said: ‘Well folks I am very happy to have you here. I can’t wait to get going. Are you going to set up stakeholder advisory committees for precinct planning? We would like to see that.’ And he said: ‘Yes, ah well you know, it’s my first week on the job and I will get back to you.’ And it took a little bit of convincing but I think it did not take that much for Waterfront Toronto to decide that they would have a very, very robust public consultation process that would include public meetings and a stakeholder committee.” [Wilkey September 2010]

One important issue was how residents would relate as a group to Waterfront Toronto. The self-created West Don Lands Committee was the vehicle for planning public meetings and dissemination of information but how could community input be managed? Waterfront Toronto appointed a public relations firm to facilitate this:

“Before every public meeting of the stakeholders, at least one, sometimes it was several meetings at which they would give the West Don Lands Committee a progress report. They would say: ‘These are the problems we are struggling with’ and normally people don’t want to hear about that in the public meeting and before those public stakeholder meetings, The public relations facilitator would be on the phone to you and say: ‘What are the important things to bring back from the last discussion?’ So it was very iterative, that she was very good at, so during that period we probably had several stakeholder meetings over a period of eight months.” [Wilkey September 2010]

**Contribution to answering the Research Question**

The planning of West Don Lands proves that communities can self-start the planning of PDL, subject to being funded so that appropriate professional resources can be tapped, thus ensuring the community is a pivotal stakeholder for the sound planning of the PDL site. The establishment of trust is also a key factor. In this case, the trust was established, first through Waterfront Toronto making an offer to utilise the community’s own
institution. Such resolve maximises confidence and brings the provider (in this case Waterfront Toronto) into direct contact with the receiver (Cork Town community). There is likely to be a limit to trust in some circumstances where the extent of the redevelopment from what prevails in an area will be too great. This situation was discussed with respect to the Housing Commission Victoria’s slum abolition program and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan as affecting inner Melbourne (2.1.4). Under such circumstances the likely outcome can only be resolved through adversarial actions by communities.

The story also reinforces the need for the planners to ‘iterate’ ideas and issues with a smaller external group of community members to iron out and obtain feedback to matters which the general public would see as being tedious or should have been resolved. Thus an advisory group involving residents is a sensible body to manage the interface between bureaucracy and the ordinary citizen. Thus for this case, the research question is answered in the affirmative.

Image 6.1 Representation of West Don Lands in its completed form, showing the Don River and flood retarding works in the foreground and Corktown to the right. Toronto’s CBD commences a kilometre past the top edge of the image (Waterfront Toronto 2013).

### 6.2.2 East Fraserlands Vancouver

East Fraserlands is a planned 52 hectare residential development with supporting commercial and community facilities being built on the East Branch of the Fraser River in the City of Vancouver, British Columbia. It is located next to a suburban area with few commercial and community facilities or public transport services. Its intrinsic advantage is its location on the River. The Fraser River has been, from the City of Vancouver’s foundation, the place where industry and related activity has occurred, taking the
advantage of transportation that the river offered to the hinterland as well as overseas. In the case of East Fraserlands the site was occupied by a timber mill, taking lumber brought down from inland forests. But it closed several years ago and the site has remained almost vacant. Land to the north that is now included in the site has been purchased by the City of Vancouver.

In 1995, the Vancouver Industrial Land Strategy reviewed all industrial land in the City to determine which areas would be retained for industrial use and which areas could potentially be used for other purposes (Punter 2003 p.151), [City project manager September 2010]. East Fraserlands was identified as being unlikely to have a successful industrial future, mainly because of its configuration and location and the fact that the River was becoming less used for industrial purposes. Many other places were maintained for industry but other PDLs along with this site and CBD sites such as Coal Harbour and False Creek were earmarked for redevelopment.

In 2003, Council prepared a policy statement for East Fraserlands which involved the community, through traditional means of open houses and workshops. The statement was prepared from a combination of policy directions prepared by Council planners and the community’s own policies prepared at the workshops [City project manager]. At about the same time there was a local committee set up called the East Fraserlands Committee (one of several district committees in the city) that continues to be involved in the project. It is a committee of mainly local residents plus those in other adjacent parts of the Southeast sector of the city. The early visioning process did not run that smoothly and there was a lot of concern displayed by the community:

“There was a lot of angst. It was the early conceptual planning and the basic arm wrestling over things like development density and supporting amenities like park space and community centres, and the approach to the ecology of the site which is important for the Fraser River as it is the biggest Salmon River in the World. There was an opportunity to bring it back as a salmon stream in front of the site. It was a hot button issue that the community was interested in.” [City project manager September 2010]

After the visioning processes were completed and the principles for the site were established the Council adopted a Policy Statement which enshrined the site’s future in broad land use terms. The next stage, using the parameters laid down in Council’s policy,
was to consider the layout of the site through a charette process that was widely advertised in the local community:

“That was a very interesting week we had. We had about 1000 members of the community that came for about 16 hours a day for a week with designers, city staff, other consultants, going through a whole range of topics: housing; the retail, community management; the ecological approach; the design of parks and we came out at the end of the day with numerous plans- actual concepts. We then spent several months refining again with community engagement involving the local community alliance. But there were also public open houses, and then the consultants. And then we got the feedback from the East Fraserlands Committee.”

[City project manager September 2010]

The description shows how deeply involved the community was in the project and this ultimately provided a strong measure of consensus about the final form of the proposal and this was ‘grist for the mill’ for the well-known New Urbanist firm Duany and Plater-Zybeck to prepare the final plan. The plan was then translated into an Official Development Plan (ODP) which Council adopted and exhibited.

The community’s involvement did not end there. Before the land could be developed, it needed to be rezoned through a change to bylaws and attached to this were various development agreements associated with the transfer and development of land with which, dependent on the nature of development, the community had a greater or lesser
involvement. For example, the community had a major involvement in the planning for open spaces including the future town centre when the detailed zoning arrangements were prepared. This allowed it to become involved in designing the spaces which it would one day be the places of structured and unstructured community activity. On the other hand, its involvement was less when building plans were to be approved, this being achieved through collaboration between the City’s urban designers and the developer.

**Contribution to answering the Research Question**

The charette process appears to be very successful when a large PDL site is to be redeveloped. However, it needs to be embedded in the broader urban planning process. Thus, while the charette has been a centre pin for the planning of East Fraserlands it has been only one part of community engagement about the site. That engagement started in 1995 and continues today. Community engagement then should be seen in all physical and temporal ranges and for rational planning to take place it should proceed from the city or regional dimension to the site planning scale. To do otherwise will be to invite *ad hoc* decisions that may not be in alignment with community expectations or understanding. The findings of this Vancouver case history reinforces the view that when engaged early in a well defined planning process where the community is always engaged at every stage, community input is valuable in finalising plans and designs.

**6.3 Retrofitting places**

**6.3.1 Queens Quay Toronto**

Queens Quay is a major street which passes along the edge of Toronto Harbour. Rebuilt in the 1970s to provide access to the old, largely abandoned wharfs, a major development of high rise apartments and parkland took place along it with recreational and commercial places (Waterfront Toronto 2006). In 2001 Queens Quay was placed under Waterfront Toronto’s management.

One of the first projects undertaken by Waterfront Toronto was to call a design competition- the *Waterfront Toronto Central Waterfront Public Realm International Design Competition*, to design a missing link in the 480 kilometre Waterfront Trail around Lake Ontario and the St Lawrence River and to make a world class waterfront for Toronto. The winner proposed that Queens Quay, which had a formation of two lanes each way plus a median for trams, be narrowed to two lanes. The tram line would be
located at its edge, and the new trail link would take up some of the former road (Waterfront Toronto 2012). There was initial reluctance to the project by the City Council but a traffic assessment showed that road vehicles could be accommodated in a two lane road. The Toronto Transport Corporation (TTC) also opposed the plan initially [Andrew Gray, Vice President Waterfront Toronto September 2010].

![Photo 6.2](image)

**Photo 6.2** Queens Quay, the foreshore road in Toronto. The road to the right of the tramlines is to be closed and made into a pedestrian trail. Apartment dwellers on the foreshore side opposed the proposal. Google Earth ™ 2010

The consultative process with residents and businesses was extensive, in line with the Corporation’s normal approach to public engagement. The concept was released for public consultation. Then a large number of meetings were arranged:
- A stakeholder advisory committee was formed, which was very broad based, consisting of several neighbourhood associations, major property owners, commercial interests, transit and cycling advocates, the Waterfront Regeneration Trust and City Councillors officers;
- The consultative program included public forums, open houses and workshops. The workshops and forums were well attended, with about three hundred people at the first forum. The proceedings were recorded and used in the final development of the designs;
- The plan went on public display and submissions were called for;
- All the information about the consultation was made readily available on the internet. (Waterfront Toronto Website)
The consultative processes for Queens Quay are typical of the very comprehensive and meticulous approach to consultation that Waterfront Toronto employs:

“The Waterfront Toronto model is probably the most robust of any agency or entity which does consultations. I think the community people who have been involved in it, have changed their expectations about what consultations should be.” [Wilkey September 2010].

However, the good consultation program did not assuage the concerns of some people. The main opposition arose from residents and businesses fearing that the new layout would reduce access to their properties. This was a hard fought battle with Waterfront Toronto:

“With the development as proposed, people on the south side would now have to come out of their condo and cross at a limited number of crossings. And so there were huge fights with the owners for the need to preserve accesses in and out. Ultimately the City Council to its credit, and the Ministry at a Provincial level, did some work on the design, which originally won the competition, and there was another consultation and those who were not immediately impacted generally supported the modified design. Those who were impacted said: ‘No. We have a right of access’ and actually there were a couple of appeals, which the Minister rejected, so it was a hard fought process. One of the troubles we always have is to alleviate the effects of development on those who simply do not like the impact on their asset.” [Vice President, Waterfront Toronto September 2010]

The key observation is that, despite very high quality and penetrating consultative processes, there is a likelihood of an adversary position taken by the resident or business community when individuals’ assets are actually or perceived to be negatively affected. Thus the problem of retrofitting PDL is a complex one manifested in many places in urban areas. It is the NIMBY (not in my back yard) phenomenon which has been well described by Robert Caldini, emeritus professor in environmental behaviour at Arizona State University:

“Humans hew [shape] the ‘normative’ behaviours of their community. In places where bike lanes or wind turbines or BRT [Bus Rapid Transit] systems are seen as an integral part of society, people tend not to protest a new one; if they are not the norm they will. Second, whatever feelings people have about abstract issues like the
environment, in practice they react more passionately to immediate rewards or punishments, like a ready parking space, than distant consequences, like the threat of global warming.” (New York Times 2011)

Contribution to answering the Research Question

A feature of the Queens Quay story is in the outreach of Waterfront Toronto through its excellent communications which precisely set out the planning programs for each project and faithfully reproduce the record of a program’s progress. This maximises the community’s ability to respond to the planning and process. However good communication with a local community may not necessarily achieve better end results from the local community’s point of view.

The main finding from Queens Quay is that, despite the excellent rational planning consultative approaches taken by planners, strong opposition should be anticipated in retrofitting PDLs. This is because immediate effects on landowners are likely to be perceived to be more important than any long-term community benefits.

6.4 New plans for existing communities

6.4.1 Regent Park Toronto

While the community along Queens Quay reacted in a typical reactive way against plans that would benefit the whole Toronto community, what will happen when a whole community is to be resettled? This is the story of Regent Park a redevelopment of the whole of a public housing estate.

Regent Park is one of the largest public housing estates in Canada. Originally part of Cabbagetown, it was built on a slum reclamation area by the Province of Ontario. Construction commenced in 1948 and proceeded through the 1950s. The estate consisted of a large number of three storey walk up and some six storey apartments. Later development consisted of high rise flats and townhouses. The 28 hectare site is situated in a very central location in the city less than one and a half kilometres from Toronto’s Eaton Centre the retailing hub of the metropolis, and is connected to the CBD and the subway system by two tram lines.

The estate is managed by the Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC), a body set up by the City of Toronto when the Province of Ontario transferred responsibility of
public housing to municipal councils under a reformed local government system. The Corporation has had to follow the requirements of the Provincial law and be fiscally responsible on a budget heavily encumbered by mortgages and municipal taxes and further limited by a major maintenance backlog. Despite this, TCHC has been able to replace some obsolescent housing stock including the first stages of a renewal project for Regent Park.

The Regent Park renewal project commenced in 2002 when the TCHC decided it must refurbish the estate or alternatively redevelop it. After recognising the potential for a higher density development so close to the CBD it decided that, on economic and planning grounds, the preferable scenario was a full redevelopment of the site. This also allowed a large component of private market driven housing (3,200 dwellings) to be built to offset redevelopment costs for public housing (1,900 dwellings). A mixed community would be created that included approximately the same number of existing public tenants as before. The broad principles of redevelopment and the reasons against refurbishments were explained to, and generally accepted by, the resident community. A major aspect of the urban design was to completely redevelop the public realm from a High Modernist garden estate layout of cul de sacs and buildings in parkland to a traditional urban grid street system with buildings with active street frontages that connect directly into outside streets.

![Fig 6.2](image1.png) Left: The new plan for Regent Park showing the rectilinear layout proposed for the estate (TCHC pamphlet) and ![Photo 6.3](image2.png) Right: First stage of the estate. (Robin Dunstone 2009)
The TCHC comprehensively engaged the tenants in the estate before plans were finalised. The following extract from the Regent Park Social Development Plan explains the depth of this initiative:

“Toronto Community Housing recognized the lessons from the history of Regent Park. Redevelopment based on the ideas and ideals of outsiders was bound to fail. If redevelopment were to work, it had to be embedded in a full-fledged revitalization of the community, rooted in the community and driven by the residents as partners in the process. . . . . The community engagement process began in July 2002. The engagement had three specific goals:

1. To ensure that the community had a distinct voice in the planning process;
2. To strengthen existing and emerging community infrastructure through the consultation process;
3. To assist Toronto Community Housing staff in building new and effective long-term relationships with residents.” (TCHC 2007 p.14)

The first phase of engagement involved over 1,000 people. This was aided by the TCHC community engagement consultants who worked with local groups to identify individuals who could act as ‘community animators’. These animators were trained to coordinate discussions on topics affecting the redevelopment. In this way, the community itself collected information on a range of issues including on the design of Regent Park and the management of the development and relocation processes (Ibid, p.14). The TCHC made very special efforts to take into account existing resident needs achieved through flexibility in the plans that allowed for changes to be made in concert with community expressed needs:

“There are elements in there that are influenced strongly by the community. We left things to be resolved in the community. There were details about traffic and about the density and preferences and walking and stores and shopping and the use of open space and the kinds of open space and the type of recreational facilities that would be important.

What is happening, as well, is the plan continues to evolve. It is not a static plan but its basic frame will remain the same. There are various elements that will change and have changed already. We had a large 6 acre [2.4 ha] park that is the centre of this community. That now has an aquatic centre in it so there is not as much open space as we had before. The planning for that park with the community was a very,
very important process that produced various changes. One of the issues that emerged was that people felt the need for playing fields which that park didn’t provide so the plan evolved and changed to incorporate playing fields and we readjusted elsewhere to recapture some of the density that was lost.” [Planner of the Estate September 2010]

A further aspect of community engagement is participatory budgeting. The TCHC uses this approach for all its estates, that brings tenants, through their appointed representatives, directly into the decision making process:

“They are engaged in participatory budgeting, which is the largest effort of this sort in North America. Participatory budgeting means TCHC gives real money to the tune of a couple of million dollars\(^{12}\) to its tenant communities and they go through a process of priority setting to determine what capital repairs are needed, not like sewers, but maybe recreational based community improvements. What we find is that it is actually not so much a competition. Some communities are willing to say: ‘You know what? You guys need something more than us. Let’s move our money over there.’ And the point about participatory budgeting is that it is not advisory. It is real decisions over real money which TCHC have given to them. This is an incredible repeatable annual event.” [Former Chair TCHC September 2010]

There is some doubt about the effectiveness of the community engagement process to permit the community to increase its capacity to make its views known. A community leader who has been active in planning Toronto’s public/cooperative residential estates says:

“I think they spent $200,000 [at Regent Park]. Now my life has been built around consulting with people and doing things which make them stronger. But, in fact, the City and TCHC spent all its money to make people weaker. So there is no strong tenants group in Regent Park. There was no strong group of people who can say ‘this is what we want’.” [Former Toronto City Mayor September 2010]

The remark above displays a very different view of the TCHC previous chair who says:

\(^{12}\) Note that this is less than 1/2 % of the TCHC total budget (RD).
“The community engagement process at Regent Park was pretty sincere; pretty substantial; everything from hiring local animators to local economic development advice. We were in the business of engaging an existing community. So, for me, I think that the bright spot in the City for institutionalising and pushing engagement further than anyone else is TCHC; and everything they do is on the website.”
[Former Chair TCHC September 2010]

Despite the conflicting views of experts on the effectiveness of community participation in Regent Park, there is good evidence that the design has been redirected towards the preferences of residents through the TCHC listening to residents and adapting its plans and through the small participatory budgeting effort, which has provided autonomy to those elected as tenant representatives, to prioritise some public works. However there is less evidence that residents had any real impact on the broad layout and density of the estate:

“The general layout and arrangement and mixture of public and private housing appear not to have been strongly debated, despite the view that there was an acceptance amongst immigrant families” [Chair West Don Lands September 2010].

Density, housing mix and general public realm pattern were seen by TCHC as principles established as a baseline for planning the estate and whilst discussed with the resident community they were probably unchallengeable. The main drivers for the design were the established urban design principles that demanded that the High Modernist ‘island’ estates which discouraged both internal and external interaction be replaced with a connected street system (a grid in this instance). Likewise, the principle of a mixed public/market housing estate is more likely to have been derived from the TCHC own imperative for the redevelopment not to be a cost burden on future budgets. It was also seen as a good planning solution with the normative aims of strengthening the community by providing for a mix of ownership, dwelling types and incomes; and increasing population density in areas of high accessibility thus reducing pressure on outward metropolitan growth. These broad strategic principles are still quite appropriate but could have been, indeed are most likely to have been, reached initially as a corporate decision without collaborative discourse with the community.
**Contribution to answering the Research Question**

This study shows that when a PDL redevelopment is to occur that affects an existing area where residents will be temporarily relocated there are four important findings. First, it is critical that the directly affected resident community be part of the participation processes towards a PDL renewal project. Even when temporarily relocated, people should be part of the plan-making process. Second, it points to a potential interaction between the planners preparing a broad concept and the community, allowing debate as plans are being prepared thus providing a feedback loop to the designers. Third, it is clear that the community has been most effective in moulding the estate to its own needs for more detailed aspects of the public realm, especially in how it will use public open space. This is a key area of design that requires local community input. Lastly, and associated with the last point, the local community, if given access to funds in a participatory budgeting process, acts very responsibly and effectively. Thus the implication of this case study is that the local community has been effective in the planning and design of the estate particularly for the purposes to which the public realm is to be used and its consequent design.

**6.4.2 Crown St Glasgow (previously the Gorbals)**

Glasgow by 1900 was a major city in the world. With a population exceeding one million it was declared *The second city of the Empire* whose fame rested on the manufacture of ships, trains and engines. The jobs created by manufacturing created great wealth but only for a few who lived comfortably in the West and South ends of the City, who often became benefactors to the arts and education. However, the many immigrant workers from Ireland, Eastern Europe, Italy and other parts of Scotland did not fare so well. Overcrowding of the tenements of the Inner Southside and Eastside led to squalid and very unhealthy conditions. Nowhere else on the Inner Southside was squalor as bad as in the Gorbals (Glasgow CC n.d.- Local Histories). By the end of the Second World War 27,000 people were living in this tiny part of the urban area which also included a lot of industry and commerce. But a strong community existed which had its own schools, a synagogue, mosque, churches and shops as well as clubs and associations. This most dense urban area had a vibrant and multi-cultural life. Tramways and an underground railway connected it with the nearby city centre and the rest of the city.
Post war reconstruction in Scotland under the Welfare State was carried out under the Housing (Repairs and Rents-Scotland) Act 1954 that required Councils to carry out slum clearance plans. By 1958 much of the old Gorbals had been demolished and cleared for a scheme that included nineteen storey flat blocks designed by the Modern International School architect Sir Basil Spence. The tower blocks were inhabited for a mere 14 years as the buildings became damp-ridden; Glaswegians referred to them as ‘The Dampies’. Not only were the apartments damp, redevelopment had virtually destroyed the tight knit community and this, in turn, led to social disruption and ultimately voluntary abandonment by residents. The Gorbals became a place of crime and despair. Disurbanisation of Glasgow to its outskirts and new and expanded peripheral towns and de-industrialisation along the River Clyde (2.2) caused greater unemployment which added to this difficult situation (Lever 1991).

The late 1980s saw the demolition of the unsuccessful tower blocks and an ambitious scheme for a new community was prepared by the Council through an urban design competition. The competition winner, CZWG, was appointed to prepare a master plan. The plan aimed at returning housing to a pre-Second World War typology with midrise accommodation but with a substantially lower population density. The urban design consisted of a largely rectilinear form distorted in places to create a town park and streets with changing vistas. Housing was to be largely ‘perimeter block’ typology, with walk-up ‘stacked’ housing sharing a mid-block private open space. The new development was marketed as Crown Street and is known today as The Crown Street Regeneration Project (Scottish Government 2008):

“The strength of the new plan is how it integrates development with its surrounds using the old street patterns as a guide. Careful consideration was given to the historic landmark of the heritage listed church designed by Alexander ‘Greek’ Thompson. Now, nearly 20 years on, the estate is of high amenity and has become gentrified to some extent. Its population is now only 10,000. It is totally different from the old Gorbals, and represents a very high quality example of a medium-high density neighbourhood.” (CABE 2008 p.7)
While its design is very attractive and is a contemporary version of several high amenity Georgian estates in Glasgow’s West End, it is the success of the project in social terms which is of most interest to this research. One of the keys to success of the Crown Street Regeneration Project has been the engagement of the community. A community council was formed and was involved in the decision making process throughout. This ensured that community views were considered and the designs reflected local aspirations. A similar community council was formed for the partial redevelopment of the neighbouring Oatlands estate (Glasgow City Council, 2009, p.18).

Another key to success has been the strength of partnerships forged with other organisations particularly the landlord- New Gorbals Housing Association. The Association has insisted on high standards of design at every stage from the master plan though to the management and maintenance of the estate.

**Contribution to answering the Research Question**

The important messages derived from the Crown Street project for answering the research question are twofold: First, the use of urban design competitions is a good way to create a range of different designs that can highlight different ideas and opportunities for the land, thus providing a sound debating point for both communities and experts. Second, the insistence of upholding to design and development standards by a housing cooperative or other body representing the local community is an important way to ensure development is for the local community rather than private developers. Thus the involvement of local associations is likely to provide an effective way for a local community to affect the planning, design and development of PDL.
6.5  Institutionalising and De-institutionalising public involvement

6.5.1 Payne Phalen, St Paul, Minnesota

The City of St. Paul has a history of independent neighbourhood groups and a reputation for citizen participation:

“Born in an era of city versus citizen group confrontation, the theme of the participation system lies in people working together to build better neighborhoods, and in citizens having a direct role in the city’s decision-making process. Land use planning and control and communication with citizens are seen as central roles for the district councils.” (Thomson K n.d., n.p.)

In 1975 the City of St Paul instigated a system of 17 Local Planning Districts (LPD). Each district has an elected board of local interests: the District Planning Council (DPC). Each DPC establishes committees to handle various aspects of its work from the consideration of planning matters to other more specific projects such as park planning and management of infrastructure works. The DPC has also a critical role on a Mayoral council that determines the works budget and this is a participatory budgeting exercise. A key to each DPC workings is its independence. Each body is an incorporated non-profit body which has established its own identity and operations through by-laws and has its own system of electing members to it (usually a combination of resident and local commercial interests). The St. Paul district planning system has been held out as a good example of community participation which has included much direct involvement by communities in decision-making particularly where discrete local projects are involved (ibid, n.p.).

Payne Phalen (District 5) is one of the LPDs. An example of its involvement in PDL plans is the Phalen Corridor Initiative which included a range of bodies sitting with the affected LPD on a Steering Committee which was supplemented by a Board of Advisors comprising the Mayor, Port Authority President, Labour representative and the local member of Congress (St. Paul, City of 2009). The reason for the initiative was to regenerate PDL that had resulted from deindustrialisation and disurbanisation of inner St Paul. The Payne Phalen area lost over 6,000 jobs during the 1980s which contributed to high local unemployment and greater poverty (USEPA 2002 n.p.).
The corridor initiative centred on developing PDL spread along a goods rail line. This was promoted by constructing a strategic road along the corridor (Phalen Boulevard) which successfully linked the corridor with the interstate freeway system and surrounding residential areas of the city’s Inner Eastside. The Port Authority commenced an industrial estate which increased interest in the area and a number of industries and other uses, including housing, moved to the corridor creating 3,000 jobs and over 1,000 dwellings.

What is particularly unique about the LPD system is how these local organisations form the bridge between major decision makers and capital flows and local initiatives and needs. Thus funding from federal, state, local and charitable sources can be directed to a project that has local community representation. While described as not being perfect vehicles for communication (LWV 2007), LPDs are integral to good governance at a local level, and this is especially important for the City of St Paul, a large central capital municipality with a population approaching 300,000.

**Photo 6.4** Affordable housing along Phalen Boulevard. Strict age and income tests are applied to potential purchasers. (East Side Neighborhood Development Co. Ltd. 2009)

**Photo 6.5** Phalen Boulevard in its sub-arterial section with an existing industrial building. The road provides for a combined pedestrian/cycle trail and adjoins a railway line. (Robin Dunstone April 2009)

**Contribution to answering the Research Question**

The Phalen Corridor Initiative shows how LPDs have become integral to getting change for the local community’s good. One might adapt questions asked here to Australian case studies:

- Have local organisations, whether they be constituted by local or central government or self-generated by a community been involved and how effective have they been?
- What funding arrangements for PDL projects have been provided that are tied to community initiatives or are conditional to the community being involved in the project?
- With regard to taking a more holistic approach involving education and employment, can such programs be devised to support receiving communities with socio-economic deficits?
- What coordination across different levels of government has occurred and how does it link with charitable institutions and the private sector?

### 6.5.2 London Docklands Development Corporation

London Docklands have been discussed previously in the context of the Thatcher Government’s impact on the development of English cities in the 1980s, and its effect on urban design in development of PDLs (2.2). The story is continued here, looking more closely at the impact of deinstitutionalisation of planning the docklands on its resident communities and the challenges and more recent attempts to integrate communities into development corporation plans and developments.

The Port of London had been situated in a massive series of docks created over 200 years. Much industry had accumulated close to these wharfs but by the 1970s new methods of goods handling including containerisation had meant that deeper purpose built ports were built elsewhere including at Tilbury and Felixstowe. This change in location created a lot of dereliction and huge job losses of over 80,000 in London’s East End (LDDC. n.d.b).

Michael Heseltine, Secretary of State said in 1981:

“The place was a tip: 6000 acres of forgotten wasteland.” (LDDC, n.d.a, Slideshow)

London Docklands Development Corporation (LDDC) was one of 12 Urban Development Corporations commenced by the Thatcher Government in the 1980s. It was given wide powers of land resumption and amalgamation, development control and agreements with private interests. Its designated area was also declared an ‘Enterprise Zone’ that provided potential for tax relief, capital allowances and access to other central government resources (2.2). The LDDC was run by a board, which did have local government representation, but generally favoured development interests. The LDDCs mission superseded a plan that had been prepared jointly by affected borough councils and the Greater London Council (GLC). Thereafter, the GLC (till its termination) and boroughs set up the Docklands Consultative Committee to monitor LDDC activity.

Political backlash against the Thatcher Government by the Labour-held borough councils and other powerful groups and individuals made communication difficult for local
communities in the initial stage of development. Furthermore, the LDDC did not have a remit to improve local community facilities and programs for the 39,400 residents within the designated area who were mostly living in public housing. These people received education, health and other social services from local government or ad hoc bodies. However the quality of these services left a lot to be desired for residents who suffered from very high unemployment, and poor education and health standards. Docklands communities also felt left out during the surge of development activity that occurred in the early 1980s, and they were exposed to construction and traffic problems caused by redevelopment. By and large, local communities felt democratically excluded from the huge transformative development process that was happening. Some of these difficulties were recognised in 1987 by a House of Commons select committee on the employment effects of UDCs which reported:

“It is not good for the health of a community for the original inhabitants of an area to see others benefiting, as they see it, at their expense while they suffer from increased road traffic congestion, higher house prices and associated ills. Nor is it just.’ the report stated: ‘UDCs cannot be regarded as a success if buildings and land are regenerated but the local community are bypassed and do not benefit from regeneration.” (Hillman 1998, p.3)

The Committee’s report prompted change by Government to expand the LDDCs remit to provide community services and thereafter the LDDC expanded its community team backed up with a £100 million budget for community services.

The problem of integrating local communities in the transformative stages of major PDL developments was also felt in other places. For example, at Salford Quays on the Manchester Ship Canal, Raco et.al. state:

“This focus of getting the development ‘up and running’ had significant implications for broader processes of community involvement and sustainable governance. The research showed that existing, long-term residents often perceived the new developments as a threat to their communities and to their future residence in the area. There was a general feeling that developments were ‘out of control’ and that technical, political and financial considerations dominated decision-making processes and frameworks. As with development projects elsewhere, many residents felt that their presence in the development area was increasingly a
problem for development agencies that had become focused on a process of urban
gentrification the name of making local communities more ‘sustainable’.” (2007 p.127)

Cooperation between the LDDC and Borough Councils became more essential as
infrastructure projects for roads and a city airport progressed. Major agreements were put
in place between the Councils and the Corporation which, amongst other things, provided
for local job security, training facilities, community centres, new social housing,
refurbishment of existing housing and new schools. These accords also spelt out how
communities were to be involved by seeking their views on development applications and
community projects. An additional factor emerged where a community leader and
unionist Peter Wade, the chair of the Association of Island Communities, accepted a
community liaison role with the developers of Canary Wharf. This caused consternation
in the local communities but also signalled a thawing of hostilities by residents against
private enterprise (Museum of London Docklands 2011).

By 1990, with the prospect of de-designation of some parts of the LDDC area, the three
boroughs became involved in LDDC’s corporate plan and by the end of 1991, and for the
first time since 1984, the boroughs were all represented on the LDDC board. The politics
of the past now seemed to be left behind. The LDDC chairman in his 1992/93 annual report noted:

“Relations between the LDDC and local councils are cordial; co-operation between us is smooth and agreement at our joint objectives mutual, so that incoming investors are unlikely to notice the change.” (Hillman 1998, p.8)

This overall improvement in co-operation can be seen in two ways. First the LDDC, was able to demonstrate that it could improve the communities’ very poor education and health prospects by selective use of its resources and second a Conservative UK Government had been re-elected for a third term, and in the case of Tower Hamlets, the Liberal Democrats were in control of the Council (Brownill 2010). All earlier adversary rhetoric had been expunged with few exceptions, and the LDDC was now seen as a temporary institution as powers gradually returned to the boroughs through steady ‘de-designation’ of redeveloped areas.

While the new-found emphasis on improving local communities made some good progress, the LDDC made only a relatively small contribution of the total expenditure for the whole of Docklands. But Councils, as planning authorities, saw more inclusion in the new Docklands consensus rather than the local community (Brownill 2010, p.132).

The importance of the Docklands story is to do with the tension between local government and central government’s ability to transform a place. The previous plan for Docklands by the GLC and Councils was far less dense and more to do with obtaining employment and better living conditions for residents. On the other hand, there was no actual physical plan created by the LDDC. Rather, its approach was to ‘parcelise’ land into marketable (saleable) sites based that would allow potential purchasers the right to submit their proposals to the corporation (Edwards 1992). This, together with the fiscal benefits of the Enterprise Zone, drew a lot of private capital into the designated area but also cost central government £3.9 Billion. Under this approach to development, which approached laissez faire conditions, the community was totally excluded until after 1987 when the LDDCs remit was changed and accords were struck with the boroughs. The local communities were supposed to benefit from the ‘trickle-down effect’ that transformative development would bring (Cullingworth & Nadin 2006). The question to be asked is: ‘is it possible to have a compromise between localized interests and central government’s interest in transforming an area so completely as has been accomplished at
Docklands?’ This has been attempted through the most recent reincarnation of a UDC in East London. The Labour Government created the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (2004-2012) that, as Brownill reports, was based on a new ‘conventional wisdom’ comprising three elements:

“Promoting London for global competitiveness; ensuring social inclusion; and providing networked governance forms that can link these different objectives.”

(2010, p.135)

The important new governance arrangement was retention of local government as the planning body and hence the likelihood that through other planning practice requirements the voice of communities will be heard and taken into account.

**Contribution to answering the Research Question**

The experience of London Docklands, before more inclusionary policies were applied to the LDDC, shows that exclusion of affected local communities can have significant effects on how they can affect the planning, design and development of PDL. It leads to the conclusion that:

- Local government should be the initiator for the planning of PDL, or a partner with another state body.
- The local council should be the approving body for development proposals although it may also be subject to final ministerial approval or appeal; and
- The local community should be represented on any board or other local ad hoc institutional arrangement for PDL redevelopment.

**6.6 Summary of International Contributions to the Research Question**

This summary distils the possible contributions the international case histories can make to the consideration of the Maribyrnong Valley case study findings.

The involvement of local communities at the early stages of a plan is effective as it instils trust in local communities through the open nature of the regular meetings and information given to the public. It also allows the community representatives to be involved in to technical analysis and remediation processes. This can be accomplished in the most emotive situations such as clean up of defence sites. Thus the early involvement
of a local community has a major advantage in setting the framework for its future involvement in planning the PDL.

West Don Lands is an example where the local community, supported by a grant was able to achieve an initial concept for a PDL site that placed it in a strong position to become closely integrated with the plan preparation and development body. It is an example of the development of trust which allows the resolution of strategic plans at the formative stage of planning where a community advisory committee is established. Such an advisory committee allows much detail to be resolved before providing plans for public discussion.

The East Fraserland example shows how important it is for the community to be involved in planning issues from a city scale to the most detailed and that proceeding from the more general wider city strategy engenders trust and provides a sound base for the local community to debate and provide good input into a PDL planning in its neighbourhood. The progressive approach from the wider to local area and utilising collaborative events such as charettes are a means to ensuring positive involvement of the local community. The East example is of direct relevance to the Maribyrnong Valley case studies due to its locational, demographic, economic and cultural similarities.

The story of Queen’s Quay shows that sometimes the views of existing residents can be opposite those of the general community. This can cause much anxiety to both proponents and antagonists so that only a higher body such as a court, regional body or minister can decide on behalf of both the local and wider community. This shows a limitation on local community decision making sometimes requiring central decision making.

The Regent Park story shows that the relationship between residents and planners and developers is crucial as the livelihoods of residents are directly affected. Sensitive inclusionary approaches promotes a strong involvement with the directly affected local community and improves community well-being. It can also generate ideas from the community which improve the design and function of PDL. It also shows that consensus can be obtained when issues of metropolitan wide economic context are discussed with the residents.

The Crown Street story raises two major points. First, design competitions that involve the community in judging or assessing them may be an alternative to other enquiry by
design processes such as charrettes. Second, a residents’ cooperative may be a good way to formally represent the community. Likewise Payne Phalen and West Don Lands used locally appointed committees. Thus local communities may in part be represented and have a strong advocacy effect through elected or appointed local bodies.

The Payne Phalen story shows how local planning bodies elected from local communities can be effective in partnership with other bodies, both government and private in achieving good results for the community. It also shows that holistic approaches that aim to correct a number of deficiencies in a neighbourhood have a major advantage over just planning and development of PDL. This may require some external sources of capital to introduce schemes that link into development (such as reemployment schemes), which was in the case of the Western Suburbs Environment and Planning Programme (1982) but is usually not practiced in Australia. This type of coordination has potential in the development of large PDL sites and is a possible yardstick for assessing the research question.

The value of the London Docklands story is in what not to do. In the early 1980s Urban Development Corporations in England were so structured and given such powers as to effectively exclude local communities from involvement. It was only later when much development had occurred that government, after enquiry, allowed local communities to be compensated for impacts on their lives and LDCs were enabled to take into account local communities’ needs. The important issues for the research question are how legislative action can repress local community action and the need for a predominant or partnership role for local government.
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Chapter 7 - The case study sites

This Chapter introduces the Maribyrnong River Valley case studies. The case study sites are located in the urban part of the River Valley, which holds great significance to Melbourne’s recreational and industrial history. The Valley has been the subject of a great change after the closure or relocation of large potentially hazardous and offensive industries. Much urban renewal on these PDLs has occurred and it is for this reason that the Maribyrnong River Valley was chosen for the case studies of the thesis. See Appendix 2.1 for further information about the significance of the Maribyrnong Valley relative to other PDL development in metropolitan Melbourne.

This Chapter describes the ‘urban valley’ of the Maribyrnong River from Keilor Township to its confluence with the Yarra River, then traces the planning, design and development of the four case studies selected by the method discussed in Chapter 5. Each of these sites is examined for its planning and design processes, and concomitant community involvement. It therefore sets the background for the analysis derived from the participant survey conducted through interviews in Chapter 9.

7.1 The Valley’s physical and social context

The flat and rather treeless Keilor Plains are the key topographic element of the Maribyrnong River catchment. These geologically recent volcanic basalt plains have a consistent regional slope from the river’s headwaters in the Great Dividing Range at over 600 metres above sea level to the coastline of Port Phillip Bay.

The incision of the River into the basalt after each successive volcanic event has produced deeply entrenched meanders in a complex series of reaches. In the mid sections of the River and in its major tributaries, Deep Creek and Jacksons Creek, the Valley is contained in a gorge which in some parts contains alluvial terraces. The gorge is up to 60 metres deep at the edge of the urban area at Keilor. In the lower sections of the River, the floodplain widens and the gorge is replaced by steep valley sides that stretch up to the basalt plains. The Valley is less steep in the suburbs of Aberfeldie and Ascot Vale where the underlying geology is heavily eroded, older volcanic material and tertiary sediments. The Maribyrnong River Valley thus offers a welcome relief to the generally flat plains of
Melbourne’s western suburbs and hinterland. It therefore has an intrinsic and recreational value that western suburbs people greatly appreciate (DSE 2006a).

At Keilor, the River enters suburban Melbourne. The urban boundary is quite sharp here being dictated not only by well-defined planning regulation including the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) but also by the Calder Freeway, the flight paths of Melbourne Airport and the Valley’s gorge and floodplains. It is the suburban and urban places within the UGB that are the focus of this study. The urbanised Valley accounts for 100 square kilometres or about 3% of the total metropolitan urban area. For distinction between this and the whole valley it is termed the ‘urban valley’.

The population of the urban valley consists of an estimated 121,000 people (2006) or 3.7% of the Melbourne’s contiguous urban area population (2006). While there are some significant differences between the urban valley’s suburbs, the general pattern for most suburbs is close to the metropolitan average with the exceptions of:

- Lower income, higher unemployment and higher numbers of children in Braybrook and Sunshine North. These are suburbs with a low socio-economic status according to the SEIFA Index\(^\text{13}\).
- Higher income and lower unemployment and lower numbers of children in Kensington. This is a suburb with a high SEIFA Index (ABS 2006a).

Appendix 7.1 shows the selected statistics for each of the suburbs of the valley.

### 7.2 PDL of the Urban Valley

The Maribyrnong’s urban valley has an estimated 49 larger PDLs that have been redeveloped, or are under development or may be developed. Appendix 5.2 describes them. The list below shows, in approximate chronological order, the defining historic characteristics that have made the Valley such a rich source of PDL:

- The horse racing and training industry has always been important to the urban valley. It includes Flemington Racecourse, and has been used in the past for racing and training at Epsom Racecourse (now Ascot Vale Housing Estate) and a pony course and Army remount paddocks on the Defence Site Maribyrnong.

---

\(^{13}\) The SEIFA Index stands for Socio Economic Indexes for Areas and is a product of the Australian Bureau of Statistics that is derived from variables related to disadvantage, such as low income, low educational attainment, unemployment, and dwellings without motor vehicles (ABS 2006a).
- Animal product industries were very prominent at Kensington and Footscray in the lower reaches of the urban valley and at Braybrook in its middle reaches. These included associated saleyards at Newmarket and two major abattoirs that have now been decentralised to country centres that has provided a lot of land for redevelopment in inner urban parts of the Valley.

- Basalt quarries pitted the River’s escarpments where stone could be won easily. Several have now been rehabilitated and are now used for various uses including recreation grounds, shopping centres and housing estates.

- The defence industry has also been prominent in the valley. The earliest defence use was a magazine in Footscray its function transferred to what is now called Jack’s Magazine. This was closely followed by the Colonial Ammunition Works at Footscray 1888, then explosives and ordnance factories at Maribyrnong. The urban valley became the most important area for defence industries in Australia between the 1920s and 1960s, but by the 1990s all major plants had closed down and had become surplus to Defence needs.

- Many other industries established in the Urban Valley in the 20th century. Some of the port associated industries of chemical manufacture and sugar refining still exist in the lower reaches. Upstream cotton and bran mills have converted to warehousing, offices and artisan studios. A number of heavy industries have relocated and smaller businesses that manufactured chemical and plastics have closed down being generally replaced by open space and housing.

7.3 **Selected PDL sites for the case studies**

Each of the PDL were ranked by criteria as discussed in Chapter 5. The highest ranking four estates were selected as the case studies. They are Edgewater (former Ammunition Factory Maribyrnong), the proposed estate on the Defence Site Maribyrnong (former Explosives Factory Maribyrnong), and Waterford Green (former Ordnance factory Maribyrnong). They are similar being former or existing Commonwealth Department of Defence land. Lynch’s Bridge- Kensington Banks is the other estate which was formerly a combination of municipal saleyards and abattoir plus a Commonwealth Ordnance depot. (Images 7.1.and 7.2 and Table 7.1). The background to these sites is now examined in more detail. The case studies have been ordered by distance from Melbourne’s Central Business District.
Image 7.1 Topography of the Maribyrnong Valley and Surrounding Melbourne. The stars show the position of the case studies; the light grey/green the approximate extent of built up Melbourne; and the symbols are for the port, airport and Melbourne CBD. The radial lines show the limits of the visual coverage of Image 7.2. The deep gorge of the River can be seen, commencing at the most northerly case study. (Adapted from Gleadow n.d.).

Image 7.2 The Maribyrnong Valley and the four case studies outlined in red. Go back to Image 7.1 to see the extent of this photo. (Courtesy Vic Urban 2002)
Table 7.1: Some characteristics of the four case study sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area- Hectares</th>
<th>Period of Re-developement</th>
<th>Predominant Previous uses</th>
<th>Developed by</th>
<th>Estimated Dwellings at capacity</th>
<th>Dwellings 2006 (1)</th>
<th>Population 2006 (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynch's Bridge/Kensington Banks</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1989-2005</td>
<td>Saleyards, abattoir, and ordnance depot</td>
<td>Government and local government, then Government and Urban Pacific P/L</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>3881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Green</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1998-2003</td>
<td>Ordnance manufacture</td>
<td>Lend Lease and others</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>2705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Continuing 2001-2015 est.</td>
<td>Ammunition manufacture and storage</td>
<td>Delfin Lend Lease</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Site Maribyrnong</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Not redeveloped.</td>
<td>Explosives manufacture. Defence research</td>
<td>Proposed to be Places Victoria in association with private developers</td>
<td>2000-3000 (3)</td>
<td>0 (2)</td>
<td>0 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) From the 2006 Australian Census, using small area (Census Collection District) data (ABS 2006b).
(2) Not revealed by the 2006 Census but by observation it is close to none
(3) 2000 is estimate of the Maribyrnong City Council and 3000 is the estimate of Places Victoria

7.3 Law relating to community involvement in the planning and environmental protection when the estates were planned and developed

Chapter two described the legislated planning and environmental protection measures for planning PDL in Victoria related to other comparable countries of the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States of America. The planning time period covering all estates is from the earliest at Lynches Bridge-Kensington Banks (1982-early 2000s), Edgewater (1992-present) and Waterford Green (1992-present) and the Defence Site Maribyrnong (2000-present). These dates cover a period when the Town and Country Planning Act was replaced by the Planning and Environment Act (1987). When the new Act was brought into operation the effect of this change for the research question was not substantial as there was no additional statutory obligation to engage potentially affected persons, including local communities, prior to the detailed preparation of a planning scheme or its amendment.

All estates other than the Defence Site Maribyrnong were covered by new amending planning schemes. The Defence Site remains depicted as ‘Commonwealth of Australia’ in the Maribyrnong Planning Scheme, a designation that provides no planning controls over
the site as it is still considered to be under the sovereignty of the Commonwealth Government as ‘A Place of the Commonwealth’ (Waugh 1996). The one substantive change in the 1987 Act was the introduction of Minister’s panels that allowed ‘submitters’ whose objections were not acceded to on the adoption to the amending planning scheme to be heard by a panel appointed by the Minister, reporting to both the Planning Authority (usually the municipal council) and then the Minister. This gave residents and other local groups in the community and other ‘stakeholders’ an opportunity to propose changes but only after the planning proposal had been prepared by the Planning Authority. This situation was still far from being a collaborative planning approach to resolving the planning of PDL developments (See 2.1.4).

A complementary environmental assessment process under the Planning and Environment Act 1987 was also available during the planning of all the case study sites. The Environment Effects Act (1978) was applied by the government nominated Minister (See 2.1.5). Both Edgewater and Waterford Green were assessed for their Environment Effects. While the act does not specifically require specific involvement of the local community, in this case two groups were set up by the consultants for the landowner- a ‘Government Reference Group’ and a ‘Community Reference Group’ (See 7.3.2). These had no particular legal status but were clearly able to monitor the progress of the project and effect input into the plans. In the case of Lynch’s Bridge/Kensington Banks, community input came through a standing resident committee and before that a strategic planning committee that were both set up under executive authority by the Council and the Planning Minister of the day.

The Defence Site Maribyrnong is another example where the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 still applies as it is Commonwealth property. The land has now been declared as being capable of development subject to decontamination and compliance with a Heritage Management Plan (See 7.3.4).

7.4 Planning and local community participation for the case study sites

7.4.1 Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks

Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks is an estate of about 1350 dwellings and associated neighbourhood activity centre and open spaces. Commenced in 1988 and substantially
completed in 2005, it comprises terrace housing with some detached housing, low rise and mid-high rise apartments and a small neighbourhood activity centre. In addition, it includes the Kensington Community High School, two public housing hostels and several parks including a linear parkway along an old Stock Route. Comprising 51 hectares it is located five kilometres by road from the centre of Melbourne, and is approximately bounded by the Maribyrnong River, Smithfield Road, Racecourse Road, Market Street, Epsom Road, Bayswater Road and Kensington Road and Hobsons Road, Kensington.

The estate (Image 7.3) which had a population of about 3,900 (2006) is part of the Victorian era suburb of Kensington which had a total population of 8,676 (2006) in its area of 3.9 km². The adjacent suburb of Flemington, which adjoins its northern edge, had a population of 7,376 (2006). Thus, Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks makes up nearly half the population of Kensington and about a quarter of the contiguous Flemington and Kensington population (ABS 2006b).

Lynch’s Bridge is the name given to the whole project as it evolved during the 1980s. It is now generally associated with the land that is north east of Epsom Road which is the original Stage 1. Land to the south west of Epsom Road is generally called Kensington Banks.

Image 7.3 Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks outlined in red. 37° 47’ 34” S, 144° 55’ 15” E (Google Earth™ 2010)
See Appendix 7.2 for further information of this estate about its physical geography, history, people past and present, and decontamination process.

**The planning process**

The planning process needs to be seen initially in political terms. In 1982, the Cain State Government was elected. This new Government, the first Labor government in nearly thirty years, had a major reform agenda for the way planning was to be carried out in Victoria. Firstly, it was going to listen to people and encompass their views much more than previous Governments. Secondly, it was not going to be as closely bound to the limited community involvement processes of the previous Government including the practices associated with the Town and Country Planning Act 1961. A reform program was put in place that included the preparation of strategic planning policy for inner Melbourne and, later, in 1985-6, the preparation of new principles and concepts for planning in Victoria leading to the present *Planning and Environment Act 1987*. Lynch’s Bridge project was one of several undertakings that would revitalise inner Melbourne and the western suburbs.

The closing of the Newmarket Saleyards and associated abattoirs through regionalisation of saleyards freed up over 40 hectares of land within inner Melbourne, an ideal place for the new Government to show how planning could provide denser development that was sensitive to local communities’ needs and aspirations as well as to the emerging values of Melburnians who prized inner Melbourne for its significant urban conservation values (Lewis 1999 p. 90).

In 1984, the Lynch’s Bridge Steering Committee under the auspices of Evan Walker, Minister for Planning and Environment, prepared the *Lynch’s Bridge Redevelopment Strategy*. This strategy encompassed an area that crossed the River from Footscray to excess rail land in Newmarket. The plan set the broad principles for the renewal of the saleyards and municipal abattoirs as well as some fixed (non-negotiable) elements of the strategic framework (Loder and Bayly 1987). The Government’s Major Projects Unit was established in early 1987 and took responsibility for the Lynch’s Bridge Project. Planning consultants, Loder and Bayly, were engaged to prepare development options for Stage 1. This was carried out using the principles derived from the redevelopment strategy. After public consultation, the preferred plan was adopted and construction of estate works
commenced in late 1987. The first invitation to tender on Stage 1 (360 dwellings) for subdivided plots was advertised in May 1988. A further Stage 2A (of 180 dwellings) was commenced off Westbourne Road in 1989.

Lynch’s Bridge was initially a successful development but then quickly fell into great difficulties. At the end of the 1980s the collapse of the Australian economy due to the stock market crash caused more impact in Victoria than any other state, in part due to State-level financial mismanagement and to very rapid deindustrialisation (Lack 1991). High levels of unemployment ensued and the building industry was very severely hit. Several builders at Lynch’s Bridge became insolvent or were hard pressed to complete their work. There was a need for future development to be redefined. This was achieved in 1990-1991 and led to some very innovative design that lifted densities and dropped overall development costs. Using the new Subdivision Act’s liberalised strata provisions, some of the designs allowed the separate sale of bed-sit and single bedroom loft housing over garages [Developer/planner in interview].

The delay for the development of the rest of the estate was related to works for land decontamination works and flood prevention. Much of the cost of the flood prevention works was borne by the Federal Government’s Better Cities Program with a grant of $10.7 million (Neilson n.d.). In 1993 the works were completed under the Kennett State Government. The Government retained the project but, reflecting the political mood of the time, decided to make the project a public-private partnership.

The rest of the Lynch’s Bridge project was commenced in June 1994 when Pioneer Homes (later to become Urban Pacific) signed a Joint Venture Agreement with the Victorian Government. The new part of Lynch’s Bridge was to be marketed as ‘Kensington Banks’. In 1995 an amendment to the Melbourne Planning Scheme was approved that added a customised zone called the Lynch’s Bridge Development Zone that was overlaid by the Lynch’s Bridge Development Plan (Urban Pacific. 1996) (Figure 7.1). The effect of the new zone was that no permission was needed for much development that conformed to the Development Plan and that did not exceed two storeys. However, building plans had to be approved to the satisfaction of Melbourne City Council (Victorian Government 1995). To achieve this approval efficiently, a special arrangement was put in place where builders would submit their plans to a Design Committee composed of officers of the City Council, Office of Major Projects and an independent
architect/urban designer. The builder was generally invited to discuss the plans with the committee (OMP 1995).

A Joint Venture Project Group was established, comprising Urban Pacific and Office of Major Projects. It had the role of recommending any changes to the Master Plan for Kensington Banks and creating the detailed codes for urban design that guided the development of each stage. In addition, the partners prepared ‘Landscape Design Guidelines’ that referred to soft landscaping, built form and engineering details (Urban Pacific 1994).

Each stage consisted of a number of ‘parcels’ generally consisting of part or all of a street block that was laid out in accordance with the stage plan. These parcels were tendered to one of six preferred builders and Urban Pacific. The parcels were balloted to abolish favouritism and randomise development. The builder’s architects would then design the houses on the parcel and present these to the Design Committee.

Figure 7.1 The Lynch’s Bridge Development Plan No 2 which covered Kensington Banks development and which was incorporated into the Melbourne Planning Scheme in 1995 (Victorian Government 1995)
A major innovation in land transfer was also pioneered at Kensington Banks. The land was not transferred to the builder but, instead, held by the State in trust for the builder. The house and land package was then sold to an individual who, on settlement, bought it from the Government. This avoided title transfer costs, thus reducing the ultimate cost of development, and was an important innovation that helped the marketing of the estate at a time when Victoria was climbing out of its deepest recession since the Great Depression.

Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks was considered to be a very effective PDL development model because of:

“The willingness of the State Government (through Federal Government grants) to carry out up-front infrastructure works to make the site available for development;

The commitment to protect heritage aspects of the site and, in particular, parts of the saleyards and associated buildings and the Stock Route as a linear pedestrian/cycle park down the centre of the estates;

The higher densities of housing achieved at 28.5 dwellings per hectare for Kensington Banks and 40 dwellings per hectare at Lynch’s Bridge enabled by producing a range of housing products yet, in the case of Kensington Banks, providing over 25% of the land as public open space;

The recognition by all that affordable housing was part of the strategy for housing mix, being 20% of all dwellings;

The flexibility of the plans and processes put in place to manage the project efficiently.” (MPV 1987)

The last Stage of the development was laid out in 2004.

The estate has received several awards by peak bodies including the Urban Development Institute of Australia and Institute of Landscape Architects. Its most prestigious award was given in 2006 when it received the International Real Estate Federation’s Prix d’Excellence for a master planned development.

Local community participation

In the case of Lynch’s Bridge, the Cain Government’s philosophy to involve local communities in the planning and design of developments led to a range of local approaches designed to improve the relationship of the people of Kensington with the State and Council. Community involvement commenced when the original Lynch’s...
Bridge Redevelopment Strategy was being prepared. The community and community groups and organisations were all invited to make submissions as plans were being developed. A working group was formed in August 1982, which included local members of the community, to plan the best possible redevelopment of the area. Community comment was stimulated through displays, neighbourhood meetings, school discussions, newspaper articles and slide presentations (OMP 1995).

In 1984, comments received from the community consultation were incorporated into a report to Government that proposed the basic principles to guide development. These included issues for Lynch’s Bridge about density, design, public/private housing mix, housing for different needs such as for the elderly, community housing and many other matters to do with heritage, community facilities, landscape and open space (MPE 1984). The report showed the Government’s high priority for involvement of the community. Then detailed planning began with the appointment of planning consultants.

In 1987, alternative plans for Stage 1 Lynch’s Bridge were presented to the community. A newsletter was distributed to residents and businesses and people were invited to give their opinions of alternative plans as well as other aspects of the future management of the suburb including the closure of roads. The plans were displayed in nineteen different community places over a month.

A community consultation officer was jointly appointed by Melbourne City Council and the Office of Major Projects. The officer acted as a bridge between the local community and the two organisations. There was also a General Advisory Committee (GAC) which was both community based and chaired. Established in 1988, it met on a monthly basis and continued for the next eleven years. This group consisted of representatives from the community, community groups, the Melbourne City Council and Government (OMP 1995, p.3).

The GAC considered a whole range of issues and was seen to be effective in keeping the Government and developers to the 10% target for social housing as well as successfully lobbying for a community school (for children with learning or personality difficulties) in the old saleyard offices. It was also given the opportunity of commenting to Major Projects Office and the Council about the layout of the whole development, including what would become Kensington Banks and the Stock Route cycle and pedestrian route.
Good relations were also kept between Urban Pacific and the local community and as early as 1996 Urban Pacific was encouraging the City of Melbourne to fully explore the extent of community issues, facilities and requirements. The company sponsored a community planning workshop with participation of the City of Melbourne, Office of Major Projects and other affected bodies. A Community Plan was prepared that assessed the needs of the new and existing residents of Kensington (Pioneer Housing Group, 1996).

Contact with the Kensington community continued in a very direct way because of the philosophy of Urban Pacific. The company kept people informed; was very active in providing quarterly letterbox drops of information to local residents and businesses (with one seeking nominations for the GAC); it held company sponsored barbeques where it provided a progress report; and had a presence at every annual Kensington Fair [Former Project Developer]. This contact was very important in assessing the community’s views about the exact form that the estate would take within the general confines of the Development Plan and the company’s marketing strategies. Later, the company provided a community liaison officer for the site.

7.4.2 Edgewater

Edgewater is a new estate that was the former Ammunition Factory Maribyrnong (AFM). Commenced in 2000, it has evolved as a place of large detached, semi-detached and terrace houses with some smaller, higher density ‘warehouse’ reproduction units and other compact housing and more recently mid-rise apartments. The estate occupies 90 hectares within the suburb of Maribyrnong and is located adjacent to the Maribyrnong River, with about one third being developed as parkland, managed by Parks Victoria as an extension of the Maribyrnong Regional Parklands (Image 7.4).

The estate is now approximately 90% developed. Remaining development is to include medium-density compact housing and mid-rise apartments. When the estate is completed in about 2015 there will be about 1,200 dwellings as well as a neighbourhood activity centre and some lakeside commercial facilities. See Appendix 7.3 for further information of this estate about its physical geography, history, people past and present, and decontamination process.
The planning process

Before the land was rezoned for development the site was designated a Commonwealth of Australia Reservation in planning schemes. The Commonwealth Constitution requires such a designation because, so long as the land remained in the hands of and was used by the Commonwealth, state laws could not operate over it (Waugh 1996, p.137). The land came within Victorian jurisdiction when Australian Defence Industries (ADI) became the owners because, as a Commonwealth trading corporation, ADI did not possess the same constitutional immunity. Despite the State assuming jurisdictional control over the land there were no specific local council policies in place. The City of Sunshine (which administered the northern part of the site) had adopted a land use strategy in 1987 but it had merely shown the land as having Commonwealth Government status. The City of Footscray that administered the southern and most extensive part of the site had no strategic plan for the area. This lack of specific local strategic context for the land was later criticised by the panel inspecting the submissions to the plan:
“The Panel found it disappointing that little attention had been paid by either the Councils or ADI to examining the proposals in a strategic context. In other words do they fit in with other changes occurring in the locality?” (Panels Victoria 1993, p.15)

It was only later that the City of Maribyrnong (newly created after the Kennett Government local government amalgamation program) prepared Principles for New Planning Development (1996) and the Maribyrnong Valley Vision (1997). These local spatial strategies covered a much greater area than the site, and showed Edgewater as a residential and recreational place in line with changes to the planning scheme in 1994. This vision was firmly set in place in 1999 when the policy was introduced into the Municipal Strategic Statement of a revised planning scheme (Maribyrnong City Council 1999a).

Studies for an Environment Effects Statement (EES) (ADI 1992a) under the Environment Effects Act 1978 were prepared through a range of consultants appointed by ADI. These studies produced a number of findings relating to heritage, and a range of environmental studies. The planning scheme amendments that would permit the land to be used for a mixed use and residential development known as Footscray L36 (Footscray City Council 1992) and Sunshine L46 (Sunshine City Council 1992) were also prepared when the EES was finalised.

In essence, the planning scheme amendments were designed to:
- Provide specially tailored zones for the estate that would permit some types of land use;
- Differentiate between mixed use areas on the higher plain area and generally residential areas on the escarpment and a reconfigured flood plain;
- Determine the residential densities for specific areas;
- Specify the nature of a number of planning agreements to be struck between the Council and the landowner to manage the cleanup, development and conservation of the site.

All this was expressed in zone controls as well as in a plan incorporated into each planning scheme called the Physical Framework Plan (Figure 7.2). The plan showed the
broad layout of the site including the location of the mixed use and residential and recreational areas, dwelling site densities and business areas for the land.

The proposed zones provided a process that required the landholder to prepare a secondary plan called a *Primary Development Plan* that more effectively defined the road pattern to be developed and the broad allocation of uses including areas to be dedicated for public open space and the proposed lake. Once a stage of subdivision was to commence, a *Further Development Plan* was to be prepared for Council approval that specified the dimensions of lots and the built form controls, including building envelopes applicable to them.

![Fig 7.2 The Physical Framework Plan approved as part of Amendment L46 of the Sunshine Planning Scheme and Amendment L36 of the Footscray Planning Scheme](image)

The Panel was set up by the Minister for Planning. After hearing submitters, it reported in August 1993 recommending only minor changes to the amendments. Subsequently, the Minister approved the amendments in November 1994 with minor modifications as recommended by the Panel. These served to improve the future administration of the
planning scheme as recommended by the Panel (Panels Victoria 1993) but did not change any major aspects of the proposed development.

After approval of the planning scheme amendments, Maribyrnong City Council officers, as the delegated administrators of the planning scheme (in Victoria called the ‘Responsible Authority’), and the landholder and developer became engaged in the detailed work in preparing the sets of plans required by the amendment and the drafting of a number of planning agreements on a range of tasks built into the zone controls including the management of decontamination works, the transfer of public lands, the construction of flood balancing works, and the preparation of development guidelines to be used with the built form controls for individual buildings. This work will continue until the estate is completed.

After the approval of the modified *Primary Development Plan in 1999*, each detailed *Further Development Plan* covering a stage in the estate, included guidelines required by one of the planning agreements relating to the subdivision of the land. Called ‘Edgewater Housing Establishment Requirements’, these guidelines covered themes relating to architectural design, siting of houses, building height, energy efficient design, external materials and colours, ancillary structures, fencing, landscaping and site management (Maribyrnong C. C. 2003, p.63). In addition, Lend Lease offered a number of pattern designs that could be used by landowners. An in-house architect negotiated the final design exclusively with the future residents.

**Local community participation**

Community involvement commenced when people were informed that the ammunition plant would close. The City of Footscray (The affected municipality at the time) made representations on behalf of the community about job losses but this was to no avail. [Previous Council planner in interview].

The preparation of the plan for the ‘Ammunition Factory Maribyrnong’ (now Edgewater) was undertaken with five levels of consultation:

- ‘Government and Community reference groups
- Information dissemination and exchange
- Liaison with specific interest groups
- On-going liaison with Government agencies, and
Wilson Sayer Corr (WSC), the planning consultants for ADI, appointed a reference group for government agencies and another group for the community. The Community Reference Group comprised representatives from the Western Region Commission, Friends of the Maribyrnong Valley, Hazardous Materials Action Group, Western Region Urban Advisory Centre, Avondale Heights Residents’ Association, Maribyrnong Residents’ Association, Footscray Institute Student Village, Living Museum of the West, the Department of Humanities, and Footscray Institute of Technology (now Victoria University).

The inaugural meeting of the community reference group was held on the 19 December 1990. It considered the Edgewater (AFM) and Waterford Green (OFM) sites together. The last meeting occurred after March 1992. The consultants also held separate meetings with key interest groups to ascertain specific information about their concerns.

In November 1991, indicative redevelopment concepts prepared by WSC were published by ADI for the Edgewater (AFM) site. This was in the form of a broadsheet disseminated throughout the community (ADI 1991a). One scenario did not utilise the existing flood plain for urban development, a requirement of the Minister under his scoping powers for the EES. Comments were sought from the public.

The EES was finalised in November 1992, when another broadsheet for the community was prepared by WSC. This showed the final preferred plan that included lakes and a substantial amount of housing to be built on a fill platform on the River’s flood plain.

The community also had the formal opportunity to make submissions regarding the EES and Planning Scheme amendments. There were 35 submissions in total of which 12 were local residents or local community based organisations. The submissions were passed on to an independent panel and submitters asked if they wished to present their submissions in person. Six residents and resident based organisations appeared at the panel hearings (Panels Victoria 1993, Appendix A). The submissions included concerns about traffic generation from the site, the upstream flooding of the river due to filling the flood plain, the ongoing liability of the Commonwealth for the contaminated material repository and
the dwelling density and height being proposed. By far the greatest concern was the utilisation of the flood plain for housing\(^{14}\) (Ross 1991).

The effectiveness of the consultation was reported on by the panel considering the EES and planning scheme amendment submissions:

“The Panel commends ADI, on the open and consultative approach it has adopted in the development of these proposals. This approach has eliminated much of the confrontation and uncertainty which can afflict major redevelopment proposals. Indeed, the only remaining resident concerns relate to the effect which development on the flood plain will have on the Maribyrnong Township upstream from the Footscray site.” (Panels Victoria 1993, p.12)

While the new permissive planning regulations for the land gave more certainty to the developer there was now effectively no role either in a positive (good ideas); or reactive (objecting) sense for local communities. There is only one known occasion that the community were given the opportunity to comment when the Primary Development Plan was substantially modified in 1999. The Council informally exhibited the new plan as the planning scheme did not require a re-exhibition, even for substantive changes.

As a community formed on the Edgewater site there was a change to local involvement. The developer, Lend Lease and later Delfin Lend Lease, facilitated community engagement with residents through its community liaison officer [Estate Developer in interview]. There was only a strong reaction from the community when a proposal for a major club and betting venue for the Western Bulldogs AFL team with very late trading hours was made at the rear of the supermarket and shops. Residents Against Inappropriate Development in Maribyrnong (RAIDIM) was formed to fight the proposal. The Council refused the proposal but that decision was later overturned on appeal to the Victorian Civil Appeals Tribunal (VCAT 2010b).

\(^{14}\) In December 1991 the Chairman of the Maribyrnong Residents Association, Mr Alan Ross, wrote to the consultants about a number of issues which included strong reference to the flood plain:

(a) “Doubts as to the effectiveness of flood mitigation at both Lynch’s Bridge and the Ammunition Factory site.
(b) Creating a built up area on the flood plain on which to build residences, as this will surely create more flooding upstream.” (Ross A 1991).
7.4.3 Waterford Green

Waterford Green is a marketing name used to sell property on and adjacent to the former Ordnance Factory Maribyrnong (OFM). Commenced in 1996 and substantially completed in 2005, Waterford Green consists of 1000 dwellings with a variety of dwelling types ranging from low-density detached housing to mid-rise apartments. Apart from a small group of shops at the very corner of the site and some commercial premises in heritage protected buildings there are no other commercial uses. In 2006 the census showed the estate to have a population of about 2,700 in about 950 dwellings. The estate was constructed and managed by Lend Lease after the Commonwealth Government had disposed of it as being surplus to Defence requirements (Image 7.5). See Appendix 7.4 for further information of this estate about its physical geography, history, people past and present, and decontamination process.

Image 7.5 Waterford Green as outlined in red. 2010, 37° 46' 19" S, 144° 52' 40" E (Google Earth™ 2010)

The planning process

The City of Sunshine’s 1987 Strategy designated the land as Commonwealth Government. It was assuming the status quo would continue [Former City Planner in
By the time the land became part of the new City of Maribyrnong in 1995 the amendment for a housing estate had been put in place. It was only later that the City of Maribyrnong prepared *Principles for new Planning Development* (1996) and the *Maribyrnong Valley Vision* (1997). These local spatial policies covered a much greater area than the site, but showed Waterford Green as a residential and mixed use place in line with changes to the planning scheme in 1994. This vision was firmly set in place in 1999 when the policy was introduced into the Municipal Strategic Statement of the revised Maribyrnong Planning Scheme (Maribyrnong City Council 1999a).

The planning process for Waterford Green is identical to that of Edgewater. Both estates were conjointly considered although there were distinctly different Environment Effects Statements and a separate planning scheme amendment (Sunshine Planning Scheme L 47). The planning panel process was also run conjointly. The Panel recommended a few minor modifications to the amendment and it was approved in November 1994. The amendment was less contentious than those for Edgewater because of the site’s lack of residential neighbours, site decontamination and flood plain issues.

The planning processes were nearly identical to Edgewater resulting in a similar set of zones, agreements and a Physical framework Plan (Figure 7.3). One difference between Edgewater and Waterford Green was the development of urban design guidelines. Two sets were developed:

“The Urban Design Principals (Sic.) - Mixed Use Zone for the western part of the estate that included the medium density housing, was considered to be a very poor attempt at defining the parameters and standards for urban design and was contributory to the very poor built form result.

*Urban Design Guidelines- Waterford Green*, applied to the eastern, low-density area.” (City of Maribyrnong 2003a p.163)

These guidelines were established under a S 173 agreement required as a condition of subdivision. The enforcement of the guidelines has been criticised because of inaction by neighbours and the Council to enforce them (Ibid, p.63).
Local community participation

As joint consultation occurred with Edgewater, the information below is a partial reiteration of the Edgewater story modified to reflect the community’s involvement in Waterford Green. In essence:

- A community reference group was set up to consider the combined EES and amending planning scheme process. It met seven times over a period of two years while the EES studies and amendments were being prepared.

- There was little objection or concern for Waterford Green as there was no flood plain to develop (the most contentious issue at Edgewater).

While the new planning regulations gave a lot of certainty to the developer there was now effectively no role for local communities either in the positive (good ideas) sense or reactive (objecting) sense as most development was to be permitted as-of-right. Even
amendment of the Physical Framework Plan did not require the Council (as responsible
authority) to notify people.

The estate was extended towards Cordite Avenue and rezoned using a similar zoning to
the original proposal. It was not controversial. However, an amendment in 2003 on an
infill area within the estate that included three defence houses and the five storey ex-
military drafting office, with a proposed extension for apartments was quite contentious.
An informal local organisation was formed which has since disappeared. Nearby residents
who lived in either detached houses or terraces vehemently objected, resulting in an
independent panel hearing. The amendment was approved substantially as exhibited
(Maribyrnong C.C. 2003b).

More recently, the local community fought a proposal for three mid-rise affordable
housing towers, each of eight storeys, on a site at the northeast corner of the estate. The
City of Maribyrnong refused permission and residents also vehemently opposed the
proposal because of the effect it would have on the estate, particularly the parking of
vehicles in the streets. The appeal was heard with residents giving submissions. The
development was disallowed by VCAT on grounds related to lack of on-site car parking
(VCAT, 2010a). Subsequently, a further proposal for a group of buildings ranging up to
19 stories has received permission after the applicant appealed against Council’s refusal
(VCAT 2012). This proposal was also vehemently opposed by the local community.

7.4.4 Defence Site Maribyrnong

The Defence Site Maribyrnong is the site of the former Explosives Factory Maribyrnong
(EFM). It has been identified as surplus to Department of Defence requirements and has
been progressively vacated since 1990. The last body to occupy it was the Defence
Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO) research laboratories are now relocated to
Fishermans Bend. Its 128 hectares make it the largest remaining under-utilised Defence
site in urban Melbourne. The site is directly opposite Waterford Green (Image 7.6).

The east side of the Defence Site abuts the Riverbank Estate of detached and terrace
housing, once occupied by a CSIRO defence research laboratory.

See Appendix 7.5 for further information of this estate about its physical geography,
history, people past and present, and decontamination process.
The planning process

Section 52 of the Australian Constitution makes any land that is a Place of the Commonwealth subject to the laws of the Commonwealth of Australia (Waugh 1996). The Defence Site Maribyrnong it is still Commonwealth land as its function, albeit residual, is Defence research and development, a role of the Australian Government. The land therefore cannot be regulated by a planning scheme under the Victorian Planning and Environment Act 1987. The Maribyrnong Planning Scheme therefore shows the land as Commonwealth Land and subject to no land use or development controls. However, the Commonwealth Government intends to sell the land and in the event of its transfer to Places Victoria or other private entities, a planning scheme amendment can be made to the Maribyrnong Planning Scheme.

The Maribyrnong Planning Scheme, prior to 2010, did show the intent for the future development of the land in the form of the Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS). Although incapable of being implemented without rezoning, this ‘statement of intent’ does throw light on the likely future of the site. In essence, the MSS proposed:

- The land to be developed largely with housing for 2,000 households;
- Parks to be established at Horseshoe Bend and atop Remount Hill connected by linear parks through the housing and along the river;
An employment area to be established along the Cordite Avenue/Raleigh Road
frontage;

- A town centre (called a Hub) to be situated along the main access road and the No. 57 tram line extended to serve it. The Hub would be a mixed use area containing some high density housing and a range of community uses;
- Other strategies affecting the land included investigating a new road and bridge crossing to Essendon West and the more general strategies pertaining to housing and the river valley (Maribyrnong Planning Scheme 2010).

The strategies of the MSS were based on a specific study of the site adopted by the City of Maribyrnong in 1999: Directions for Future Land Use and Development- Commonwealth Department of Defence Land Maribyrnong- August 1999 (Maribyrnong City Council 1999b). These ‘directions’ or strategies give more specific guidance to the likely development of the land although they have no status other than being a reference document in the Planning Scheme (City of Maribyrnong 2003).

Remediation of the site is being undertaken by the Commonwealth Department of Defence and the land is proposed to be transferred to Places Victoria. The site will be remediated to standards set by the Victorian Environmental Protection Authority (VEPA), in accordance with the Heritage Management Plan prepared from an integrated heritage assessment (Foresite Ltd n.d.) under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Vic Urban 2010).

Community involvement was not apparent during the site characterisation phase of the project (2000-2005), other than consultants to the Department of Defence choosing people to interview with respect to heritage matters. However, there are references to meetings with the Department of Defence project managers in this period when they were actively seeking information for the characterisation studies. There was also some contact with people by consultants especially during the heritage study to discover how people worked at the factories including Koori people’s involvement.

Local community participation

The only major community event was an open day in 2004 when buses took people over the site and experts provided information. Subsequently, an open forum was provided by the principal consultants at the City of Maribyrnong town hall to further describe the
studies that took place on the site including heritage and site contamination assessments. Very little progress was made for some time but then with the change to the Rudd Federal Government, a public meeting was conducted in March 2008 by Bill Shorten, MHR sitting member for Maribyrnong. This provided an update on disposal of the land to Vic Urban (now Places Victoria), decontamination and other impinging issues for the Commonwealth including the provision of affordable housing.

In September 2009, Vic Urban began a community consultation process with a workshop at Maribyrnong RSL, attended by the author, which involved mostly residents of the area. There was brainstorming on a number of fixed topics such as employment, the river, sustainability, etc. A break-out small group method using butter paper and post-it notes was used to collect people’s thoughts on the night. This was the beginning of a visioning process for the land.

Vic Urban’s initial approach to the community was advertised in the local and cultural press; 17,500 households in Maribyrnong and adjoining suburbs were letterboxed with printed pamphlets that were also disseminated from Council and MP’s offices. A two day display was held at Highpoint Shopping Centre that 150 people visited. Three stakeholders’ forums were held for the community, businesses and youth and there was an information day, the Minister attending along with 70 members of the public (Vic Urban 2010).

Vic Urban prepared a draft shared vision after receiving 109 written submissions. The draft vision was circulated and meetings held with key stakeholders and further displays mounted at Highpoint Shopping Centre and the Maribyrnong Community Centre. The Shared Vision is attached as Appendix 7.6.

Vic Urban has identified that the site is particularly important as a major infill project (DPCD 2008). It estimates that the site could accommodate about 3,000 dwellings dependent on the outcome of Phase 2, the master planning process. It also points out that at least 25% of all dwellings will be affordable to low and middle income people (Vic Urban 2010). It will seek community and stakeholder ‘input’ through public information displays, feedback and workshops with local groups and businesses (Vic Urban 2010). However there is currently no reference to a standing committee involving residents or
engagement in locally-generated activities such as a local fair similar to that carried out at Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks.

The planning of the site with its three kilometre edge with the River will need to be cognoscente to the Government’s shared vision for the River (DPCD 2010).

Progress has been made with the decontamination of the Site. Community consultations by geo-technical engineering consultants were conducted in 2012 and August 2013 when it was explained the methods to be employed in the remediation works about to get underway. (Dept. of Defence 2013, Golder 2013).

7.5 Conclusions about the case study sites

The description of the estates shows that they are suitable places to provide answers to the research question. More specifically, it shows that there are both differences and similarities presenting useful data in making findings on the research question.

The similarities which allow the comparisons are those which determined the selection of the case studies in the first instance namely their large size, similar public ownership, need to decontaminate the site, and the requirement for planning processes that could enable local communities to become involved (Chapter 5). The differences include the era and political circumstances in which the planning, design and development of each estate occurred, and the ‘place’ relationships with existing communities having regard to the land’s physical as well as the local community’s socio-economic situation. This mixture of similarities and differences provide a basis upon which further research was conducted to address the research question.
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Chapter 8 - Urban design analysis of the case studies

The purpose of the urban design analysis is to evaluate the urban design characteristics of each of the developed estates to determine their strengths and weaknesses. This analysis will complement the assessment of the responses of participants in Chapter 9. It consists of a ‘Visual Form Analysis’ after Lynch (1960) and a written critique of the developed/developing estates under specific elements of urban design expressed by Bentleigh et al. (1985), and Watson, et al. (2003) and for Australia, McMahon in Thompson and Maginn (2012), and the Victorian Government’s Urban Design Charter and planning schemes’ State Planning Policy Framework (Appendix 8.1).

This analysis relates only to the three developed or developing estates. The participant interviews for the Defence Site Maribyrnong could not consider these as design has not progressed to a point where even notional layouts have been prepared.

8.1 Visual form analysis

Lynch’s analysis classification contains five elements which are, in turn, divided into major and minor elements making ten in all. They are Paths, Edges, Districts and Nodes. Districts have not been plotted here as, generally, they need to be part of a larger area analysis, but there is later reference to potential districts or districts that straddle a case study. Lynch’s definitions for the elements are incorporated in the box below.

DEFINITIONS OF LYNCH’S VISUAL FORM CLASSIFICATION

“Paths: Paths are the channels along which the observer customarily, occasionally or potentially moves. They may be streets, walkways, transit lines, canals, railroads.

Edges: Edges are the linear elements not used or considered as paths by the observer. They are the boundaries between two phases (sic. parts), linear breaks in continuity: shore, railroad cuttings, edges of development, walls. They are lateral references rather than coordinate axes.

Districts: Districts are the medium-to-large sections of the city ... which the observer mentally enters ‘inside of’, and which are recognizable as having some common, identifying character. ... They are also used for external reference if visible from the outside.

Nodes: Nodes are points, the strategic spots in a city into which an observer can enter, and which are the intensive foci to and from which he is travelling. They may be primarily junctions, places in a break of transportation, a crossing or convergence of paths, movements or shifts from one structure to another. Or the nodes may be simply concentrations, which gain their importance from being the condensation of some use or physical character, as a street corner hangout or as an enclosed square.

Landmarks: Landmarks are another type of point-reference, but in this case the observer does not enter into them; they are external. They are usually a rather simply defined object: building, sign, store or mountain. Their use involves the singling out of one element of a host of possibilities.” (Lynch 1960 pp.47-48)
The elements are drawn for the three developed estates to produce a simplified visual form analysis. The ‘path’ element has been split for this research into pedestrian/cycle paths and vehicular paths. All the analyses use the same symbols as expressed in the legend below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual Form Legend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Element
- Vehicular
- Pedestrian

Minor Element

A reflection here is that the Built Form Analyses is both subjective and simplistic. For example, numerous pedestrian routes as well as vehicle routes provide combined pedestrian and vehicular access which are not shown as ‘paths’. There can also be variable interpretations of their status depending on whether the person is an external observer (like the author), a resident of the estate or an observer who extensively uses one of the elements such as a walkway leading to the Maribyrnong River Valley. Nevertheless, the graphic presentation does provide an initial appreciation of each estate and the basis for the analysis which accompanies each map.

8.1.1 Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks

Fig 8.1 Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks Visual Form Analysis (After Lynch 1960). Base material supplied May 2013, Courtesy Land Vic™.
The analysis shows that the estate is well connected to Old Kensington (around Kensington Village) for pedestrians but less so for vehicles where there is only one access point into old Kensington for Kensington Banks People. Likewise, there is discontinuity for vehicles over the linear stock-route there being only one crossing provided in Kensington Banks, although the secondary stock-route is crossed at three points.

The two major landmarks are different from one another: the one on the northwest (left) being a high-rise apartment block rising above a large open space and the one on the northeast (right) a complex of remnant saleyards and the administrative building, with its distinctive historic clock tower, now used for the Community High School. Minor landmarks include the stock bridge over the Maribyrnong River, now part of the pedestrian cycle network joining Kensington to the river trail system; the gateway buildings to the former Melbourne City Abattoirs, now refurbished as apartments; the distinctive semi-circular apartments (colloquially known as Bath Crescent) which form a visible juncture between the main northern access road and the stock-route linear pedestrian route. The other subtle but important landmark is the underpass of Epsom Road where murals depict the history of the area, from times when Koori peoples were the only inhabitants of the area through until its use as saleyards and abattoirs.

There are no major nodes but the small activity centre near the junction of Smithfield Road and Gatehouse Drive has some significance for Kensington Banks as do the small spaces along or next to the trail system which, left to right are, Riverside Park, the central space between the semi-circular apartments, Peppercorn Park and The Womens Peace Garden.

Edges are only dominant in three places: along the River; the Smithfield Road border where it is a minor edge where the backs of houses abut Smithfield Road penetrated by some pedestrian access points and; thirdly, along Epsom Road where most dwellings obtain access from the rear or side streets. This has limited ‘cell development’ to a reasonable minimum and elsewhere the new estates are, arguably, well integrated with Old Kensington.

Overall, there is a pleasing spread of both minor nodes and landmarks which provide some progression and interest through Kensington Banks. This progression appears to be somewhat lost in Lynch’s Bridge and the bottom left part of Kensington Banks.
Edgewater is well connected to the residential areas to its west and south (left and bottom) with the singular exception of a continuous row of three storey terraces which block movements over Gordon Street in the north western part of the estate. Ascot Vale is also separated by the Maribyrnong River which presents a major edge. The other edges are internal being the massive surrounding walls of Jack’s Magazine and the lesser edges formed at the top and bottom of the escarpment.

The key landmarks are Jack’s Magazine and Edgewater Lake and its surrounds, which include the Maribyrnong River. The lake and river form a united area of open space, which could be described as a ‘District’ that is contiguous along the Valley including all the public lands on both sides of the River.

The most striking aspect of the analysis is the central axis which provides both vehicular and pedestrian access between the activity centre and Edgewater Lake, the River open space and the Maribyrnong River Trail. While the minor nodes of the activity centre are split by Edgewater Boulevard they are nearly coincidental with some minor landmarks, two of which are still to be built, which point to the activity centre as a node, a place of gathering. Likewise, the lakeside mid-rise identifies the local activities about the cafes.
and lakeside leisure interests and provides a node for the residents located in the lower part of the estate.

The analysis shows that, away from the central spine of Edgewater Boulevard/Cumberland Drive, there are very few nodes or landmarks. These parts of the estate resemble the homogeneous residential area, typical of Australian city suburbs.

The most contentious element is the pedestrian/cycle system that has to negotiate the steep 14% ruling grade of the escarpment. This has been successfully resolved in the Jack’s Wood area by diagonal paths built across the grade, but it has not been properly resolved further to the south where stairways and steep ramps are the only access provided between the top and bottom lands. North of Jack’s Magazine, the pedestrian system has not yet been constructed.

### 8.1.3 Waterford Green

![Waterford Green Visual Form Analysis](image)

*Fig 8.3 Waterford Green Visual Form Analysis (after Lynch 1960). Base material supplied May 2013, Courtesy Land Vic™.*

What is immediately apparent is the ‘cell’ development of Waterford Green, created by the major edges of the River, development backing onto main roads, and the mostly impenetrable tilt slabs of the Highpoint low intensity retail precinct. Waterford Green appears to be a very isolated place where the only connections to other places are by road
or the minor pedestrian ways using local streets to Highpoint Shopping Centre and a steep trail from the residential area to its south (bottom left of map).

Unlike Edgewater, the estate’s nodes and landmarks are not coincident. There are two groupings of minor landmarks: the historic, ex-administrative buildings of the ordnance works and military barracks in the southeast (bottom right); and the ex-Second World War mid-rise drafting offices in the northeast (top right). These are remote from the minor nodes of river activities and playground activities of the open space called Waterford Green and the activity centre in the southeast (bottom right). There are no major nodes. The closest major node is Highpoint Principal Activity Centre about 400 metres to the east.

A difference in the grain of lot sizes is apparent in the eastern side of the estate which is part of the estate developed with compact housing (Referred to as Waterford Gardens in 7.3.3). This is part of the estate may be a different place to the western part of Waterford Green. It may be a rather small ‘district’ as defined by Lynch.

The central and south-eastern part of the estate is flat with a regular street and lot pattern. The lack of any landmarks or nodes makes this part of the estate homogeneous.

8.2 Urban design elements

This part of the chapter consists of a written critique of the developed/developing estates under specific elements of urban design using typology analysis of Bentleigh et al. (1985), and Watson, et al. (2003) and for Australia McMahon in Thompson and Maginn (2012). While the techniques vary between these authors, there was some similarity in what characteristics should be assessed. The following characteristics have been chosen:

1. Place (context with surrounds and internal districts);
2. Permeability (connectivity);
3. Legibility (character and landmarks);
4. Access (fronts and backs);
5. Variety (adaptation of buildings and places);
6. Use of space (roads and public open spaces); and
7. Activity centres (gathering and meeting in central places).
These elements are not separate from the Built Form Analysis. Both the built form and urban design analyses shall be discussed together in the Findings to this Chapter.

Some of the words used have a technical meaning and are defined in the box below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITIONS FOR URBAN DESIGN ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong> in this research means a readily identifiable area of urban development that is distinguishable from other ‘places’ due to its physical separation, layout, land use, density, local movement, self-contained community assets (e.g. schools, activity centres, recreational assets) or socio-economic standing (being usually a selection of these). Lynch’s ‘District’ would constitute a separate place. From this definition it can be seen that it is possible to have, through various combinations, an almost infinite variety of places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permeability</strong> refers to the density of the public realm (streets, lanes and open spaces) which enables a person, whether on foot, bicycle or in a motor vehicle to traverse an area. When a place has a lot of connections in all directions it said to have a ‘fine grain’. Usually it is the aim of urban design to achieve fine grained connectivity both within an area and with adjoining places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legibility</strong> is the ability for a person to sense how they can reach a destination with ease. This is a quality that depends not only on ‘permeability’ but on a range of sensory devices, often called signifiers. These include landmarks, the character of an area’s spaces including building typologies, the terrain and the mixture of land uses with distinctive forms and activities. These differences in the landscape of a place lead to parts of it becoming memorable and distinctive thus acting as signposts enabling people to navigate to their destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to buildings</strong>: If buildings across the public realm face one another there is less confusion about how they can be accessed. So the common standard for design is to have ‘fronts to fronts’ and ‘backs to backs’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variety</strong> is one of the qualities that enhance legibility but also has the ability to improve the interest and level of public activity in a defined space. Variety can be achieved in the careful selection of elevation materials for buildings, spatial arrangements of buildings and the dimensions and scale of spaces. It is also improved by ground level activity within the public realm where there is a mixture of uses that support the community; and by landscaping the public realm to make opportunities for unstructured activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a high degree of overlap with these elements and this is inevitable as, for example, the extent of connectivity, landmarks and variety affect the meaning of ‘place’. Essentially, there can be no simple starting point in urban design analysis and so Table 8.1 has been produced which allows cross checking:
Table 8.1 Urban design characteristics of each estate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Design Characteristic</th>
<th>Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks</th>
<th>Edgewater</th>
<th>Waterford Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(a) Place (Integration with surrounding communities)</td>
<td>Generally well integrated for pedestrians but restricted for vehicles. Cell development on main roads but with pedestrian permeability provided</td>
<td>Very well connected to the south and west and connected to the north and south through the parklands for pedestrians and cyclists. Little ‘cell’ development.</td>
<td>Poorly connected to the south residential area and to the east where there is industry and Highpoint Shopping Centre and north where there is cell development which will diminish integration with the Defence Site when redeveloped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(b) Place (internal integration)</td>
<td>Well integrated for pedestrians and cyclists but poor in Kensington Banks for motor vehicles due to only one crossing of the linear park.</td>
<td>Generally very good, but the escarpment treatment limits both pedestrians and cyclists because of steep grades and there is only one road from the top levels to the fill platform.</td>
<td>Generally good but the location of the shops and poorly sited and shapes of open spaces are a drawback to potentially better integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Permeability (Connectivity within the estate)</td>
<td>Poor between Kensington Banks and Lynch’s Bridge for vehicles but good for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
<td>Very few points in the layout where there is a problem but some block lengths could be shorter for added permeability.</td>
<td>Several blocks could have been shortened for better cross connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Legibility (including character and landmarks)</td>
<td>Good, although location of the major landmark (high rise block) could have been better thought through to coincide with the activity centre.</td>
<td>Generally very good but there is a question about the unfinished development on the escarpment.</td>
<td>Moderately poor due to: the boring nature of the architecture; repetitive street layout; the off centre adapted buildings; mid-rise apartments with no active frontages; and the off-centre shopping centre with ambiguous pedestrian access to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Access to buildings (fronts and backs)</td>
<td>Good. Back ‘mews’ built onto widened spaces and given adequate identity.</td>
<td>Just a couple of places where fronts and backs are mixed up.</td>
<td>Poor in parts of the medium density area in its east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Variety (Adaptation of buildings and places; careful attention to detail)</td>
<td>Sound adaptation of the saleyards and the stock routes which provide an historic patina for the estate. Much internal variety in the architecture and layout. More limited variety in later stages of development.</td>
<td>While Jack’s Magazine is preserved and some of the early 20th Century buildings have been adapted, the ammunition factory has been removed. This is despite the mixed use concept of the Physical Framework Plan.</td>
<td>Good adaptation has protected some of the Army and ordnance factory pasts. Unfortunately, all manufacturing buildings have been destroyed including a very significant forging works. This is despite the mixed use concept of the Physical Framework Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Spaces for unstructured and active pursuits (recreational use of the public realm)</td>
<td>The linear parks are the strongest attribute which provide good access for pedestrians and cyclists to a range of activities. These spaces provide visual relief to a reasonably intensive development as well as provide recreation for the wider Kensington, Footscray and Flemington communities.</td>
<td>The strongpoint of the estate, provides a range of activities for residents and Maribyrnong and Footscray communities as well as the wider western suburbs populace. The spaces are legible and accessible by car as well as foot/bicycle.</td>
<td>The river open space is barely adequate for the regional importance of the River. The linear parks are generally unusable being too narrow with no community facilities. The original concept of one wide linear park down its centre has been lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 The activity centres (gathering and meeting in central spaces)</td>
<td>The Smithfield Road centre is highway oriented and saps any footfall and energy that an internal space may have achieved. It lacks any community uses and the SOHO development does not have active frontages.</td>
<td>The activity centre is disintegrated by car parks and offers little opportunity for unstructured activities. However, it acts as a central place for the wider area and has the future opportunity of recreating itself because of its location. People on the fill platform below have convenience shopping there.</td>
<td>The centre is highway focussed and caters poorly for pedestrians offering no spaces for them. It is off centre which allows little pedestrian accessibility for some residents. Pedestrian access is ambiguous. The only community use in the area, a child care centre, is located several hundred metres away.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3 Urban Design Findings

The following is a synthesis of Table 8.1 above and the Built Form Analysis, looking at each case study and assessing what could have been achieved to improve aspects of each estate. A Photo Gallery annexed to the end of this Chapter provides examples for the text. References to Table 8.1 are shown by the Table row number.

**Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks**

Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks is, first and foremost, a carefully constructed estate that has been well integrated into Old Kensington. Its main drawback in terms of both internal (Table 8.1:1a) and external permeability (Table 8.1:1b) is the lack of connectivity for motor vehicle users (Photos 1-2). This could be corrected as there are opportunities to provide such access across the main divider- the main Stock Route. Legibility within the estate is good (Table 8.1:3), aided by a variety of house styles and typologies (Table 8.1:5) (Photos 3-4), however, an opportunity appears to have been lost with the location of the major building (Photo 12) away from the small activity centre in Smithfield Road.

Attention to detail (Table 8.1:5) is a significant attribute of the estate and this is well shown through the development of spaces called ‘The Mews’ (Photo 5). Another detail which provides variety and interest is the treatment of the Stock Route through the use of stock rails (Table 8.1:5) (Photo 1) and the historic murals painted on the Epsom Road underpass abutments (Table 8.1.5) (Photo 6). The old Stock Route linear park and accessory spaces such as the Womens Peace Park and Peppermint Park provide a fascinating sequencing along and close to the route (Table 8.1: 5 & 6). The use of a coincident node and landmark is used to good effect to connect the Stock Route with the small activity centre along the main axis road (Table 8.1:3, Photo7). Other landmarks (Table 8.1:3) are well located to achieve an interesting progression for pedestrians and cyclists (Photo 8).

Heritage protection has been achieved through retention of the stock routes and peppercorn trees, the gatehouse to the previous abattoirs and the administrative building and clock tower in Racecourse Road and the past illustrated by the previously mentioned mural and stock rails (Table 8.1:5, Photos 8 & 9).

The main failure of Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks is the lack of an activity centre designed to encourage pedestrian activity including unstructured interactions for residents.
(Table 8.1:7, Photos 10-11). The centre, being off centre, is ill-defined without a landmark and more attention to the massing of buildings may have overcome this. For example the shifting of the mid-high-rise or a similar ‘bulking up’ of development may have achieved a 24/7 presence with ‘eyes on the street’ if it was coincident with the activity centre (Photo 12).

**Edgewater**

Edgewater is a place that fits well physically with the old fabric of Footscray to its south and the southern part of Maribyrnong to its west (Table 8.1:1a). Internally, it is split by the escarpment of the Valley from the old flood plain now raised in parts by a fill platform used for housing (Table 8.1: 1b). This division makes for some connection challenges which are, in part, resolved by cross slope paths (Photo 13) but elsewhere the escarpment is only crossed via steps and steep paths (Table 8.1: 2). The only way for vehicles to get from the high part to the low parts of the estate is via Edgewater Boulevard. This steep 14% rise makes it impractical for many pedestrians and cyclists to use comfortably (Table 8.1: 2). On the other hand, the boulevard permits a strong visual axis within the estate, connecting the low area to the high area. This is reinforced by the major landmarks of Edgewater Lake and the River and several minor landmarks along this spine. These coincide with focal points of activity which makes this part of the estate highly legible (Table 8.1: 3, Photos 14 & 15).

The layout of the estate has some regularity that, similar to Kensington Banks, could have been designed to achieve more interest as has happened in the northern part of the lower area where the location of the lake, escarpment and Jack’s Magazine have demanded a more complex layout (Table 8.1: 5) (Photo 16). But the variety of the architecture makes most streetscapes interesting and distinguishable from one another (Photo 34). Variety has also been achieved through the innovative use of compact housing and the development of small sets of town and terrace housing, some being of Delfin Lend Lease’s distinctive ‘warehouse’ style (Table 8.1: 5, Photo 17). Attention to detail within the context of a design guidelines framework and the Further Development Plan’s built form based code has produced a good arrangement of well organised space and is sufficiently different to create interest and variety (Table 8.1: 5). There are some places where more attention to detail would have avoided ‘fronts to backs’ problems (Table 8.1: 4, Photo 17).
Despite being narrowed by residential development, the residual flood plain is still an impressive swath of land that, with Edgewater Lake and the River with surrounding parkland on both its sides, provides a major regional parkland from 300-500 metres wide (Photo 18). This area is sufficiently large and significant in its own right to be considered a separate place or ‘district’: Maribyrnong Regional Parklands, according to Lynch’s built form analysis (Table 8.1: 6, Photo 18). The connections from this district into the estate are sound and help strengthen the seam between the two. For example, the lakeside mid-rise (Table 8.1: 3) indicates the availability of restaurants and cafés for wayfarers moving along the Maribyrnong River Valley (Table 8.1: 3, Photo 19). The visual link from the Valley is continued with the development of mid-rise apartments at the brow of the escarpment (Photo 20) and other massive buildings such as the ‘Western Bulldogs’ hotel and gaming centre (to be built).

While the activity centre’s location on the top-lands is very well situated to serve the estate and a wider area to its west and south, it has a disintegrated layout that copes well with vehicular traffic but which is not in favour of pedestrians (Table 8.1: 7, Photo 21). Furthermore, it has provided very poorly for any central unstructured activities which would make it a place for human interaction. The only space for this is outside three shops next to the supermarket (Photo 22). Attention to design detail and using the design principle of spatial containment for human activity in the public realm may have created a ‘true’ space for people. The centre’s low density (and therefore low capitalisation), together with the availability of surrounding car parks, open space and its location on the tram route between Highpoint Principal Activity Centre and Footscray Central Activity District makes it possible to redevelop the centre as a mixed use and more intensively used place in the future.

**Waterford Green**

In contrast to both Edgewater and Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks, Waterford Green is an isolated place made more so by the ‘cell development’ that could have been avoided along Wests Road and Cordite Avenue (Photo 23) and which could have been ameliorated by better connections to the south. It can be described as a separate place (Table 8.1:1a). The eastern part of the estate is largely medium-high density apartments, many with ‘fronts to backs’ confusion (Photo 24). This is a different character to the rest of the estate which is mostly detached housing and terraces (Photo 25), and can be
described as a different place not only because of its typology but also by its socio-economic standing (See Table to Appendix 7.4).

Internally, the estate is more permeable although North to South access is poor in its north due to very long block lengths of up to 190 metres (Photos 26-27). Also the apartment area has a character which does not lead to pleasant permeability. Pedestrians may feel they are within a ‘privatised’ space (Photo 28), or are forced to walk on roadway (Photo 24). This is an example of ‘town cramming’ that is not an acceptable outcome for either the public or occupants.

The location of landmarks (Table 8.1: 3) does not coincide or act as signifiers for specific community uses such as the proposed ‘activity centre’ once the proposed location adjacent to the old RAFA parade ground now a hidden part of the estate (Photo 29). This dislocation does not provide the visitor with any clues about central places and where they are located. The minor landmarks are not places of public assembly but rather ‘remnants’ of the past now used homogeneously for apartments (Photo 30).

Variety (Table 8.1: 5) in that part of the estate along the Wests Road frontage is very good where the Ordnance Factory’s administration building and the RAFA barracks have been transformed into apartments (Photos 31-32). Elsewhere, variety is lacking, particularly for the housing where, whilst every house is dissimilar in detail, they as a group do not provide any clues about location. This is to be compared with a carefully designed and therefore generally memorable set of buildings at Edgewater (Photos 33-34).

The open spaces (Table 8.1: 6) both in distribution and function are similarly disappointing. They have become remnant linear spaces that do little for the landscape and have virtually no functionality (Photos 25 & 26). A comparison with the original concept shows that the planned linear park has been substituted for wide verges in several streets. This has removed the possibility of having a series of nodes for varying recreational purposes, and is costly to maintain, and reduces access to fronting houses.

The activity centre (Table 8.1: 7) has been located at the extreme south-east corner of the estate and is quite remote from much of Waterford Green’s population. It faces outwards to the main road in a quadrant that provides adequately for motor cars but is very poor for pedestrian communication as line-of-sight is severely reduced and there are no spaces that
would aid congregation or casual activity. Pedestrian access to the shops is along laneways that are ambiguous and have no priority as walkways (Photos 35 & 36).

8.4 Conclusion

This Chapter has analysed the three developed case study sites from a planimetric standpoint using Lynch’s 1960 ‘Visual Form Analysis’ and then, using the schema of Bentley et al and others, there is further analysis of each estate. The photo gallery illustrates these elements (Photos 1-36). The analysis shows:

Integration with surrounding places: Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks and Edgewater are well integrated with their surrounding residential areas for pedestrians. Kensington Banks is split in two for vehicles by the Stock Route. Waterford Green is very isolated, first by previous development conditions, particularly by Highpoint’s low intensity retailing to its east, but second, by turning its back to the surrounding main street system and future development to its north.

Permeability: Edgewater has good permeability although this is limited for people traversing the escarpment. While solved by cross-grade paths at Jack’s Wood, other parts of the escarpment appear to have much less permeability due to limited access via steep paths with stairs. Internal permeability for pedestrians is very adequate for Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks but not so for vehicles and, for car travel, the place will be conceived by motorists as three separate internal cells of Lynch’s Bridge, Kensington Banks (first stages north of the Stock Route) and Kensington Banks (later stages south of the Stock Route).

Legibility: Legibility is worst at Waterford Green where the most important buildings in terms of heritage and scale are landmarks adapted for housing without providing any community activity at ground level. This was an opportunity lost. On the other hand, Edgewater has adapted some of the original buildings in its activity centre, and further landmark buildings that are built or are in the process of construction coincide with, or are located close to, local nodes producing a high degree of legibility. This legibility is further aided by the powerful element of Edgewater Boulevard which visually connects the top-lands with the lower fill platform on the former floodplain. Kensington Banks has some good legibility, helped particularly by the coincidence of the semi-circular ‘Bath
Terrace’ and a node in the Stock Route linear park. This linear park is made more legible by the open spaces and features along or close by it.

**Variety** in housing is evident at both Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks and Edgewater and this creates further legibility and interest for these two places. Waterford Green, however, provides much less variety because of its regular street pattern and uninteresting, sometimes grotesque, architecture.

**Access:** There is little confusion about access to housing in Edgewater and none to speak of at Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks. The confusion of backs to fronts at Waterford Green is particularly bad in the higher density eastern part of the estate.

**Open spaces** of all scales and shapes abound at Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks which provides an ambience of inner Melbourne and many formal and informal recreation opportunities. Edgewater also has the advantage of adding to the Maribyrnong River Valley’s already considerable recreation assets in the vicinity; connectivity and integration (physical and visual) with the estate provides an open ambience to the place. Waterford Green’s open spaces are insufficient in area and depth to protect the River Valley as a regional open space system; and the other open spaces are squandered through designing them as narrow linear spaces that are hard to maintain and too narrow to use for recreational activities.

All **activity centres** have failed to develop into places where there are pedestrian spaces that promote both formal and informal activities and therefore there is no sense that any of the centres are ‘buzzing’. Kensington Banks centre, facing Smithfield Road has taken away footfall from Gatehouse Street and the opposite SOHO has not been designed with active frontages where business activities can be part of the streetscape. Waterford Green’s shops face away from the estate, are not centrally located and, worse still, the design reduces its capability of being a space for people’s activities. Finally, Edgewater’s centre is dispersed by car parking and has only a residual space for people to gather. It has the potential to become a better centre with people spaces in due course due to its location and the possibility of redevelopment of the car parks and present low intensity development.

The analysis in this Chapter will now be used to compare the results of participant responses about urban design in the next Chapter.
Photo Gallery

All photographs are the author’s. The Southing and Easting can be used to fly down to investigate the scene using the ‘Street View’ facility on Google Earth™ or similar GIS.

Lynch’s Bridge- Kensington Banks

PHOTO 1: Roads which end at the Stock Route providing pedestrians with good permeability but not for car and truck drivers [Towards Northeast: 37º 47’ 31” S, 144º 55’ 19” E].

PHOTO 2: The only crossing of the Stock Route is a narrow one lane road. This may be good for free passage of pedestrians along the Stock Route but means that local vehicular trips are overly restricted. [Towards Northwest 37º 47’ 41” S, 144º 55’ 07” E]

PHOTO 3: The variety of housing displayed at Kensington Banks and its arrangement allows the resident and traveller to identify their place and orientation in the estate and provides variety in the landscape [Towards East 37º 47’ 35” S, 144º 55’ 10” E].

PHOTO 4: Immediately opposite Photo 3. These are more distinctly different buildings. The two Morton Bay Fig-trees are very local signifiers in the estate not shown in the built form analysis [Towards West 37º 47’ 35” S, 144º 55’ 10” E].
PHOTO 5: Musgrove Mews at Kensington Banks: a well-defined space which has a broad outlook for fronting bed-sit and one bedroom ‘singles’ units. This design overcomes the backs to fronts issue while still retaining a moderately high density. [Towards Northwest, 37º 47’ 31” S, 144º 55’ 12” E]

PHOTO 6: The stock-route underpass, called ‘the back door’ at Epsom Road where many millions of sheep and cattle were drafted after sale to be trucked to other places or slaughtered in nearby abattoirs. The mosaic depicts the history of the place. The underpass now connects pedestrians and cyclists moving between Lynch's Bridge and Kensington Banks. [Towards South. 37º 47” 25” S, 144º 55’ 26” E].
PHOTO 7: ‘Bath Crescent’ as it is commonly known, provides a key transition from the shared vehicular and pedestrian Gatehouse Drive, which leads to the activity centre in Smithfield Drive, (foreground) and the Stock Route linear park. It is a landmark at the junction between the urban space and the historic linear space [Towards South- 37º 47’ 35” S, 144º 55’ 10” E].

PHOTO 8: The clock-tower of the old Newmarket Saleyards administration building. This is a small but significant historic landmark whose preservation recalls the past use of the site. The building is now used as a community school. [Towards South, 37º 47’ 32” S, 144º 55’ 32” E].
PHOTO 9: The Maribyrnong River Stock Bridge, once used to draft sheep and cattle to abattoirs in Footscray. It is now the connecting pedestrian/cycle path to Footscray and the Maribyrnong River Trail (foreground). This is a good example of adaptation of a robust structure, a landmark that signifies the entrance to Kensington Banks. [Towards South, 37º 47' 47" S, 144º 54' 52" E]

PHOTO 10: Shops in Gatehouse Drive lack ‘energy and footfall’ because they face away from this street to the highway oriented frontages of Smithfield Road [Towards North, 37º 47’ 31” S, 144º 55’ 11” E]

PHOTO 11: The SOHO development opposite in Gatehouse Drive is a design failure and does not contribute to central activity. These frontages can hardly be called ‘active’ as you cannot see what goes on behind the facade. [Towards North, 37º 47” 31” S, 144º 55’ 11” E]
PHOTO 12: The high to mid-rise apartments at the SW corner of Kensington Banks that adjoin the Riverside Park. This is the largest landmark on the estate yet it is not at the village centre. The ground floor only provides for a small restaurant. The stock-bridge in Photo 9 is directly behind the camera position [Towards North 37° 47' 39" S, 144° 55' 12" E].

Edgewater

PHOTO 13: The cross slope paths of Jack’s Wood allow pedestrians to climb comfortably up the escarpment at Edgewater. This is part of the escarpment that adjoins historic Jack’s Magazine and is given over to public open space. Views of Melbourne’s city centre can be seen in the distance. Other parts of the escarpment are now crowded out with medium-high density housing with few views from roads and providing only staircases or indirect access to lower levels. [Towards South 37° 47' 01" S, 144° 53' 41" E].
PHOTO 14: Edgewater Boulevard. Looking from the fill platform up the escarpment to Edgewater Place. The building is that shown in Photo 20. [Towards West, 37º 47’ 08” S, 144º 53’ 53” E].

PHOTO 15: Edgewater Boulevard from near the rim of the escarpment looking down to the fill platform, Edgewater Lake and the Maribyrnong River. Near the mid-rise in Photo 20 [Towards East, 37º 47’ 06” S, 144º 53’ 34” E].

PHOTO 16: Good permeability achieved through the development of small ‘pocket parks’ which connect roads and rear laneways - Northern part of the fill platform. [Towards East, 37º 47’ 02” S, 144º 53’ 49” E]

PHOTO 17: The warehouse units to the right provide an alternative to both apartment and detached house living. In this instance, they front the backs of other houses, a layout that is unlikely to engender a neighbourly situation. [Looking South, 37º 47’ 02” S, 144º 53’ 49” E]

PHOTO 18: The spaciousness of the estate is achieved by the development of Edgewater Lake and a large set-back of buildings from the Maribyrnong River corridor. Edgewater Lake (seven hectares) is seen here together with mid-rise apartments. [Towards North, 37º 47’ 20” S, 144º 53’ 09” E]

PHOTO 19: The mid-rise development adjacent to Edgewater Lake. This is the most important building landmark in the fill platform area. The ground floor contains a restaurant café and convenience shop [Towards East 37º 47’ 11” S, 144º 54’ 04” E].
PHOTO 20: The mid-rise apartments in Edgewater Boulevard, seen in Photo 14, on the edge of the escarpment. These, together with the proposed six storey apartments with ground level shops opposite, will provide a strong nearby landmark to Edgewater Place, the activity centre, that is less than 100 metres distant. [Towards Southeast 37° 47’ 07” S, 144° 53’ 38” E].

PHOTO 21: The ALDI Supermarket and three shops separated by car park and roads from other parts Edgewater Place [Towards Northeast, 37° 47’ 05” S, 144° 53’ 29” E].

PHOTO 22: The only concession to public space for pedestrians is outside the shops which adjoin the ALDI supermarket. [Towards North, 37° 47’ 05” S, 144° 53’ 53” E].
PHOTO 23: Cell development at Waterford Green. Here at the edge of the estate, the residences face away from the road. This type of cell development denies the possibility that, one day, the neighbourhood of Waterford Green and a new one on the Defence Site Maribyrnong (to right) will be integrated. Integration is especially important as Waterford Green residents will rely on local shopping and other local needs on a centre on the Defence Site. The better solution would have been to front housing onto this road (Cordite Ave) and to provide rear vehicular access. [Towards South, 37° 46’ 58” S, 144° 52’ 57” E].

PHOTO 24: This uninspiring but named lane is about seven metres wide. This is a ‘front’ for the houses on the right while it is the ‘back’ for houses on the left. It is not much better than ‘by-law housing’. The rear of the units to the right face a similar concrete space for garages. [Towards South, 37° 45’ 22” S, 144° 52’ 49” E].

PHOTO 25: The western part of Waterford Green is low density detached houses (left) and terraces (right). A double row of trees masquerades as a linear park. Four of these unusable and high maintenance strips replaced the linear park of the original Physical Framework Plan. [Towards East, 37° 46’ 24” S, 144° 52’ 42” E].
PHOTO 26: Village Way linear park has no intersecting access for 190 metres. This makes it a park without many customers. Note the poor quality of the landscaping and lack of community facilities. Visitors and residents have to walk over no-mans-land to reach their cars. [Towards West, 37º 46' 16" S, 144º 52' 46" E].

PHOTO 27: Seagull lane: ‘Shotgun Alley’. This lane is directly behind Village Way and therefore is without any cross connections for vehicles or pedestrians for its entire length. [Towards West, 37º 46’ 14” S, 144º 52’ 47” E].

PHOTO 28: Fronts to fronts along a pedestrian lane which is access to the Parade Ground open space. Access to Village Way, the connecting street, is only three metres wide. The backs of these houses are to a fully concreted lane sharing access to other 2-3 storied buildings. At this scale the public realm is overwhelmed by the liminal space between the footpath and the buildings’ edges. [Towards South, 37º 45’ 18” S, 144º 52’ 50” E].

PHOTO 29: The Parade Ground open space. The surrounding development is residential that allows minimal accessibility along lanes (Photo 28) and whilst permeable by foot is not legible from any surrounding streets. The square and original buildings were initially planned to be adjacent to or part of the estate’s activity centre. [Towards South, 37º 46’ 20” S, 144º 52’ 52” E].
PHOTO 30: This view shows two adapted and extended defence ex-drafting offices, now all apartments. While the largest and most significant buildings at Waterford Green, they have no active frontages and ground space is privatised. Note the overflow car parking indicating under-provision in the area. [Towards Northeast, 37º 45' 16" S, 144º 52' 46" E].

PHOTO 31: The Ordnance Factory administration building now converted into apartments. This is a very sensitive treatment of space and adaptation of a heritage minor landmark. Contrast this with Photo 24, located just behind this building. [Towards South, 37º 46' 23" S, 144º 55' 52" E]

PHOTO 32: The RAFA barracks adjacent to Photo 31. Landscaping and façade retention has made this heritage building a true reminder of the area’s past. [Towards Southwest, 37º 46’ 25" S, 144º 52’ 52" E].
PHOTO 33: These large houses cover as much of the site as the building envelopes permit. They are repetitive and grotesque in their architecture and are to be found right across the western part of Waterford Green. [Towards West 37° 45’ 19” S, 144° 52’ 47” E]

PHOTO 34: On the other hand, Edgewater’s careful architectural and landscape detailing has produced excellent streetscapes that distinguish one part of the estate from another. [Towards South, 37° 47’ 15” S, 144° 54’ 04” E]

PHOTO 35: Built looking outwards on a quadrant, the shopping centre maximises car parking at the expense of providing any pedestrian meeting places, or spaces where long-distance personal recognition can be achieved. [Towards West, 37° 46’ 28” S, 144° 52’ 52” E].

PHOTO 36: The pedestrian approach to the shops past a heritage building to the left is ambiguous and unappealing. Other approaches from the estate are equally ambiguous. [Towards South, 37° 46’ 27” S, 144° 53’ 51” E].
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Chapter 9 - Participant Analysis

This chapter is an account of what people said through the case studies’ interviews. The analysis allows the research question through the themes to the research question developed through five steps as discussed in the research method (Chapter 5). These address the research question for the strategic and local planning of each estate, the relationship of the Council to the developer, and decontamination of land. In addition to these broader themes, it analyses aspects of urban design which were discussed by participants and their responses are compared with the urban design analysis in Chapter 8.

NOTE: Brackets at the end of quotes or references relate to the participant’s area of interest and the type of participant referred to in Chapter 5. e.g. [Kensington Resident]

The research question asked: How does the involvement of the local community affect the planning, design and development of Previously Developed Land? In order to answer this question participants were asked a set of questions generally to cover the topics of:

- The participant’s knowledge about the strategic planning aspects of the case study estate at the time of it first being planned;
- The extent to which the participant was involved with or understood the plans for the case study estate, including contamination and remediation of land and their understanding of community involvement in their planning, design and development;
- Knowledge of the statutory planning issues for the land (including Planning Scheme amendments and approvals);
- The view of the participant about the urban design of the case study estate as it has been developed;
- What could have been done better relating to the planning, design and development of each case study? (Appendix 5.3 is the questionnaire used as a guide to the participant interviews).

9.1 Local communities involvement in the strategic planning of the estates

9.1.1 The extent and nature of community involvement

All estates have had a measure of public involvement in their planning, Edgewater and Waterford Green having had a common initial involvement through a Community
Reference Group. Lynch’s Bridge/Kensington Banks has had a much more extensive and sophisticated community involvement. The planning for the Defence Site Maribyrnong has just recommenced and it is too early to determine the extent and nature of local community involvement.

The earliest involvement by the community was in the working party for the Lynch’s Bridge strategic planning exercise in 1982-4:

“The community was involved on that committee as well. We opened it up because we were trying to find out what land uses should there be and we called for submissions in terms of looking at what should go on there. And we had meetings about what should actually go there.” [Kensington Resident]

Communication with the local community became broad when the first stage of Lynch’s Bridge was planned:

“I think the Government and Council were trying to get all the parties that would have an interest in the land whether it was community groups, government groups, council groups or aged services groups or the public housing groups. They were making an effort to try to engage with the local community in the widest way that they could.” [Former Liaison Officer]

The community were later given opportunity to become involved in the overall concept for Kensington Banks prior to a developer being appointed to the Kensington Banks part of the project in 1993:

“The design exercise was very heavily community focussed. We appointed four separate architectural firms to come up with concepts for the whole area. Rather than have them as options we wanted people to explore ideas and we wanted to mix and match and take. The concepts were then put on exhibition and people came and looked at them and said what they liked and disliked about them and we took the output of that process. Everybody in the area was letterboxed with a plan which had the four options, plus there was the shop at Macaulay Road which was open and people came.” [Government Planner/developer]

The level of engagement by the community for Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks has been both continuous and constant. The public engagement included the monthly meeting of the General Advisory Committee (GAC) comprising residents and other stakeholders.
There were other means of communication also employed such as shop fronts and public meetings (For a discussion of these see 7.3.1). The language detected from the interview material is about listening and feedback where, at both Lynch’s Bridge and Kensington Banks, plans and presentations were made to promote interactive community debate and discourse rather than just providing a ‘telling’ mechanism. Even the term ‘General Advisory Committee’ gives a nuance of collaboration between the community and the decision-makers.

It is concluded that the strategic planning of Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks enabled early engagement with the community as a collaborative partner in the development of the overall strategy. Later, the community was re-engaged when estate layouts were prepared. This was also a collaborative exercise which is demonstrated through the planners seeking people’s ideas about the urban design alternatives presented to them.

The form of engagement for the joint consideration of Waterford Green and Edgewater was different from Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks. Instead of engagement over a long period, the Community Reference Group, in seven meetings over a two year period, was brought up-to-date with the progress towards the preparation of the Environment Effects Statements:

“I do recall meetings where those groups attended those meetings and were sort of informed.” [Estate Developer]

“Yes we certainly were [present] at the resident reference group meetings. We voiced our opinions at the meetings of course and I remember seeing whiteboard plans that were taken at the meeting and the consultants took them away and I think most of the points raised were in the reports that came after.” [Maribyrnong resident]

The major question that arises from the above quotes about Edgewater and Waterford Green is whether the seven advisory meetings, as well as the feedback from the alternative designs widely circulated to the public, actually constituted a collaborative engagement with the community. The resident quoted above did not think so:

“No we weren’t engaged. We put our comments in and since the developers have a lot of money and ‘The Friends’ (residents group) don’t, it happens that the developers always win. It’s all so matter of fact and it happens.” [Maribyrnong Resident]
There was acquiescence or disinterest by the local community for the plan for Waterford Green:

“The ordnance factory area [Waterford Green] was almost a flow on from the planning at Edgewater and everybody expected that things would be carried out there in a proper administrative manner. There wasn’t that consideration about flood plain areas.” [Maribyrnong Resident]

On the other hand, the total empowerment of a community may lead to the status quo or an unrealistic situation:

“Now if you ask the community directly; if the community really has a say on something, they would make Edgewater, the whole damn thing, a park, and the same with Waterford Green. So where you say ‘community consultation’ what that means is ‘we are going to listen to you and see if there are, maybe, any points [sic. aspects of the plan] that we may delete, adapt or adjust or add something nice’. Basically they had the essential things in place.” [Footscray Resident]

While community involvement for Edgewater and Waterford Green was clearly more than tokenism, residents expressed scepticism including those on the Community Reference Group and other residents from the flood prone Maribyrnong township. The lack of a response from planners shows that consultative processes were not interactive and therefore not collaborative. Rather, the engagement process was aimed at achieving acceptance of ADI’s broadly planned outcome. The persons on the Community Reference Group and the Government Reference Group had mostly forgotten how the reference group functioned. Three persons who had been acknowledged in the EES as being on the reference groups, when interviewed, said that that they had no recollection of the meetings. This indicates that the engagement process did not engender debate or achieve alternative outcomes generated by the community.

The level of enthusiasm for public participation at the newly created Maribyrnong City Council after 1994 was not that great either, which at that time was under the control of State appointed commissioners:

“There were committees and newsletters. Commissioner Barbara Champion was enthusiastic about community engagement but it did not seem to be a priority in those days of the Kennett Government.” [Former City Planner]
This led to a dearth of further community participation which virtually excluded the public.

In the last decade there has been an attempt by Defence’s project managers and latterly Places Victoria to engage with the community on the planning of the Defence Site Maribyrnong. This has included the holding of public workshops, discussion sessions with specific groups including school children and the preparation and dissemination of a draft ‘shared vision’ adopted after receiving submissions. This has resulted in the community becoming positive about its role in the future planning process, albeit that it has some misgivings about whether its views and preferences are going to be acted upon in the light of stronger external forces to use the land:

“‘The public meeting was a good concept, however I feel that all too often economic consideration has erased the importance that local people give to those meetings. I believe this is the reason why there is a lack of attendance to consultations of this nature by most members within the community because they feel no matter what they say, it won’t carry enough weight.” [Maribyrnong Resident]

**Reasons for different engagement processes**

The findings of the literature survey include the observation that external political and economic circumstances may negate or repress community response and reduce/increase community impact (4.5). This is demonstrated by the success of the community involvement at Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks, if compared to Edgewater and Waterford Green, and points to the following variables:

- **The way the project is set up within the wider governance framework and the attitude of the State Government towards inclusion of local communities.**

  In this respect the progressive nature of the Cain Government was a decisive plus to facilitating community involvement for Lynch’s Bridge (7.3.1). By the time that the Waterford Green and Edgewater estates were being planned it was at the end of the three Labor Governments. The impact of deindustrialisation and poor management of State financial resources changed the mood of Government from being progressive and inclusionary to seeking the investment of private capital, changing the *modus*...
operandi of government so that the needs of local communities became less important than facilitation of development for potential investors (2.2).

- The extent to which the community has been involved in strategic planning during or previous to the project commencing.
The Lynch’s Bridge strategy, which defined the future use and broad function of the Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks estates as developed, was inclusive of local communities (also 7.3.1). On the other hand, the planning authorities’ lack of any strategic context for both Edgewater and Waterford Green was severely criticised by the ministerial panel considering submissions. This lack of a plan prevented local communities to discuss, in any meaningful way, how the development of the estate fitted into the broader strategic issues of Footscray and Maribyrnong suburbs and the Maribyrnong River as a regional asset (7.3.2).

- The capacity of the community to become involved.
Kensington in the 1980s was becoming gentrified and had already its own strong residents association which talked to other inner urban associations keen to avoid destruction of inner Melbourne by freeways and high-rise apartment blocks. Supporting this approach was a change of culture at the Melbourne City Council where progressive Labor and independent forces were in power in the latter part of the eighties. Conversely, the local residents’ association at Maribyrnong had an inwards looking culture and did not share links to inner urban associations. It was isolated geographically from the headquarters of the local council. Both affected councils were traditional Labor strongholds and did not possess the same progressive approaches to involving the community as the City of Melbourne.

- The extent to which the project planner or developer is willing to consult openly with local communities to overcome their concerns.
In the case of Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks, the land was largely owned or managed by the City and State Government which engendered a sharing of plan development processes with local communities particularly because of the political complexion of the Council at the time. On the other hand, Australian Defence Industries, while a government corporation, had the role of disposing Edgewater and Waterford Green to provide adequate monies to rebuild Defence facilities elsewhere. Under these circumstances, ADI acted similarly to a private land owner. This induced the need to optimise the return by reducing the planning timeline, and selling the land
at the highest and best market price. Under these circumstances, there was much less involvement with the local community.

**Differences and similarities of group responses**

At Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks the account of residents, planners and developers about the method of involvement and how it occurred is very uniform. People’s memories and associations, first with the Lynch’s Bridge Working Party and then the GAC were essentially the same. It is posited that this is because the whole experience of the Committee and Working Group was an effective and memorable method of communicating when the estates were being planned.

At both Edgewater and Waterford Green, resident, planner and developer memories had faded about the two reference committees although they were clearer with residents who took part than with the planners and developers some of whom could not remember that they had been a member of the groups. There are even signs of absenteeism from the Community Reference Group as described by the panel with regard to the National Trust Australia (Panels Victoria 1993, p. 61).

The planning for the Defence Site Maribyrnong is in its early stages without developer input but there appears to have been sound cooperation between planners and residents. However, residents are proclaiming some scepticism about whether and community engagement process will enable their views to be introduced into a plan when more powerful development interests are considered:

“When you go down this whole track and the Council will obviously become involved as well at some stage or other, I get a bit cynical whether all the things the residents have talked about just sort of get lost in... I may be wrong, but maybe a lot of things get lost, I reckon.” [Maribyrnong Resident]

**9.1. 2 Strategic issues that the community was able to change or support**

At Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks, it is clear that the community’s voice was being heard through an ‘inclusive’ engagement approach which allowed debate and local viewpoints to be expressed. Even under the Kennett Government, whilst there was greater suppression of local involvement, the philosophy of the development partners enabled an ‘open’ relationship with the community:
“You had the change to the Kennett Government and you also had the change at the
Major Projects Unit and the Council without an elected Council when the
community was really squashed out and silenced. The committee [GAC] not only
provided accountability but it also provided a way of balancing the different interests
and it was never made up of people looking after their own interests. This was a
mixed committee; there were people who were pro public housing; there people after
urban amenity; you had a variety of open meetings that anyone could attend as well.
And so it really provided a viewpoint through the issues. You know they were
frustrating meetings where, at times, people didn’t think anything was happening or
know what was going on, but, at times, decision making moves slowly.”
[Kensington Resident]

Several changes to the plans were accomplished with the sanction of the community
including maintaining the secondary stock route as linear open space:

“And there was a fairly strong community involvement in some of the conceptual
stuff which we planned, not only the Womens Peace Garden which was put-in in
the late eighties, but also how the open space was configured along the two stock
routes. There was this sort of secondary route with lovely trees and retention of that
bit and the main stock route has given us some of the best urban design outcomes.”
[Government Planner/developer]

The community sustained pressure on government to provide a percentage of social
housing that, amongst other things, provided family housing which would bolster local
school enrolments:

“One of the basic strategies that the committee was interested in was a certain
percentage of the land was to be developed for community housing, social housing,
non-profit housing and there was an agreed amount of 10% and that was then I
think a fairly new strategy at the time. And so there was great interest in the
community to ensure that it happened.” [Former Community Liaison Officer]

The community also became engaged in protecting the principles of the Lynch’s Bridge
Redevelopment Strategy shown by its staunch resistance to a tourist park proposal:

“The tourist park proposal was situated about where the trucking bay was on
Smithfield Road. We had a public meeting down there and we also had one in the
Upper Trinity House Hall. It was at a critical stage when you get a kind of local
political movement developing around an awareness of the planned redevelopment. So people were much more aware of the need to preserve the site’s intrinsic amenity and the last thing that you wanted was something like a tourist village.” [Kensington Resident]

“There came meetings later and there was a public fight going on against Don Dunstan.16 There was a secondary fight where Don did not have the majority of Cabinet supporting his proposal, nor did he have the Council necessarily fully supporting it. There was confusion in terms of the Government’s attitude and in the end everyone went against it.” [Kensington Resident]

The only issue where the Kensington community opposed the developers was about the height and density of the multi-storey apartments shown for a later stage of development. However, due to the openness of the contest and the goodwill engendered over the years, both the developers and community continued good communication after the decision to allow the development:

“The Kensington Association and the local committee [GAC] did make a submission. I do recall we were somewhat nervous about getting involved. But, nonetheless, there was a panel enquiry and the issue was robustly fought. It was openly fought, and once we moved on, I still had reasonably good relations and I think the community had reasonably good relations with the people who proposed it.” [Government Planner/developer]

At Edgewater, while the principles of developing the site were generally accepted by the community, residents did not have their way about preventing the filling of the flood plain. Despite the hydraulic modelling showing otherwise, the community was still concerned about the development causing worse flooding upstream to Maribyrnong Township. This main ‘bone of contention’ persisted even after the Panel’s report supporting the rearrangement of the flood plain:

“There was not much which people could see at the time that would not cause new problems as far as the residents were concerned. We wanted development to be reduced to two storeys and the flood plain kept at its original height and classed as

---

16 Former Premier of South Australia, then Secretary for Tourism Victoria.
flood plain so that there would be no increase in flooding upstream.” [Maribyrnong Resident]

The general disinterest of the community in Waterford Green has been noted. The result was that the community had no impact on the general strategies that were applied other than to agree in principle with them. This lack of community involvement is evidenced in the few references made to community submissions in the Panel’s report (Panels Victoria 1993).

**Differences and similarities of group responses**

Whether or not to integrate Old Kensington with Kensington Banks not only split the resident groups but also heritage planners from urban designers and developers:

“The residents were not definitive about that at all. There were groups of residents who wanted it to be separate. They didn’t want anything to do with Kensington Banks. There were other residents groups who wanted it to be integrated. And usually when you do a consultation process you can see 80% of the community heading down a certain track around the form, around integration and all those things. That was not the case here I can tell you that! And that caused considerable angst given that we were trying to involve the community.” [Former Developer]

The evidence discussed above indicates that, while no perfect solution could be found, the design which evolved was generally to the satisfaction of both Old Kensington residents and the developers. The dialogue that was enabled through the GAC and the display of alternative concepts allowed a reasonably harmonious resolution of the issue based on compromise.

Another example of harmonious resolution was finalising the Development Plan for Kensington Banks. While residents opposed the high-rise development in the southwest corner (as discussed above) there was little concern afterwards when the plan was approved after the panel had recommended approval. These examples indicate that the inclusive involvement of the community created community satisfaction.

The relationship of the Council to the Government and local community is not clear with respect to the major issue of the tourist park cited above. This proposal cross-cut the Tourism and Planning portfolios of the State Government and while the local community
made its views well known, the decision was made by the State Government ‘In Cabinet’ and it may be several years before it can be ascertained if the Government (the key partner/developer) took the residents’ views into account.

The use of the floodplain at Edgewater was opposed by residents even after the Panel considering the proposal reported favourably about the proposed flood balancing scheme that would allow some development on the flood plain. The filling of the flood plain was supported by developers and planners and the drainage management authority.

There was no strong opposition from any group for the proposed development of Waterford Green.

**9.2 Local community involvement in detailed planning and design**

While the extent of strategic and major planning issues has been discussed above, an estate’s form and liveability may also be affected by some of the detailed responses to the design of an estate.

Residents at Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks were active in detailed matters which included protecting the view-line from The Ridgeway, relocation of a Moreton Bay Fig and stopping the development of an oval on Lynch’s Bridge Park:

“There was one piece of anger which was due to our very poor planning. We initially went to the Kensington community with a building scheme where the architect cut off the view-line from The Ridgeway and that sent the community absolutely spare. I missed it. I should have picked it. We committed to not doing that.” [Former Developer]

Residents even took the opportunity to side with the Major Projects Unit in keeping the Central Park with its crescent building colloquially called ‘Bath Crescent’:

“The Crescent not only divided the community [laughter], it divided the project group [more laughter] and I still hate it. It is the least successful part.” [Former Developer]

“That ‘arc’ idea came from an architect trained in Paris. When he came out, he designed this structure which we call ‘Bath’ and he said he could ‘look through the gaps and see the centre of the universe in Paris’. And while he said it was the centre
of the universe we used to laugh and tell him it was the Rialto Tower.\textsuperscript{17} That reflected, I think, an attempt by the developers to do something which marked Kensington Banks out as not just a tract of soulless whatever. So it is the only kind of semi-distinguished architecture down there.” [Kensington Resident]

On balance, the involvement of the community in more detailed aspects of the estate has been beneficial through improving the estate’s landscape and architecture and has also avoided the confrontation that has more recently occurred at Edgewater and Waterford Green (7.3.2-3).

At Edgewater, community liaison was provided through a community development officer. As proposals for each stage were approved, the community were advised. With the exception of the installation of a post box and the reduction of the lakeside apartments from five to four storeys, there is no evidence to show that the residents were actively involved in the estate’s detailed development and, indeed, they appear to have been specifically excluded until after a decision was made between Council and the developer:

“With respect to detailed plans and agreements for the project; Delfin Lend Lease [the developers] did not discuss these with the Edgewater Residents Association.” [Liaison Officer]

When confronted with proposed infill developments that were beyond those anticipated in the plan, rather than being given the opportunity to negotiate, residents’ only opportunity was to exercise their rights of objection and appeal (7.3.2).

The same situation applied at Waterford Green as at Edgewater. There is no evidence of community involvement in detailed development proposals when the estate was being planned, designed or developed. When residents were notified about infill proposals, they reacted by strongly objecting to them (7.3.3).

\textit{Differences and similarities of group responses}

At Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks, residents, developers and planners shared a similar recall of the local detailed planning and design of the estate. The alliances between the development partners and community were variable. On the one hand there is evidence of

\textsuperscript{17} 60 storey office tower in Melbourne’s CBD. The tallest building in the city at that time.
strong assertiveness by the community about view-lines from Old Kensington opposing
the developer’s plans and where the local community supported the Office of Major
Projects in reinstating a significant part of the open space system. On the other hand,
there are other details where residents supported the developers. It is deduced that the
community had a voice and, at times, was willing to express it on detailed matters to the
development partners. At Edgewater and Waterford Green there was no strong evidence
from any group to suggest that the community had any effect on the detailed design of the
estates.

9.3 The relationship between the Council and the Proponents

The partnership of Pioneer Homes (Urban Pacific) and Major Projects Unit and the
magnanimous attitude of the Melbourne City Council for Kensington Banks produced a
collegiate environment which overcame issues relating to the Council’s powers to
unilaterally approve development:

“You needed the City Council to regard you as a team member with them in moving
the thing forward for the years of Kensington Banks’ development. Basically it was
a partnership but Council as the Responsible Authority was willing to sit on a
committee with others and not have the majority vote on the basis of respecting
people who feel passionate about things in moving the project forward.”

[Government Planner/developer]

“The achievements at Kensington Banks were a result of a collegiate environment
and the vision that the City of Melbourne and the Office of Major Projects had
forged. And, to some extent, the Urban Land Corporation\footnote{The Urban Land Corporation was a predecessor of Places Victoria} were prepared to stand
back and just see, even though they were the Government vehicle through which
the development happened.” [Former Developer]

The end result was much better coordination and understanding of complimentary roles
between the partners and the approval authority. This ‘sharing’ between organisations
prevailed and filtered through from major decisions on block design and landscape works
down to the details of house design. Bureaucracy was avoided through this committee
comprising officers from the City, Government and Urban Pacific which considered the
details of the builder’s house plans, with the advice of an independent urban designer.
Even the builders were effectively engaged with each other in jointly marketing the estate:

“Kensington Banks was unique because Urban Pacific only built 25% of the dwellings. What it did was to establish a very strong relationship with five other builders who got to build on all the other builder parcel sites. We used to run a ballot system for some sites, creating a very fair distribution. And there was a combined marketing effort from all of them.” [Former Developer]

The input of the local community was very limited on these detailed transactions as the general layout had been established in the Development Plan annexed to the Planning Scheme (Melbourne Planning Scheme 1994, 7.3.1). However, the GAC was kept involved about matters which might be of interest to it, such as the previously reported ‘Bath Crescent’ issue at Central Park:

“When Urban Pacific got half way through in their early proposals they had this rather nice big central park which had these curved ends to it and then when they came to submit their detailed proposal they had done away with all of that and the disappointment of both ourselves and the local community was so palpable that Urban Pacific turned around and put it back.” [Government Planner/developer]

The detailed plans for Waterford Green and Edgewater were prepared through joint discussions between Lend Lease (and then Delfin Lend Lease) and the City of Maribyrnong. These were seen as technical matters by the Council and were substantially delegated to officers. The sale of land to various developers was also seen as a matter between Lend Lease and the builder and the City took no role in this.\(^\text{19}\) There seemed to be no need for Council, as a political body, and the community to become involved as the plans that followed on from the Primary Development Plan (PDP) were more detailed versions of stages of the plan and there was little variation from the PDP. Likewise, the multiple agreements were seen to be a legal matter between the land owner and the Council as the ‘responsible authority’ and sometimes a nominated public authority, as these were the technical outcome of the planning scheme’s requirements. Their drafting was accomplished as a legal exercise between the parties’ solicitors. These

\(^{19}\) The development of a dwelling is permitted as-of-right although the building must conform to the form controls of a Further Development Plan. Also, in the case of Edgewater, Delfin Lend Lease, as a condition of the sale of the land, requires every house plan to be approved by an in-house architect, who uses urban design guidelines developed by the company (and signed off by the Council) to approve each building. This can be contrasted with Kensington Banks where there was a committee formed by the partners and Council and their advisors approved the plans.
administrative processes were smooth and efficient although there is some evidence that, pre 2000, the relationship between the Council and developers had become broken around the time of the *Primary Development Plans* being modified:

“A revised *Primary Development Plan* for Edgewater had gone through a notification process and some form of public meeting. It was something similar to a panel process, but no statutory notification was required. So that was pretty much what we wanted to achieve out of the project after the previous director’s departure. It was essentially to develop a working relationship with Lend Lease which, at that stage, was a little bit fractured.” [City Planner]

There is also limited evidence to show that the more detailed design of Waterford Green was considered to be inappropriate. There was uncertainty in the Council office. They were not used to this rectilinear and extensive type of subdivision. There was the fear that Lend Lease was using the new design to squeeze up yield without improving amenity. There were also concerns about lack of open space and how engineering rules were not being adhered to. However, Lend Lease was convinced that the New Urbanist approaches to design, especially the work of Andre Duaney (New Urbanist consultant to the developer), was sound [Former City Planner].

**Differences and similarities of group responses**

The planners and developers for Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks had very similar views about the success of the project. There was much less evidence adduced for Waterford Green and Edgewater on the relationship between the Council and Lend Lease as it was a matter conducted in bureaucratic confidentiality between council officers and the developers following the line of decision making set down in the planning scheme.

**9.4 Decontamination of land**

At Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks remediation proposals were not concealed from the community but not discussed with it either, and a somewhat technical approach to site clean-up was taken:

“The public weren’t involved. We just kept them advised that there was a cleanup going on. What could they add? There are rules for what you can and can’t do. We had to meet the environmental guidelines which we did.” [Government Planner/developer]
At Edgewater and Waterford Green a more open approach was taken at the Panel Hearing but there was some scepticism about the end result particularly about the burial of low level wastes in the Edgewater repository:

“I told a German remediation expert about this repository to be built on the side of the hill on a clay base and plastic liner and she mentioned that this was done in the City of Dresden and, after a number of years, it began to leach down into the river, and cause multi-millions of dollars of cost. So I raised this with the panel but, of course, nobody wanted to hear anything about that.” [Maribyrnong Resident]

Generally, the local community was not concerned about health matters relating to the standard of remediation although some offsite effects relating to traffic and noise during the site cleanup were a cause for transient concern.

There is more current concern from residents about the Defence Site Maribyrnong. This is largely to do with resident perception that contaminated land cannot be used for housing but it can for open space. This is seen to be a strategic bid to protect the site which has very high heritage and recreational values:

“The suspicion is there that it will be very difficult to clean up the site and the Friends of Maribyrnong Valley [residents group], would love to see that site converted into parkland as a significant place for the Nation. This is an unrealistic view, which has been expressed at the outset, but which is unlikely to be accepted.” [Maribyrnong Resident]

**The need for different decontamination approaches in the future**

The standard to which land is decontaminated also has a bearing on its future use. For detached housing and public open space the standards are higher than for commercial and industrial use (NEPM 1999). See 2.2. In some cases, where the land has been strategically assessed for non-residential uses a lesser cleanup standard may be applied (for example, if the land is shown to be ‘Future Industrial’ in a Municipal Strategic Statement of a planning scheme). In the case of Edgewater, the activity centre has only been remediated to a commercial standard thus preventing a mixed-use development being built without further assessment and probable additional remediation:

“Edgewater’s commercial area has been remediated to a level that does not allow residential development so I think a fault in Edgewater’s planning is likely which goes against [State Government] Activity Centre Policy. So, in retrospect, and
probably on today’s standards, you would look at ensuring a higher remediation standard so that the community centre has a residential capability.” [City Planner]

Thus remediation to a lesser standard may affect the planning of uses on a PDL which could, in turn, affect the aspirations of the local community. This is a matter which needs to be investigated at an early stage for the Defence Site Maribyrnong. Currently, the community is being informed about the assessment and future rehabilitation of the site (7.3.4) and this is especially important because of its abuttal to existing residential development.

Differences and similarities between group responses

The decontamination of the all the estates was generally not contentious with residents, planners or the development partners. There was the partial exception of Edgewater where residents sought more controls over the on-site repository including the requirement for the Commonwealth Government to accept residual liability for its maintenance (Panels Victoria 1993, pp.53-56). In other circumstances, either geographic remoteness for Waterford Green, or careful adherence to providing the public with good technical information by the Melbourne City Council for Kensington Banks, ensured the management of the clean-up without residents’ concerns being heightened.

Planners and developers were acutely aware of VEPA’s environmental auditing requirements and there was no detectable difference in the way either group considered VEPA’s management of the auditing process.

9.5 What did people think about the design of the estates?

This part of the analysis makes a direct comparison of the urban design analysis in Chapter 8 with participant responses. It therefore follows the analysis pattern although some translation is necessary where residents used less technical words than urban design usage.

9.5.1 The estates as separate or integrated places

The comparator for measuring whether the estates were separate or integrated with their surrounds are the findings associated with 8.1a and 8.1b of Table 8.1 in 8.2-3 and the extent of Major and Minor Edges in the Visual Form Analysis in 8.1. The aim here is to
determine if people’s perception of place relates to the physical relationships of the estate and to their surrounds as detected in the urban design analysis.

Perception of the estates being part of a wider neighbourhood was greatest in Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks and least in Waterford Green. Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks people feel part of the whole suburb:

“I never call it Kensington Banks. I live in Kensington and I see that as very much a strong bond. I am not drawing a distinction between Kensington and Kensington Banks, because Kensington is a great suburb as well; the Village [Macaulay Road] and the shops and the cafes; and I think that Kensington Banks has really benefited the suburb in particular by the use of the Stock Route. The number of people that use the Stock Route and take the kids down to the park and those sorts of things has been extremely beneficial to the suburb.” [Kensington Banks Resident]

However it has been noted that residents of the lower part of Kensington Banks:

“have trajectories towards a ‘café culture’. Essentially they are not looking to engage locally and so the children go elsewhere to school. Residential Kensington focuses on Kensington Railway Station going down the hill, whereas if you live in Kensington Banks it is easier to catch the train from South Kensington and go that way, where you actually don’t get the sense of community in terms of shopping. They use their car and will do convenience shopping elsewhere. I find the Lynch’s Bridge people are more likely to be convenience shoppers at Kensington and join in with the community than the Kensington Banks people.” [Kensington Resident]

This indicates that Kensington Banks people have a somewhat different perception of the place and use the suburb only partly for local needs.

Edgewater people are more likely to express their place as Edgewater and not Maribyrnong. There is little commonality between people to the south in Footscray which accommodates many poor, itinerant and recent migrants in apartments (Appendix 7.3) and the estate’s residents. This is despite very good connectivity as shown in the urban design analysis:

“I think that this particular estate is quite an exclusive and very different area to most of its surroundings, certainly as far as Maribyrnong and the Footscray/Maidstone areas are concerned. It is probably more aligned to the Ascot Vale side of the River
where the properties and residents are more upper-middle class. While at this point of time the residents of the area to the south come across to ALDI [supermarket in the activity centre] to shop, there is no relationship at all with us. And I don’t know a lot about that area but I have been told that there are a lot of new migrants or refugee people in that area.” [Edgewater Resident]

When the need for unity with other people outside the estate has arisen it has not been the Edgewater Resident’s Association or the Maribyrnong Resident’s Association which takes the running but RAIDIM (Residents Against Inappropriate Development in Maribyrnong), an entirely new local organisation.

Residents see that Waterford Green is geographically isolated from the rest of the suburb of Maribyrnong. It is therefore known as Waterford Green and not Maribyrnong:

“I like this estate as it is and its position but, in some ways, it feels disconnected to the surrounding area because you are surrounded by main roads and to get to other parts, traversing is not that simple. Even to get to the River itself you don’t have a direct connection. In some way I feel we are a little bit enclosed in our own little area.” [Resident of Waterford Green]

The estate is also isolated because there was no attempt by the planning authority at the time to overcome the obvious possibility of connecting Waterford Green to Highpoint, the principal activity centre and largest attractor in the area:

“If you had had an acquisition [of land to the east] you would have had a much better urban design solution with a median strip which connects Waterford Green to the Highpoint Activity Centre and that would be a better transition from a pedestrian point of view. It [the low density retailing area] creates an impression of a thoroughfare barrier.” [City Planner]

*Differences and similarities of group responses*

Residents were most concerned about sense of place issues with planners and urban designers recognising the different characteristics of the new estates compared with their surrounds.
Comparison with urban design analysis

Residents’ comments indicate that sense of place is not solely dependent on the connectivity of an estate to its surrounds. It relates to a perception of whether or not the people who reside in one area are different or the same as those residing in an adjoining part. In the case of Edgewater, which has good connections to the local streets, the distinction of one place from another is almost exclusively on social and economic differences and at Waterford Green there is a high probability, based on the urban design analysis, indirect remarks and census data (Table to Appendix 7.4), that the eastern medium density apartment section is a different place from its western low rise separate dwelling part. There is even a mild distinction drawn between Lynch’s Bridge and its association with Old Kensington which both centre on Macaulay Road activity centre with Kensington Banks whose residents relate to other farther afield places for shopping and public transport. Thus it is concluded that sense of place is as much perceptual about who lives there as it is about connectivity to its surrounds.

9.5.2 Estate layout: connectivity, legibility and accessibility

The topics of internal connectivity (8.2 of Table 8.1) and legibility (8.3 of Table 8.1) and access to buildings (8.4 of Table 8.1) are the criteria for this part of the analysis. The interaction with nodes and landmarks with the pathways is the criterion for permeability, connectivity and accessibility as shown on the Visual Form Analysis (8.1). While able to be separated in the urban design analysis, connectivity, legibility and accessibility were more difficult to separate in the participant interviews, especially those of residents, and are therefore collectively considered here.

Kensington Banks has issues with vehicular permeability between it and Old Kensington. The same also applies to car movement between Lynch’s Bridge and Kensington Banks. On the other hand, pedestrian connectivity is very direct along the Stock Route linear park and to the many roads which join onto it:

There is an Old Kensington and the newer Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks:

“I think both places have integrated but it doesn’t actually have all that many direct interfaces. There are connections and they work well because they are all quite studied.” [Government Planner/developer]
“And basically this was partly a community thing and partly there was this *cul de sac* philosophy that was still around. So there were still people who did not want connectivity.” [Planner/urban designer]

Legibility is also not optimum due to the ‘kinks’ in both Lynch’s Bridge and the earlier stages of Kensington Banks but this characteristic is seen to be tolerable having regard to other positive design aspects of the estate such as providing for different house product on awkward sites:

“...It is not such a legible place for a visitor. The layout is a bit of a maze. The Stock Route does define the route for pedestrians. So from that point of view of legibility and connectivity it is not really a problem. The road layout is just a bit more convoluted than it needs to be.” [Planner/urban designer]

Legibility and connectivity are seen to be very good at Edgewater:

“Edgewater has a better sense of good to it than what we had been dealing with over at Kensington Banks. It connects into surrounding areas reasonably well.” [Ibid.]

“At Edgewater you can see what is coming up and how it all relates.” [Maribyrnong Resident/planner]

Both residents and planners find Waterford Green a little hard to understand for its blandness and regularity, a condition that is reinforced because of the flatness or uniform nature of the terrain:

“That to me is one of those estates you could put anywhere and you wouldn’t have a clue where you were. There’s also ‘a certain sameness’ and that is due to things being designed by computer. It is all a bit too congested together and it looks like polystyrene.” [Footscray Resident]

“I have been into that estate a few times and you lose your bearings pretty quickly. I see it as a bit barren. It is as if Waterford Green is book-ended by open space on the west end and commercial on the east. And there is just endless repetitive housing in between. If you look through the prism of a planner is this saying: ‘Is this as good as we could have done?’.” [Maribyrnong Resident/planner]

These comments indicate the need for more landmarks, distinctive spaces and destinations in the estate which would improve its legibility. No points were made about its connectedness except Waterford Green, as noted by a resident (9.5.1), the estates
isolation from other parts of the suburb by main roads and the River. Lack of legibility is also evident at a detailed level where there is confusion between fronts and backs of housing and lack of design skills to turn house sites to address intersecting roads:

“The Waterford Green plan is quite crude; just simplistic. They took the rigid grid too far in many ways, and they didn’t have the skills to turn the houses around at the end of long blocks so that they were fronting the side streets.” [Planner/urban designer]

There are also several places where the detailed layout creates legibility issues where fronts and backs are opposite each other:

“Waterford Green, even though it has got the housing diversity in it, has a lot of front to backs stuff-ups. It’s got buildings fronting onto the lanes, so wherever you go you can show people some problematic examples.” [Planner/urban designer]

**Differences between or similarity of group responses**

Neighbourhood layout connectivity and legibility was a lively topic at Kensington Banks by all groups. This led to a design being prepared with only one single lane vehicular connection between Old Kensington and Kensington Banks. In the case of Edgewater, both planners and residents agreed that the layout was both legible and well connected. On the other hand, planners and residents agreed that the layout for Waterford Green was both confusing and boring. Developers did not make any comments about the layout except with respect to the location of Waterford Green’s activity centre, shortly to be discussed.

**Comparison with urban design analysis**

The remarks by participants very closely accord with the urban design analysis. The remarks of the urban designers, in particular, are alike with respect to all estates connectivity, legibility and access to premises. Residents did not use the same terminologies and generally, and not surprisingly, were unable to express the design of the estate in the same technical terms as planners and urban designers. The greatest criticism has been for Waterford Green with its uniformity and grotesqueness of architecture and at times tight spaces in the multi-unit eastern area. This accords with the urban design analysis where long block lengths, sameness in architecture, incorrect use of landmarks and ‘fronts to backs’ confusion was detected.
9.5.3 Robust buildings and places

The direct comparator for robustness in the last chapter is Section 8.5 of Table 8.1, referring to the ability of existing buildings and places on PDL to be reused and adapted for new purposes.

At Lynch’s Bridge the most significant administrative buildings of the saleyards were preserved and reutilised for a community high school. A significant part of the yards were also preserved but, as yet, no permanent or intermittent use has been found for them:

”The abattoir buildings were different to the saleyards. In the saleyards we kept the historic triangle which the community high school moved into and also some of the saleyards structures. Most of us tried to find a use for the saleyards structures. There have been several things tried there. Down the bottom [Kensington Banks] there were uses proposed several times but, because of the costs and the rectification works and the design of the buildings, there wasn’t much that was retained except the shell of the [abattoir] gatehouse.” [Kensington Resident]

At Kensington Banks, the only building to be preserved is the abattoir’s gatehouse but the most significant preservation has been the adaptation of the stock routes to linear parkways still with their original peppercorn trees and the retention of the stock bridge as a pedestrian/cycle route across the River. Participants have lauded the Stock Route preservation as being the key to remembering the past, reinforced by rebuilt stock fencing and other devices such as the murals depicting the past in the stock underpass of Epsom Road:

“The integration between Kensington Banks and Lynch’s Bridge were the murals: those beautiful murals that were done in the overpass. They were masterpieces of the history of the saleyards and the stock-route. I used to love it when the people who worked in the saleyards and abattoirs came in [to the office] and they would want to have a chat and a cup of tea and would tell you about their life. Fantastic!” [Former Developer]

The protection of heritage items is considered to have been well accomplished at Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks although nothing remains of the abattoir’s industrial places and the more recent Defence Ordnance Depot.
At Edgewater the land that needed to be developed first was the area of the most historic significance where the *Colonial Ammunition Works* once stood. At Waterford Green the most significant early buildings of the RAFA barracks and Ordnance Administration also had to be developed first. In both estates:

“There was quite a lot of thought given to the mix of uses. We had quite a substantial commercial component as well as residential development, comprising both offices and retail development. And for the heritage buildings, we had to look at their optimum use so we could retain heritage qualities of the building as well. The heritage buildings on the two sites [Edgewater and Waterford Green] had to be basically rationalised. Some were kept and some were demolished and the issue there was the fact that a lot of the buildings were contaminated by the production process, particularly on the Footscray Ammunition site.” [Estate Planner]

The feasibility issue is tied up with the cost of remediation and then adaption of a structure to a new use. The location of Waterford Green and Edgewater, both close to Highpoint’s shopping centre’s periphery, left little scope for more low intensity commercial outlets as adapted factories and warehouses [Estate Planner]. Also, at the time of site preparation, the likelihood of attracting employment within adapted buildings was very low due to the 1991 collapse of the office market and the general trend away from manufacturing in inner suburbs. This made the possibility of mixed use adaptation even less likely, despite a strong commitment to it in the planning schemes. Several attempts were made to secure uses for some buildings including for the Victorian Government’s archival complex:

“The Council tried to produce commercial outcomes for the mixed use areas but the estate had to compete with Highpoint [shopping centre and low intensity retailing] which was very close. The result was that residential dominated in the mixed use areas. This was in spite of Council trying to attract business to the mixed use areas, For example, the Victorian Archives now relocated to North Melbourne.” [Former City Planner].

“By the time Edgewater got going, the office market had collapsed. So the last thing that the developers wanted was to be left with something that might need to be used for offices. So that’s another reason why they were looking at every excuse to clear it and certainly building as much housing as could possibly be provided.” [Planner/urban designer]
Waterford Green experienced the same issues as Edgewater but fortunately the main access to the estate’s first stages was past the significant RAFA barracks and the Ordnance Factory’s administration buildings, and these were sufficiently robust and uncontaminated to allow conversion to residential and commercial uses. However, all the industrial buildings were removed:

“There was a magnificent No. 1 Forge building. That should have been saved for heritage but it was demolished.” [Former Employee/historian]

“The retention of the heritage buildings at Waterford Green was well done and some of the conversions on Wests Road to commercial uses were also well done.” [Maribyrnong Resident/planner]

**Differences between or similarity of group responses**

Heritage, natural systems protection and adaptation of buildings and places for renewal were topics that planners and developers were most aware of, although residents were also concerned about these issues for Lynch’s Bridge and Kensington Banks. Their links to the urban economy are very clear and therefore this may be the reason why both planners and developers, as implementers of plans, emphasised the importance of the feasibility of adapting heritage buildings. There was a lack of emphasis on the protection of natural systems by all groups which may be explained as low expectation due to almost complete despoliation of the natural environment by previous land uses. Some residents have a particular interest in the protection of heritage and natural values on the Defence Site Maribyrnong leading to views which would diminish the land’s development capability in favour of open space and protection of buildings (9.4).

**Comparison with urban design analysis**

The consideration of heritage protection and adaptation of buildings and places lies at the intersection of urban design and broader planning considerations. It is often one of the most complex areas to examine as there are often diametrically opposite market forces at play. On the one hand, there are the needs of a developer to make a profit from redevelopment of PDL whilst, on the other hand, there is the broader community’s need to protect its heritage. Rarely do these forces have a common vector so that it is almost

---

20 The Panel inspecting the planning scheme amendment did recommend that No 1 Forge be noted as a building for which planning permission was required for demolition or defacement. Nevertheless it was subsequently permitted to be demolished.
always in the developers’ interest to convert the land to completely new use by demolishing an existing place or building. Examples of the community and developer vectors coinciding are the stock route converted to the linear park at Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks and the RAFA Barracks and Ordnance Administration building at Waterford Green converted to apartments. But the loss of No 1 Forge at Waterford Green and the ‘SAA Clean Area’ of the Ammunition Plant at Edgewater were significant. After considering the Panel’s conclusions and the historic evidence, a strong argument can be mounted to say that the plans for both Edgewater and Waterford Green were insufficiently drafted to protect existing heritage assets. This is because the Mixed Use Zone regulation treated both dwellings (the economically dominant use) as permitted as was industry and other commercial uses. Thus profit motives would have dominated with Lend Lease so that the end use became houses. A further inhibitor to adaptation was the developer’s own capabilities because Lend Lease, as a greenfield subdivider, would have possessed few building adaptation skills. Therefore, a stronger planning regulation should have been prepared which gave protected buildings more status, thus dissuading the use of the land for housing unless perhaps ‘mixed’ with other uses that could have used some of the existing adapted buildings. This was not a significant urban design issue at the time that the plan was approved and the community was not engaged as demolition and development proceeded because of the weakness of heritage building protection put in place.

9.5.4 Spaces for unstructured and active pursuits (recreational use of the public domain)

The way the space between buildings and other defining features is distributed has a major effect on the way a place is recognised and utilised. In particular, the spaces which the public can enter into or see at a distance have the most importance (Lynch 1960). In these case studies, ‘space’ includes: a road and the threshold area between the public realm and the face of buildings (such as front gardens); and open spaces contained by escarpments, groups of buildings and lines of trees or copses. The comparator for this analysis is Row 6 of Table 8.1 and subsequent comments in the previous chapter.

Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks open space and landscaping has been universally accepted as providing a good range of spaces and public landscapes for people to meet:
“There are good places to meet. I think that the old Stock Route and the secondary Stock Route work well. Every time I have been through there, there are people using those spaces and to me if people use the space, they enjoy the space. I was in Kensington Banks in December and a couple of the open parking areas to the east side of the main entrance road were closed off by residents. They were using those as I would hope them to be used for street parties with barbeques; in areas we call ‘The Mews’.21” [Former Developer]

Some parts of the estate were seen to be more attractive than others, notably the earlier stages of Kensington Banks because of the site’s ‘natural advantages’ through incorporating the stock route into the new urban fabric:

“There was a bit of a difference between Lynch’s Bridge and Kensington Banks that followed because the historic aspects of the Stock Route were only on this western side of the project. I feel less attracted to later parts of Kensington Banks. It may just be that they had less natural advantage than the earlier ones.” [Former City Planner]

Praise is also given to its landscape:

“The landscape blends in very well and it links back to Kensington and the City of Melbourne’s greater landscape along with the street-scaping with bluestone. I think the streetscape is quite usual to what you would see in Kensington or Carlton or Fitzroy; as something which belongs to ‘Inner Melbourne’. In my view, I think it relates pretty well to its community.” [Former Developer]

The major criticism of landscape by planners and developers is the Smithfield Road entrance which is seen to be marred by the Shell service station. It could be anywhere and is not indicative of what lies beyond within the estate:

“If you drive along Smithfield Road, the big service station and fast food masks any sense of the richness of the development behind it. So, to me, it hits you in the face while driving past that it could be anywhere. It doesn’t have the flavour of Kensington Banks so that is a disappointment to me.” [Former City Planner]

---

21 These are rear access lanes expanded to provide an open space with car parking spaces and garages behind housing, often with small houses (bed-sits and one bedroom) above the garaging. An example of a ‘mews’ is shown in the Photo 5 in Chapter 8.
Edgewater is praised by all groups for its open space and its lake and harbour area. The split in level of the estate offers a wide range of vistas, both short and long, as does the indented form of Edgewater Lake. Edgewater Boulevard, which is the spine road built down the escarpment, also ties the top to the bottom both physically and makes the estate readily legible, therefore comprehensible:

“I think that Edgewater is very lucky because it is surrounded by green areas and also they have kept it open when you look at the development from the other side of the river from the Ascot Vale and from the other side of the lake. You are looking at a huge swathe of green land going up through the centre to Edgewater Boulevard and up to Jacks Wood.” [Edgewater Resident]

“The feature has to be the open space and the lake, I think. The harbour edge has been designed and built very well. The harbour area will be first-class when development is finished with good quality architecture. We are getting something down there that is worthy of a very high quality riverside location so it is a correct use and style.” [City Planner]

Waterford Green’s open spaces are considered to be inadequate in extent as well as non-functional:

“The linear park strips had some logic to them but were not expressed in the design particularly well. They actually could have done more with that. They could have created a formal linear parkway that could have incorporated playgrounds and things like that. But Village Way has been left with a desolate linear strip and it has not been a high landscape quality outcome. It is not visible from Wests Road so people don’t know that where you come in, the axis, which starts at Wests Rd, takes you down to the River.” [City Planner]

The consolidation of linear parks quoted above was the original concept shown in Figure 7.3. The Primary Development Plan was modified (7.3.3) which unfortunately destroyed the single linear park concept.

There is a lack of flatter land for ball games and the linear strips are hard to utilise and maintain:

“There is not much usable open space at Waterford Green in the position where it is accessible to most inhabitants. The majority of the open space is only the valley
sides. Kids couldn’t kick a ball without fear of it running away from them.”
[Mariibyrnong Resident]

Despite these deficiencies, the river open space is seen to have a pleasant landscape and is well used, even though the linear pathway has not been connected yet to other tracks along the river.

**Differences between or similarity of group responses**

The stock route linear open space at Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks was regarded as very good by all groups as was Edgewater’s large riverside lake and its environs. Waterford Green’s residual linear open space system was severely criticised by residents and planners for its non-functionality and maintenance issues, and the River open space for its lack of usable active recreational space. On the other hand, the River environs were seen as very good by residents.

**Comparison with urban design analysis**

The remarks of all participants closely accord with the urban design analysis.

**9.5.5 The activity centres (gathering and meeting in central places)**

All activity centres have been criticised more than any other theme uncovered. There has been no praise for any of them:

“I would have done the village [activity] centres differently. I think that they failed in the sense of their mix of uses as neighbourhood centres. They were not as successful as they ought to have been as a real central node that could have been ‘the place that people love to be in’.” [Planner/urban designer]

Kensington Banks activity centre at Smithfield Road and Gatehouse Street is regarded as a failure because of its layout and mix of shops. With only one convenience store it is not seen as viable. The other shopfronts and the service station are highway uses while other premises are footloose, no doubt taking advantage of a highway location and cheap rents. The SOHO development (Small Office or Home Office) is also a failure. However, it is acknowledged that the centre is only for highly localised convenience shopping and fills a niche in the overall distribution of shopping for Kensington with most residents still within a kilometre of the larger and traditional Racecourse Road (Flemington) and Macaulay Road (Kensington) strip shops:
“We very consciously did not take away from Macaulay Rd Shopping Centre because it was starting to regenerate itself. We saw Kensington Banks as part of greater Kensington. Integration was the philosophical position from which we started. So you cannot set up another retail centre.” [Former Developer]

There has been major disappointment by planners and developers that the centre is not a place for informal congregation:

“The service station and retail was poorly managed by us because we wanted the service station on one side of the entry road with the retail on the other side of the entrance road. We were relying on the cash flow at that stage and the petrol company wanted the service station to connect to the shops and that led to it being connected to the retail.” [Former Developer]

The centre also lacks any community focus such as a child care centre, which has been developed elsewhere:

“What has had an interesting life is a little building used as a sales point for the Office of Major Projects which is at the back of the service station. It has had a couple of incarnations and some people who are interested in social engineering and building a community centre are saying it ought to be a community space but it is not viable because people who are five minutes away by walking are in their cars heading off to somewhere else or South Kensington Station.” [Kensington Resident]

The compromised layout which occurred when Shell insisted on the convenience store facing onto a car park shared with the service station has meant that Gatehouse Drive has little footfall and therefore no energy to make it a place where ‘people love to be in’. The sum effect of this lacklustre centre and the general remoteness and difficulty of walking to Kensington and Flemington shops means that people will use their cars to shop from a range of shopping venues in the western suburbs:

“We use Macaulay Road [shopping centre] on a Saturday morning for the newsagents and bread shop and that sort of thing. For food shopping, we usually go to the new Coles supermarket at the Showgrounds in Epsom Road.” [Kensington Banks resident]
Edgewater Place, the activity centre for Edgewater, covers approximately four hectares. Its dispersed layout is seen to be a major fault:

“The activity centre is a great disappointment. The early centre designs were for a more compact development which joined well over Edgewater Boulevard. This was lost due to the positioning of ALDI. There is little to make the centre a place for people.” [Developer/urban designer]

“It’s not a congregating type area particularly. They are currently building a boardwalk along the old office area that is remaining [now built], and they are hoping to bring in a restaurant in on the corner and the board walk will go in front of existing delis and all those food places and Thai restaurant and that will bring their restaurants and cafes out on to that board walk.” [Edgewater resident]

The centre is an important place for contact between estate residents and residents to the south and west:

“The centre has all the ingredients of an inner urban neighbourhood centre. I do know people on the west side of Gordon Street who resort to ALDI and do walk. But I doubt that people in the new estate, particularly down the hill, would walk. But as a centre, it works pretty well.” [Maribyrnong Resident/planner]

The centre is not that walkable because over half the catchment is located on the steep escarpment (14% ruling grade) or on the fill platform below it:

“I don’t like the hill up the escarpment so if I am going to ALDI, I still get in the car and drive up the hill.” [Edgewater resident]

“However they drive to ALDI because of the amount of shopping they have to do. So basically the walking is effectively to three shops. So if you are walking you are either coming for pleasure which is to have a coffee or coming up just to get a couple of items.” [Edgewater Resident/developer]

This has made it imperative for convenience shopping for daily items such as bread and milk to be provided on the fill platform which has been achieved under a new apartment building on the lakeside.

The centre has a limited potential to improve as greater numbers of residents move in to the escarpment area with its compact housing and apartments and it takes long-term opportunities from the intensification of the Inner West due to its prominent position in
proximity to Footscray Central Activity District (2000 m.) and Highpoint Principal Activity Centre (900 m.):

“Edgewater has more components of an activity centre: a neighbourhood centre that you would drive to; that you can be within to do a variety of things so it is a higher order having an ALDI store. There are elements there that you can start to see. There are restaurants, cafes, service businesses, but it is a hotch-potch. We should have had a stronger urban design framework for that. I still think the activity centre has some potential that can be built on so that there is an opportunity just as we see in other centres for gradual change.” [City Planner]

Waterford Green’s activity centre is called ‘Waterford Gardens’, which comprises eight shopfronts. Its retail offer includes an IGA mini-supermarket, pharmacy, take-away food shops and a hairdresser. Not even the original developer considers it to be a good centre:

“By selling off land to other developers, Lend Lease lost a certain amount of control and, in my own personal opinion, Waterford Green is the perfect example. Waterford Green is judged by Wests Road and the part that disappoints me is the shopping complex on the corner called ‘Waterford Gardens’.”
[Developer/Edgewater Resident]

The centre was relocated from its original location on the Physical Framework Plan which would have made it more central to the estate and close to the only civic utility, the day care centre in Wests Road:

“They also had some legibility problems, so at the outset we thought the village centre ought to have been at Waterford Avenue because it was the logical place where a lot of historic buildings were. And so far as I was concerned, I thought it was going in the area near the RAFA barracks conversion north side of Waterford Avenue. I was very surprised to see it turn up in the south corner. It was as though somebody had an idea and changed it.” [Planner/urban designer]

“There is a convenience store, a hairdresser, a chemist. They are quite useful shops but it not the type of place that you would even go for basics or wander around there.” [Waterford Green Resident]

The latter remark indicates that Waterford Gardens is not a place for community interaction but only a place to shop using a motor car.
**Differences between or similarity of group responses**

Activity centres were a concern of all groups but there was particular attention given to them by planners and developers. In general, planners but especially those with urban design abilities considered each of the activity centres a failure although there was more criticism for Kensington Banks because of its lack of services and design and for Waterford Garden’s off-centre location. Edgewater Place was also criticised for its disintegrated layout although it provided a potential to become a better place for people to meet.

**Comparison with urban design analysis**

The failure of all activity centres to provide the spaces for a dynamic interactive place for the local community signals a failure of detailed strategic planning and urban design. The comments by participants closely accord with the design analysis.

**Why the activity centres failed as places and a possible solution**

The nature of retailing has consistently trended away from the small independent premises that still occupy our older retail strips with well defined, often vibrant, spaces. Supermarkets from the 1960s and, more lately, larger discount department stores and shopping ‘warehouse’ operations producing economies of scale for purchase, distribution, display and point of sale have driven down sales margins relative to smaller single purpose shops. The effect of this trend in retail planning is pressure for smaller centres with single premises to be located at less frequent intervals, and for them to be located on main roads where they can benefit from casual (passing) trade and sometimes conjointly with a supermarket. This makes them less accessible by foot or bicycle. This distribution has favoured larger modern shopping centres that compete for custom over significantly bigger catchments, which indicates that they are almost exclusively motor vehicle oriented. Competition between modern dispersed activity centres has also meant that construction costs have had to be reduced through light weight, clear span design often set in a large space with cheaply built ground level car parking (such as the ALDI supermarket at Edgewater Gardens). These new shopping centres are pivotal to shopping and some other limited services, but do not have the variety of shops, services etc. of older strip centres. They are also inward looking, creating internal malls that are not ‘democratic’ people places for unstructured activities. Furthermore, by virtue of their single ownership and design, they are inappropriate for mixed commercial and housing
development where densities and ‘eyes on the street’ can produce a safe 24 hour pedestrian environment. All the case study activity centres have been affected by these trends of the retail industry brought about by the market economy that mitigates against small pedestrian oriented activity centres.

The other two key issues relate to the provision of community services and the cost of high quality pedestrian environments. In respect to the first, the need to co-locate community services is abundantly apparent as it reduces the number of trips that need to be taken therefore reducing travel time and car usage. But, in contradistinction to the ILAP concept (4.3.3), poor coordination with other community agencies or their own special siting needs has meant that community facilities are often not co-located with other central activities. These case studies show that more emphasis needs to be given to strategies that involve the pre-commitment of municipal councils and state agencies to community services in activity centres.

The other issue relates to the cost of providing good spaces where place making is possible. These environments have two difficulties in terms of cost; first, the paving and landscaping of pedestrian spaces are costly and require high levels of maintenance and; second, there is an opportunity cost in selecting a mixed use development. This is because the land in an intensive mixed use development will inevitably require stratification into commercial ground floor uses with ‘active frontages’ and above-ground residences or offices. This stratification means that building costs are not only much greater but, more importantly, the ability for the principal land owner to redevelop the land is lost if the above-ground properties are sold.

The design of activity centres needs to be seen in the context of an automobile dominated society where it will be necessary for most people to use a motor vehicle to reach work or some other destination including retailing and other local services. For place making to have any relevance, there must be a positive discrimination towards pedestrians and cyclists, some of which is being accomplished today in ‘busy places’ such as city centres. One key concept is to make an objective of designing outwards from a declared ‘busy place’ so that priority is given to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. The Figure below shows this concept of ‘promenades’ joining activity nodes that are connected to the surrounding area via walkways:
This approach forces attention onto what qualities are required for the most important places and their connectivity to other parts of the PDL and its surrounds. Thus a purposeful ‘designing outwards’ as shown by Alexander et al. 1977 (p.150-188) occurs rather than the ‘designing from corners’ approach connected to simplistic concepts such as a land survey determining access to dwellings on regular lots.

9.6 Implications for this research

The analysis of participant responses highlights several matters.

The residents of Kensington were more satisfied and understanding of development outcomes at Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks through the institutional arrangements set up first by the preparation of a strategy with the stakeholders including residents and then in various activities promoting community involvement for the development plans of Lynch’s Bridge then Kensington Banks. There appears to have been no such satisfaction for the people of Maribyrnong and adjoining places with respect to Edgewater and Waterford Green. Inclusion of and listening to people over the whole period from initial strategic planning to the completion of development thus promotes community satisfaction and wellbeing. It is too early to say if the local community will be satisfied about the planning and design for the Defence Site Maribyrnong, although
some wariness is being displayed by residents about whether the community’s wishes will be heeded.

Kensington Banks was generally improved through community involvement at both a strategic scale and at a more detailed scale. On the other hand, there was no evidence that the local community had any influence on any scale at Edgewater and Waterford Green (with the minor exceptions of reducing the height of a mid-rise building and a letter box at Edgewater). The implication is that it is better to involve the community in both the strategic and detailed aspects of planning for PDL development, but as was the case with Kensington residents, some NIMBY reaction to off-site effects could lead to some compromise of the design.

A sound strategic base for planning and design of PDL, absent from Edgewater and Waterford Green, is most desirable, for without it, it is hard to see if they will ‘fit in with other changes occurring in the locality’ (as noted by Panels Victoria 1993, p 15);

The relationship between the developer partners and Council is critical to the success of a project. In all cases this appeared to be good although with Edgewater and Waterford Green the relationship is obscured by bureaucratic confidentiality. The collegiate environment between the Council and development partners at Kensington Banks points to a sound relationship where collaboration was the adopted mode of management.

The decontamination of all developed estates was not such an important issue as might have been expected. Care in explaining the decontamination processes and levels of risk exposure are at the heart of maintaining an appropriate community calm when remediation works are being proposed or carried out. But the basic rule agreed through the National Environment Protection Measure 1999 is that the local community should be consulted if there is a chance that there could be off-site effects because of remediation activities or that the standard of remediation would affect the future use and development of land.

The most significant aspects of community involvement in urban design and the community’s response to the developments are:

- When enabled, the local community becomes most interested in aspects of the estate design: its open space network and its use; significant buildings; routes for pedestrians
and cyclists; landscape features such as trees; and its interface with the existing community;

- The community is very interested in sense of place issues and distinguishes places not only for their connectivity to the wider neighbourhood but also by socio-economic differences;

- An impermeable road network is tolerated by communities if the cycle/pedestrian network is permeable.

- Higher density is not specifically an issue but the consequences of poor design at higher densities including overlooking; poor access and lack of open space for tree planting are of concern; and

- Issues that planners and developers were interested in also related to the urban economy. These included the impact on the economy on adaptation of buildings and how the activity centres were designed and located. These issues had a major impact on the way the estates were developed and were largely beyond the ability of any local community to influence the planners or developers. The adverse effect of the urban economy on both building adaptation and activity centres indicates that there is a need to plan more effectively for the adaptation of buildings and the design activity centres. As these are places where community interaction is most intense it follows that the community has a vital interest in them.

The last chapter of this thesis establishes the findings for the research question and introduces the evidence obtained from literature (Chapters 2-4) and the International case Histories (Chapter 6). The force of the evidence through this triangulation, allows some conclusions to be drawn about planning practice for PDL planning in Victoria and Australia generally.
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Chapter 10 - Findings

10.1 Introduction - The research to-date

The research question discussed in Chapter I and further explained in Chapter 5 is: “How does the involvement of the local community affect the planning, design and development of Previously Developed Land”. The research towards answering the question proceeded on two levels: reviewing literature relevant to the research question; and investigating a set of case studies in Australia and comparable international case histories.

Chapter 1 introduced the reasons why PDL development can be considered as a discrete topic from its counterpart of greenfields development and states that there is little research about the question in Australia.

The research material has come from three main sources:

a. **Literature**: An historic narrative of PDL development and the public’s involvement from the inception of modern law-based urban planning up to the end of the 20th Century (Chapter 2), followed by an analysis of current planning practice and participatory tools for planning PDL (Chapter 3), and recent research and practice as it affects the involvement of local communities in the planning and design of PDL (Chapter 4).

While the research question is unique the literature gave some directions to answering the research question:

1. Intensive involvement of the affected community leads to community satisfaction (and potentially to actual physical improvement);
2. External economic and political circumstances improving, negating or repressing community response thus increasing or reducing community impact;
3. The importance of the stage at which community becomes engaged in the PDL planning process;
4. The importance of the methods of engaging the community in PDL plans; and
5. Aspects of the planning, design and development process in which the community are critical participants and most interested.

b. **International case histories**: The relevant findings to the research question from international case histories (Chapter 6). They were presented in story form with
conclusions about how each story answers or illuminates the research question. The research design for these is set down in Chapter 5.

c. Maribyrnong River Valley case studies: The case studies research design framework was set down including site selection and data analysis procedures (Chapter 5). Each of the selected case study sites was described for its planning and design and community involvement from literature sources (Chapter 7). An urban design analysis of the case study sites was carried out to compare participant responses to the built form (Chapter 8). The participant survey data were then analysed for each case study (Chapter 9).

This Chapter is arranged to broadly address the research question and then to draw further findings of community involvement in PDL projects. The discussion of each finding considers the context and empirical findings of the case studies (Chapters 7-9) then the academic literature pertinent to it (Chapters 2-4); followed by relevant outcomes from the international case histories (Chapter 6). Finally, an assessment is made of what is central to planning and design of PDL in Victoria or more broadly in Australia.

10.2 Summary of findings

1. Intensive community collaboration is associated with higher levels of community satisfaction and vice versa.
2. Community involvement can lead to both ‘good’ and ‘bad’ built outcomes.
3. When a community is engaged from the start of planning, this produces the most consistent good outcomes.
4. The continuation of community engagement through implementation of PDL redevelopment and into subsequent place making also produces additional community benefits.
5. Local community engagement in urban design is more critical for some parts of PDL redevelopment than others.
6. Along with community engagement, contemporary market conditions are also strongly associated with PDL redevelopment outcomes.

These findings are likely to apply to other cases in Australia and internationally. Findings 1 and 2 establish that community involvement is generally positive but there are specific issues relating to affected residents and some local engagement models. Findings 3 and 4
build on the previous findings by explaining how local community involvement can be improved. Findings 5 and 6 place limits on what community involvement can achieve and propose some solutions. The evidence for these findings follows.

### 10.3 Contribution to Knowledge

Two measures of assessment have been applied in answering the research question:

1. the level of satisfaction of the local community through its involvement in the planning, design and development process;
2. the detection of improvements (or *vice versa*) to the built form of the completed PDL estate.

These are elaborated upon in Findings 1 and 2 respectively. Bracketed numbers show the locations in the thesis of the sources of evidence.

**Finding 1:**  *Intensive involvement leads to community satisfaction, and *vice versa*

This finding addresses a direction noted in the summation of the literature survey, namely: “Intensive involvement of the affected community leads to community satisfaction (and potentially to actual physical improvement).”

The participant survey found residents of Kensington have benefitted from the institutional arrangements set up, first to facilitate the preparation of a broad strategy with the stakeholders including residents and, then in various activities promoting community involvement for the development plans of Lynch’s Bridge and Kensington Banks. These activities included a monthly meeting of the *General Advisory Committee* and direct contact for residents and others through a Community Consultation Officer that created a sound relationship between the residents of Old Kensington and the planning and development interests (7.3.1). Thus community satisfaction was promoted through the inclusion of, and listening to, people over the whole period, from initial strategic planning to the completion of development. There appears to have been no such satisfaction for people of Maribyrnong and adjoining places with respect to Edgewater and Waterford Green (9.1.1) and, in later times, the local community was forced to react to proposals it considered were not in the spirit of the original plans (7.3.2-3). It is too early to say if the local community will be satisfied in the planning, design and development of the Defence
Site Maribyrnong, although some wariness is being displayed by residents about whether their wishes will be heeded (9.1.1).

The involvement of the local community in the planning of PDL can be seen as a right that has gradually increased over the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century (2.1.1-5) and as a positive attribute to the improvement of plans. However, at times, conservative governments have reduced and even quashed local community rights to encourage private investment (2.2, 6.5.2). The right for individuals and groups to become involved in urban planning is now accepted as expressed in Habitat II (2002) through the advocacy for transparent governance systems for cities (4.1). In this Century, Collaborative Planning Theory (CPT) (3.2.1) has begun to be practiced in England through Participatory Planning practice (3.2.3) and other places through collaborative practices.

The legislative means to achieving more local community involvement is still debated as there is a tension between those who subscribe to CPT and those who take a more critical approach to planning (3.2.1). Models like Neighbourhood Plans under the English Localism Act 2010 (Bishop 2010 and others in 3.2.4), and, in Victoria, both Neighbourhood Environmental Improvement Plans as discussed by (Gunningham et al. 2007 in 3.2.5) and Community Plans (West and Raysmith 2006 in 4.3.3) have major issues associated with them with regard to local community involvement in PDL planning. For one thing, a local community is unlikely to be able to plan for a future community without external parameters being applied (4.3.3). The Integrated Local Area Planning (ILAP) model, that allows ‘top down’ (State, regional or municipal) and ‘bottom-up’ (local community) interests to participate (Pope 2007 in 4.3.3), and which creates a ‘joined up’ mode of planning (West and Raysmith 2007 in 4.1) holds out the best prospects of results which are generally to the satisfaction of most and fits Collaborative Planning Theory best.

The research into community participation shows that communities are generally more satisfied when there is trust in the planner or implementer of projects (Beierie & Konisky 2000, Beierie & Cayford 2002 and Laurian 2004 in 4.3.2). The international case histories show a similar pattern that when direct involvement of communities increases there is greater satisfaction and wellbeing for example at West Don Lands (Wilkey 2010 in 6.2.1). On the other hand, development within or near existing communities can cause strong adverse reactions from the local community and therefore planning and development
processes that do not adequately involve, or even exclude local communities, will cause indifference, despondency or even anger (Gray 2010 in 6.3.1, and Hillman 1998 in 6.5.2).

**In summary,** the literature and international case histories indicate that more community involvement leads to greater community satisfaction and therefore accords with the outcome of the participant analysis. However, the legislative means to achieve this has been variable and there is no finite conclusion about this. In the Victorian context, models need to evolve to nurture this satisfaction including the consideration of more collaborative planning models such as ILAP (See Appendix 10.1 as a potential model for the Defence Site Maribyrnong).

**Finding 2:** Community involvement can lead to both ‘good’ and ‘bad’ built outcomes.

The participant analysis shows that the physical development of Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks was generally improved through community involvement at both a strategic and more detailed scale. However, with community involvement, some compromise in design may be anticipated as was the case when Old Kensington residents succeeded in reducing vehicular access to and from the New Kensington Banks to one point (9.1.2, 9.5.2). On the other hand, there was no evidence that the Maribyrnong and Footscray communities had any significant influence at Edgewater and Waterford Green in either broad strategy or detailed design (9.2). This was partly due to there being no sound strategic base for planning and design of Edgewater and Waterford Green and it was hard to see if any new plan would ‘fit in with other changes occurring in the locality’ (Panels Victoria 1993 in 7.3.2). But it was largely due to the administrative practice that once the plan was approved (as in a permissive amendment to the planning scheme) it was considered that the community need not contribute to the development of the estate (7.3.2-3).

The evidence for improvements that the Local Community achieved is rather scant with respect to the literature although there is some advocacy on this point from Beierie and Cayford (2002) that involving the public frequently produces decisions responsive to public values and therefore are substantially robust; conflict is resolved; trust increased; and the public becomes better informed (4.3.2). The international case histories, however, are richer in examples of communities creating improvements such as the efforts to maintain and improve housing standards at Crown Street (The Gorbals) in 6.4.2, and
community involvement in the *Phalen Corridor Initiative* in St Paul, Minnesota (6.5.1) that relied on community presence so that wide reaching and holistic changes could occur for surrounding communities’ benefit. Only one example demonstrated that the local community could be a negative force in improving the physical form of a proposal at Queens Quay, Toronto, Canada. Here, residents were strongly opposed to the Lake Trail project. Their opposition was eventually overcome only when their appeals were disallowed, overridden by Government for the benefit of the wider communities of Toronto (Gray 2010 in 6.3.1).

The satisfaction of a community through intensive involvement demonstrated in Finding 1 together with this Finding therefore establishes that, on balance, the involvement of local communities in the planning, design and development of PDL is positive. Thus there is a need to maximise the effectiveness of local communities in participating in their planning, design and development. Chapter 9 established the variables that are likely to determine the nature and extent of community involvement. These are:

- The way the project is set up within the wider governance framework and the attitude of the State Government towards inclusion of local communities;
- The extent to which the community has been involved in strategic planning during or previous to the project commencing;
- The capacity of the community to become involved; and
- The extent to which the project planner or developer is willing to consult openly with local communities to overcome their concerns (9.1.1).

These criteria are utilised in the subsequent development of Findings 3-6

**Finding 3:** *When a community is engaged from the start of planning, this produces the most consistent good outcomes.*

This finding addresses a direction noted in the summation of the literature survey, namely: “The importance of the stage at which community becomes engaged in the PDL planning process.”

At Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks the involvement of the community began several years before commencement of development when residents were engaged with other interests in the preparation of the *Lynch’s Bridge Redevelopment Strategy* (7.3.1, 2.2). At Edgewater and Waterford Green there were no municipal strategies which could provide
a basis to plan the land in relation to their surrounds (7.3.2); thus the local community was not given the opportunity to debate the broader strategic issues such as the recreational future of the Maribyrnong River Valley.

The literature shows that the early involvement of local communities in preparation of PDL proposals is broadly advocated: Brody et al. 2003 in 4.2.4, Goodspeed 2008, Offenbacker 2004 in 4.2.6; and the Minneapolis St-Paul Corridor Development Initiative, and Northeast-Midwest Institute in 4.3.1. It is also embodied in treaties such as AARHUS (3.2.2) and Government Policy (Department of Communities and Local Government-UK 2011 in 3.2.3). The community is also seen as a resource to recognise and utilise its knowledge in plan preparation stages (The Advocacy, Participation and NGOs in Planning Project in 4.2.5 and Bailey 2010 in 4.3.2). Thus early engagement with Local Communities can be considered to be common practice. However, it is the extent to which this is practiced that there appear to be discrepancies. Brody et al. 2003 in 4.2.4 showed that, despite planners considering local community involvement was a priority, in practice they were more engaged with stakeholders who were participants in the development process.

The international case histories generally show that there has been early and effective engagement of the local community. At East Fraserlands, Vancouver, there was a progression from 1995 first by a city-wide plan on industrial lands, then embedded in this further plans were created which were created at a local level and which more directly engaged local people (6.2.2). In some cases, the main engagement commenced later when a specific renewal plan was seen to be required by the initiating authority such as Regent Park (6.4.1) and Crown Street (6.4.2). Alternatively, the local community can initiate the planning process such as at West Don Lands (6.2.1). Sometimes a major issue will spark the initiation of a PDL project such as at Payne-Phalen’s loss of employment (6.5.1).

The evidence from the case studies shows that the time to engage local communities in a PDL project is as early as possible. The trigger for commencement is the:
- the need to rehabilitate contaminated land that may have a planned or amenity impact on the local community; or
- the need to prepare a localised strategy when metropolitan and municipal planning strategy is insufficient to guide the PDL planning and design.
- or both as above.
The early engagement of the local community also provides the potential for local communities, and other interests, to have a say in the structuring and composition of the institutional framework for the PDL project. This could happen when a draft scoping paper for the planning of the PDL is released for comment. One of the first engagement steps could be the appointment of community leaders to a committee that can advise on the scoping paper and who may continue through to the latter phases of a PDL project.

**Finding 4:** *Continuation of community engagement through implementation of PDL redevelopment and into subsequent place making also produces additional community benefits.*

This finding addresses directions noted in the summation of the literature survey, namely: “The importance of the stage at which community becomes engaged in the PDL planning process” and “The importance of the methods of engaging the community in PDL plans”

Setting the finding in context, a major project’s planning; design and development will extend over a long period. In the case of the three developed case studies this period was between twelve and twenty years. It follows that, within this period, some stages of the estate will be fully completed whilst others will remain PDL, before detailed planning and design are commenced. Figure 10.1 below shows how the stages from Strategic Planning to Place Making can overlap for different stages of the project.

![Figure 10.1 The Planning to Place Making continuum](image)

Finding 3 has discussed the need for local communities to have an early involvement with either or both site environmental assessment/decontamination and local context setting through strategic planning (the red line in Figure 10.1). This finding looks at the continuum from Urban Design (orange and yellow bar) through to PDL development and Place Making. As defined in 2.3, Urban Design in this research is embedded in
metropolitan and municipal strategic planning strategy. Place making is also seen as a concept that fosters public activities as well as one that encompasses the micro-design of spaces for those activities (Project for Public Spaces in 2.3). The evidence about urban design and place making for this research therefore centres on the design of neighbourhoods (discussed as ‘neighbourhood design’ below) and definable elements within neighbourhoods which create the spaces of the public realm (discussed as ‘detailed design’ below). These two scales of design are now discussed separately.

A **neighbourhood design** is normally expressed as an *urban design framework* for a PDL redevelopment in Victoria (2.3). These frameworks are at the cusp of strategic planning exercises with urban design (orange and red overlap of Figure 10.1) The figure shows that some aspects of strategic plans, namely the development of standards for infrastructure components are tightly bound to the urban design framework process. For example, the placement of higher order roads and public transport and the location of schools that will serve the wider area will all need concurrent consideration with any design options.

In the case studies, alternative urban design frameworks were prepared after consultation with the community: Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks as *Development Plans* (7.3.1); and Edgewater and Waterford Green as *Physical Framework Plans* (7.3.2, 7.3.3). Local communities were involved in the design of the estates through the presentation of alternative estate designs. For Edgewater and Waterford Green, residents of Maribyrnong and Footscray were given the opportunity of commenting upon alternative concepts which were mailed to them (7.3.2-3). On the other hand a more involving approach was conducted for both Lynch’s Bridge and Kensington Banks where the community was invited at meetings and a shopfront to provide their comments about what features of each alternative design they liked (7.3.1).

The elements of these plans that were of concern to the local community were the high rise component of Kensington Banks (9.1.2) and the use of the flood plain at Edgewater for residential development (9.1.2). While both issues were resolved in favour of the developer and Council, the Kensington community was satisfied with the outcome (9.1.2), whereas the Maribyrnong community continued to be unhappy with the outcome at Edgewater (9.1.2) largely due to the perceived concern of flooding to Maribyrnong Township. It is not surprising that major public comments were made at this time. For it
is when the location and amount of future land use, intensity of development and movement system are first exposed. This is when the general effects of future development can be assessed and thus it is often the time when a local community can become most activated both in a reactive as well as a proactive sense.

The literature on participation indicates that the use of ‘design by enquiry’ is now more prevalent for projects similar to the case studies but in 1980s and early 90s these tools were not formalised. The charette is the most accepted participation tool that is seen to be highly collaborative (Katz 1996 in 2.3). In the Australian context, a charette is more likely to be utilised as an early assessment device and an evaluation tool for the statutory design (NSW Government in 3.3.4). However, there is some debate about urban designers’ ability that relates to inbuilt biases to design that lead to inadequate consideration of the environmental impacts on land (Grant 2006 in 2.3). This bias can be diminished through the main strategic aspects of the site being accepted by the stakeholders (or at least the extent of their differences being defined) prior to any design by enquiry commencing (See the sequence shown in Fig 10.1 and Finding 3). This bias was diminished in the case of East Fraserlands through a Council adopted policy statement that was prepared with community participation prior to commencing the charette (6.2.2).

The second aspect of the design process is the **detailed design** of critical elements. These details in a PDL estate are of very great interest to a community as found in the case studies (9.2) and it is here that people can relate best to the future development of PDL. In sequence, this design occurs at a point after the main urban design framework for the PDL has been planned, and when some of the main infrastructure such as roadways and parks are to be designed. These are referred to as ‘Spatial Designs’ in Figure 10.1 (shown yellow). At Kensington Banks, the design of the Stock Route linear pathway, ‘Peppercorn Park’, ‘Bath Terrace’ and the relocation of the Moreton Bay Fig all elicited great public interest (9.2); so were the protection of the remnant saleyards and its administration building, and the gatehouse to the former abattoirs (9.5.3). At Waterford Green and Edgewater the protection of key historic buildings had been supported by the community but, in contradistinction to Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks, there was very little community input into any of the detailed aspects of space creation about the historic parts of the estates or any other elements of the estate including its open space (7.3.2-3 and 9.1.1).
The international case histories show a diversity of ways to engage the public at the detailed design layout stage of PDL plans. At East Fraserlands the local community became involved in the detailed design of public spaces and community facilities (6.2.2). Other examples demonstrate involvement with the local community in detailed design and associated with it other forms of engagement to increase community wellbeing, sometimes in very holistic ways, such as St Paul’s development agreements to employ local people and affordable housing arrangements (6.5.1) and Waterfront Toronto’s use of advisory groups for design and development implementation (6.3.1); the use of on-site facilities for residents at Oatlands, Glasgow and the constant involvement of the housing cooperative in the design and development for Crown Street, Glasgow (6.4.2). At Regent Park, Toronto the resident community was involved in the design of the open spaces and, to accommodate its needs, modification to the estate design was made (6.4.1).

The local community’s involvement in detailed design is important because it is at this stage that the spaces in the public realm can be created for future community activities whether these are of the structured or unstructured kind (9.5.5). To achieve this, community involvement must continue past the strategic planning and neighbourhood design stage through to detailed design of spaces in the public realm. Beyond the detailed design of space is the crossover to place making.

**Place Making** involves the micro design and use of public realm but, as in Edgewater, it may be constrained to instigating a range of estate based recreational and cultural activities utilising the existing public domain (7.3.2). However the place making stage can include the design of spaces, with such elements as paving, street furniture and vegetation selection, that will be used for pedestrian communication and activity. In the literature, the concept of place making has taken a different turn to considering space. The *Project for Public Spaces* places a high priority on community involvement, even empowerment, in the design of public spaces, observing that designs for space do not, in themselves, create place (2.3). The implication from the place making approach is that people, first of the local area, then new residents as well, should have a say in the detailed creation of spaces and their use as places. Thus the community’s involvement is essential even towards the finalisation of a PDL project. Also, participatory budgeting, which has been successful as a community involvement mechanism (Bhatnager & Rathore 2002 in
3.3.4) at both Regent Park (6.4.1), and St. Paul MN (6.5.1), would necessitate community involvement in place making well after the completion of urban design.

In summary, the findings from the case studies show that some ‘design by enquiry’ processes were undertaken in the case studies for the preparation of urban design frameworks at the neighbourhood scale and these were particularly effective in the case of Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks. These practices accorded with planning practice at the time and given the availability of more sophisticated charettes or their equivalents today, all future neighbourhood designs should be more rigorous and involve the local community and other stakeholders.

It is at the more detailed stage of urban design, where spaces for the public are being created, that the case studies do not display the rigour necessary to create good spaces and ultimately good places. More attention should therefore be given to the detailed design and place-making aspects of a PDL redevelopment with the local and emergent community being continuously and intensely involved. Techniques for increasing community empowerment such as participatory budgeting are a means to achieving better spaces and place-making.

The next findings deal directly with the issues of creating sustainable places for communities when urban economics without community involvement would otherwise dictate.

**Finding 5:** *Local community engagement in urban design is more critical for some parts of PDL redevelopment than others*

This finding addresses directions noted in the summation of the literature survey, namely: “Aspects of the planning, design and development process in which the community are critical participants and most interested.”

The engagement of the local community is limited, amongst other things, through the practicality of providing unlimited access to the myriad of details and decisions required to develop a PDL. Some of these limits were set in the case studies. At Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks the local community, while it was made aware of details relating to the design of individual groups of buildings and the landscape guidelines, usually did not involve itself in the details of each building and space to be created. This level of detail
was considered by an expert committee of Council planner and the development partners aided by an independent architect/urban designer (7.3.1 and 9.3). However, there were exceptions at times, for example, the local community, through the General Advisory Committee, made its view known on the ‘Bath Crescent’ issue and when view-lines from Old Kensington were proposed to be terminated (9.2). On the other hand, the developers of Edgewater and Waterford Green did not share the detailed design guidelines with the community. When more detailed Further Development Plans were prepared (7.3.2), these were decided between the Council (as approver) and the developer. Even the Council, as a political body, delegated the work of approval of more detailed plans to Council officers. Whilst generally shrouded in bureaucratic confidentiality, something is known about these dealings including the internal friction between planners and engineers about design standards (9.3). So, for Edgewater and Waterford Green, the end of meaningful involvement in detailed design for residents and businesses and the wider Maribyrnong and Footscray communities occurred when the planning scheme amendments were approved in 1994. Finding 2 showed that the involvement of the community in some detailed design was beneficial and that the curtailing of community comment for Waterford Green and Edgewater was at times considered to be inappropriate. This leaves the question: ‘to what level of detail should community involvement be appropriate?’

The literature indicates that, in some places, the design of PDL with community involvement can be quite detailed, such as preparing a Form Based Code (FBC) that can be interwoven into the community visioning process through a public design workshop (Katz in 2.3). In the international case histories there has been community involvement in the design of PDL for the details regarding the scale of buildings and design of open space and community facilities at Oatlands/Crown Street, Glasgow (6.4.2) at Regent Park, Toronto (6.4.1). At East Fraserlands, Vancouver, the local community was involved in some details especially as they developed for community facilities, however limits were placed on involvement in the design of private housing which was overseen by Council’s urban designers (6.2.2).

The level of detail in Australia that the community will be engaged in is likely to be delimited by the need to make ‘space’ into ‘place’. As well, any development that causes potential loss of amenity to developed areas (such as loss of view-lines) may be critical. It follows that the level of detail required to be discussed with the local community will be
greatest where the number of pedestrian activities is to be high such as in and around activity centres, along main pedestrian ways, in open spaces, at neighbourhood access points, and with the interface with present development. It is therefore concluded that areas of homogeneous living or industrial areas need not necessitate the same degree of attention from the public.

The need for greater detail in future ‘busy pedestrian places’ also raises a design issue which is ‘where to start designing?’ Many designs in the past have become subdivisional exercises using layout patterns that have neither realised good functionality nor legibility, the prime example being Waterford Green (9.5.3). Another way of designing is to identify the most important elements in the design such as the activity centre and design outwards to connect less significant, often more homogeneous, places (9.5.5). The implication of this design approach is that some places, like activity centres and the linear pedestrian ways connecting them, will require much more detailed design, as discussed in Finding 4, because these will be strongly associated with ‘place making’ that the community has an abiding and continuous interest in.

On the other hand, a local community may try to introduce over-simplistic concepts such as was sought for Edgewater where a principal objection to the plans was that development should not exceed two stories (9.3.2). That type of naive objection, in design terms, produces discordance between a local community and design and development interests. This tension needs to be resolved early so that local communities have the knowledge to adequately engage in urban design of PDLs and can be best achieved through participation of local communities in organising and arranging a design initiative, an example being the Minneapolis St-Paul Corridor Development Initiative in 4.3.1 and in later involvement in ‘design by enquiry’ processes (2.3, 6.2.2).

In conclusion, in designing a PDL, emphasis should be given to envisioning the places where more detailed place making will occur. In designing those places, the local community should become deeply involved and that involvement should continue until the spaces are created and utilised. The concept should be to design outwards from where intensive place making is planned to occur and to give preference to pedestrian/cycle activity and the creation of spaces and opportunities for informal activities. Other places, such as more homogeneous residential areas, arguably do not need the same level of community involvement and may require less attention by existing and evolving
communities. The key to these areas’ design is to have them well connected by foot/cycle to the busy places.

Community members should form partnerships with urban designers to bring about effective spaces through a ‘design by enquiry’ process that ultimately expresses spaces as places for community activity. But there are complications to this idealistic approach now discussed in Finding 6.

**Finding 6:** *Along with community engagement, contemporary market conditions are also strongly associated with PDL redevelopment outcomes.*

This finding addresses directions noted in the summation of the literature survey, namely: “External economic and political circumstances improving, negating or repressing community response and reduce/increase community impact.”

Across the case studies, the state of the urban economy at key points in redevelopment was an important factor in the estate’s form and function. The participant analysis uncovered two issues where market conditions specifically appear to have contributed to development outcomes:
- The protection of significant heritage assets (9.5.3); and
- The location, form and function of activity centres (9.5.5).

With respect to the **protection of heritage assets**, the results of the participant analysis shows that, with community involvement, there was more resolve to preserve and conserve the heritage of Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks. This led to arrangements where there were active measures put in place such as the murals under Epsom Road and new uses for heritage buildings such as the Community High School in the previous saleyards administration building (9.5.3). At Edgewater and Waterford Green there were significant heritage losses (9.5.3). The plans for both Edgewater and Waterford Green were insufficiently drafted to protect existing heritage assets. The main issue relates to the lack of protection afforded to heritage buildings in the planning scheme amendments for both estates. They were permissive in their regulation of land use within the ‘mixed use’ areas, as industry and commercial uses were permitted ‘as-of-right’ but so was residential use. The Maribyrnong City Council failed to attract much interest in commercial or industrial use that could adapt old structures because of the wider phenomena of deindustrialisation in advanced economies (2.2) and the severe economic downturn of the
early 1990s (9.5.3). The inevitable result was that the old buildings were demolished for new residential development.

While the planners and developers were sensitive to the heritage protection issues, they also understood the difficulty of retaining the industrial structures due to their lack of adaptability (9.5.3). Thus there was no strong advocacy by anyone including the local community for protecting significant defence manufacturing heritage.

The literature has only briefly touched on heritage planning as being part of the environmental movement of the 1960s (2.1.5). In the case histories, the evidence adduced here is also sparse. The international case histories do not shed significant light on heritage protection as none had a strong existing historic fabric when redeveloped. The exception to this is the London Docklands where there are some notable retentions, including the old sugar warehouses at West India Quay, which are now the London Museum of the Docklands, and some older structures such as churches, although these were seen as remnants to be fitted into enhancing the new spaces of a vastly different and more intensively built environment (2.3).

The building of activity centres was also strongly affected by the urban economy during the case studies’ redevelopment period. All centres were either relocated or re-arranged to accommodate motor vehicle patronage. There was little attention to, or recognition of, the pedestrian and this reduced or did not provide space for ‘place making’ activities. As one planner/urban designer put it there are no places where ‘people love to be in’ (Planner/urban designer in 9.5.5). The lack of strategic design principles and lack of detailed design that promotes congregation has probably led to this unfortunate situation (City Planner in 9.4).

The previous finding noted the importance of activity centres to place making and the need for more local community involvement. Also, there was a need the careful design of spaces having regard to their future activities; and that the design of these spaces should be seen as the highest priority leading to PDL sites being ‘designed outwards’ from key places with priorities for pedestrians and cyclists (9.5.5). This is a good principle but there are competing interests to consider including those of modern retailing providers, the providers of community services, and developers because of the cost of high quality
pedestrian environments. The reasons for the difficulty of pursuing this principle are discussed in 9.5.5.

In the international case histories, at East Fraserlands the community has been able to work with the Council in designing community and commercial and central places designed to attract place-making pursuits (6.2.2). Regent Park has also been carefully designed and developed to provide for business and retail uses that gain direct access to the new rectilinear street system, thereby providing facilities for the estate and the immediate neighbourhood (6.4.1).

Working in a mixed economy to achieve both good community outcomes and profitability for the developer is often quite complex. This is particularly so in times of economic recession as evidenced by the problems encountered for all three case studies and some of the case histories. The literature points out that post GFC the use of capital to build cities may become less involved with achieving equity for less able citizens and more an accessory to special interests (Lovering 2010 in 4.2.1). The complexity of PDL planning situations is also shown where landowners and developers (the owners of capital) can be strongly opposed to local communities; indicating a powerlessness of communities to compete, in a collaborative sense, with powerful interests (McGuirk 2001 in 4.2.2). There is also the issue of planners working equitably with a local community as a ‘public servant’, one contradicted by the general philosophy of NPM organisations that treat the public as ‘clients’ (Sager 2009 in 4.2.3). The relationship between local community and capital is further problematized because, despite planners’ rhetoric on providing for citizen participation, typically they seek to maintain control of the planning process and do not strongly emphasise genuine citizen involvement in drafting specific policies, nor do they engage with community groups, becoming more involved with business and government groups (Brody et.al. 2003 in 4.2.4). This raises the issue of dealing with ‘unequal pluralism’, where some groups, often being development interests, have greater capacity to persuade decision makers than community groups (Marshall, Steinmetz and Zehner 2012 in 4.3.1).

There are significant additional short-term costs and forgone profits associated with protecting heritage assets and/or making spaces for good place making (9.5.5). While collaboration is a key aspect of improving urban design there are likely to be adversarial situations only capable of being resolved equitably by external bodies set up for that
resolution (March 2012 in 3.2.1). Speculatively, the outcomes of the case studies may have been different if independent assessment had been available with clear criteria for heritage and activity centres designed around public place making.

10.5 Limitations of the research

Data from interviews while sufficiently robust to answer the question have some limitations as reported in Chapter 5 and summarised here: First, in order to get a range of answers needed, the case study sites had to be large sites and may not be representative of smaller, privately owned PDL. Second, the number of case study and international case history interviews was limited as each interview had to be ‘in depth’. Third, interviews were chosen using a snowball sampling technique which may have introduced a bias in the data collection. This was partially countered by eliciting evidence from the three key groups of residents, developers and planners. Last, people’s memory had faded in the twenty or so years since the definitive planning and design work had happened. The use of written accounts of the time (Chapter 7) overcame this problem in some instances.

In addition to the above points, there have been many changes since the initial planning for the completed estates. These include: greater potential involvement by communities through ‘e-communications’; changed statutory requirements and government guidelines such as for the assessment of potentially contaminated land; more effective and accepted planning tools to engage local communities; and the likelihood of changed community involvement due to socio-economic changes in Melbourne’s inner west.

10.6 Further research

The thesis and associated program of research has revealed the following avenues for further work:
- The issue of scale and smaller site PDL redevelopment was outside the scope of this research. Extending the method and scope further to include smaller yet significant PDL proposals on freehold land may reveal further insight into how community involvement can be most efficiently and productively utilised on smaller sites.
- The recognition of the economic benefits of developing PDL over greenfield developments, whilst recognised in this research as normative, was not directly part of the question to be answered. However, the research uncovered the fact that, in Australia, relative to other comparable parts of the world, there has been insufficient
regulatory and fiscal policy developed to put balanced and sustainable city
development into effect (Appendix 2.2). There is *prima facie* a role for Australian and
State central government to subsidise PDL site decontamination whether this be
though grants or low interest loans or tax relief as is the case in the United States and
Canada. Alternatively there may be a case for ‘greenfield’ development to be taxed
(or not indirectly subsidised) to provide a more sustainable urban balance. This
deserves further research.

- When this thesis researched the practices occasioned when planning and designing
large PDLs, it uncovered an issue that extends beyond its remit. It is the way that
‘social planners’ involve local communities in the planning of their neighbourhoods
in a ‘bottom up’ or ‘bottom only’ method, and the way ‘town planners’ take a more
‘top down’ approach that is embedded in both higher order urban strategy and market
opportunism. More theoretical work needs to be done to find connections to these
strands of human resolve so that both can more sensibly relate to one another.

### 10.7 Policy implications

The implications of this research for policy making in Victoria possibly extending to
Australia and other parts of the world with similar economies and culture include the
following:

- New approaches to involving the local and wider communities need to be developed
by governments to ensure that communities are made aware of the environmental,
economic and social benefits of redeveloping PDL. This must be explained so that
the capacity of communities to debate the redevelopment of PDL is raised beyond
simply objecting because any proposed development would be fundamentally
different from the surrounding development. Governments should search for good
models such as the Minneapolis-St Paul Corridor Development Initiative

- Explicit guidance about the engagement of local communities in the planning, design
and development of PDL, should be provided in the form of a government practice
note, or a similar document. The use of participatory budgeting as a means to
involving local communities in place making should be included in this guidance.
The English Statement of Community Involvement may also be a consideration,
possibly requiring amendment of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*. 
- Large PDLs should be clearly defined in all urban Planning Schemes (if not yet achieved), elevating their prominence as a key element of strategic planning, and alerting local communities and other stakeholders of their relevance to a balanced and sustainable future. State guidance may be required for municipalities.

- Governments and peak bodies should prepare case studies that are helpful in illustrating exemplary PDL development and the stakeholder engagement processes that were followed. International exemplars should be examined, some of which were discussed in Chapter 6. The importance of designing pedestrian connected places needs to be emphasised and techniques such as giving priority to pedestrian places should be seen as a key gauge of a design’s rigour.

- A better understanding of PDL processes, and the involvement of the local community in these, needs to be taught in university planning schools and other appropriate learning and knowledge exchange forums;

- Policy guidance on balancing heritage and activity centre planning with retail planning and other urban economy drivers is an urgent consideration so that investment capital can be attracted to places where there are long term prospects for sustainable, unique and high quality places.

### 10.8 Conclusion

The program of research reported in this thesis was selected in the knowledge that Collaborative Planning Theory is contested. Contemporary arguments on planning theory have broadened in what Brownill and Parker call the ‘post collaborative era’ (2010, p.278). Today, the clear message is that local communities and other stakeholders have a right to become involved early in the plan preparation process of PDL and that participatory planning processes should be put in place. This is not a new concept; almost identical processes pertained to the Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks site in the 1980s, but what needs to be decided is the range of these processes and what powers and responsibilities are situated with whom.

The research carried out here suggests that, so long as representative democracy is retained in the municipal and state structures we have today in Australia, the role of local communities and other stakeholders will remain largely advisory (in a collaborative sense) but can be expected to become adversary (antagonistic) if policies for the city or metropolis are applied which have an actual or perceived adverse local effects. This latter
prospect will often be present due to the need to use PDL more intensively; differently from the surrounding area; and for higher population densities to prevail. But an advisory role is far superior to the reactive role of objection that almost always pertains today and therefore both planning practice and the statutory framework for plans to place local communities in the advantageous position of being able to consult with and possibly bargain with other interests are important. Such discourse requires communities to increase their capacity to involve themselves in the planning and design of their neighbourhood, and for interests proposing to develop PDL to become more accepting of sensitively and openly negotiating with those communities. It will also mean that planning authorities should accept, if they have not already done so, that community involvement in the planning, design and development of PDL will take both time and resources and a commitment to be communicative. Urban lands are too precious, and the long term future of our cities is too important to do otherwise.
## Glossary of terms

The terms below which are cross referenced within the table’s ‘Meaning’ column are shown in **bold**.

Where the definition has been adopted from another source, this has been referenced by the person or institution’s name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word/s</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity Centre</strong></td>
<td>In Victoria a centre which is defined in Melbourne 2030 to ‘provide the focus for services, employment and social interaction in cities and towns’. (Vic Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADI- Australian Defence Industries</strong></td>
<td>A former trading corporation of the Commonwealth Government relating to defence production. Managed the OFM and the AFM sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFM- Ammunition Factory Maribyrnong</strong></td>
<td>Ammunition Factory Maribyrnong (otherwise known as The Ammunition Factory, Footscray), now the Edgewater estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brownfields</strong></td>
<td><strong>Brownfields</strong> are real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant (USEPA). See also neologism called <strong>greyfield</strong>. Both such land categories are included as <strong>PDL</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CaLD</strong></td>
<td>Culturally and linguistically diverse communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBD</strong></td>
<td>Central Business District- the core area of a city mostly occupied by businesses although dense housing and key institutions are often found there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CERCLA</strong></td>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act 1980,(USA) otherwise known as the ‘Superfund Act’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charette</strong></td>
<td>A design-based, accelerated, collaborative project management system that spans the entire pre-construction period (NCI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Footscray</strong></td>
<td>The former city that was absorbed into the larger City of Maribyrnong in 1994.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Maribyrnong</strong></td>
<td>The present city created by partial amalgamation of the City of Sunshine with the City of Footscray in 1994. It includes the case study PDL estates of Edgewater, Waterford Green and the Defence Site Maribyrnong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Melbourne</strong></td>
<td>The Municipal Council which encompasses the suburb of Kensington. In the 1990s it extended its borders to cover the northern parts of Lynch’s Bridge (previously administered by the former City of Essendon). Now it wholly encompasses the case study PDL estate of Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Sunshine</strong></td>
<td>A former city that included the suburb of Maribyrnong prior to its partial amalgamation with the City of Maribyrnong in 1994.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative Planning Theory (CPT)</strong></td>
<td>A theory that attests a plan can be formulated by collaboration between affected parties including institutions and the community to arrive at a commonly understood and acceptable plan through a process of discourse (P Healey 1992).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary (cont) Word/s</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reference Group</td>
<td>The advisory group such as set up by ADI to have input into the EES and planning scheme process for <strong>Waterford Green</strong> and <strong>Edgewater</strong> estates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>See permeability below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Is one of the more structured forms of participation. A dynamic process of dialogue between individuals or groups, based upon a genuine exchange of views, and normally with the objective of influencing decisions, policies or programs of action. (RTPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Usually means a municipal council established by the State of <strong>Victoria</strong> to administer the Local Government Act or such other Victorian enactments as delegated to it, including many of the powers and responsibilities of the <strong>Planning and Environment Act 1987</strong> (in the case of this act a council may be referred to as a ‘planning authority’ when preparing a planning scheme or its amendment or a ‘responsible authority’ when administering a planning scheme).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decontaminate</td>
<td>The removal or treatment of contaminants to the appropriate environmental standards. Synonymous with remediate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Site Maribyrnong</td>
<td>Also known as the former Explosives Factory Maribyrnong (EFM). The yet to be redeveloped site in northern Maribyrnong with frontage to the Maribyrnong River and Cordite Avenue to its south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deindustrialisation</td>
<td>In this thesis it means the restructuring of urban economies so that there becomes a greater reliance on service (tertiary) sector employment than for manufacturing (secondary) sector employment. The effect of deindustrialisation has often been the creation of PDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative Democracy</td>
<td>Citizens deliberating about public problems and solutions under conditions that are conducive to reasoned reflection and refined public judgement; a mutual willingness to understand the values, perspectives and interests of others; and the possibility of reframing their interests to mutually acceptable solutions. (Sirianni C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>In this thesis it largely expresses the design of spaces and places for people in the <strong>public realm</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>A technical term under the <strong>Planning and Environment Act 1987</strong> which includes the construction of buildings and works, the demolition of any buildings and works, the relocation of buildings, putting up advertising hoardings and signs, and the subdivision or consolidation of land. Distinguishable from Land Use. (Vic Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLL - Delfin Lend Lease</td>
<td>The development company responsible for the development of <strong>Edgewater</strong> from about 2003 onwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC - District Planning Council</td>
<td>In St. Paul MN, a District Planning Council established by the City of St Paul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater</td>
<td>The largely residential estate development on the former site of the Ammunitions Factory Footscray (AFM).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater Place</td>
<td>The neighbourhood activity centre for <strong>Edgewater</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EES - Environment Effects Statement</td>
<td>In Victoria a document made under the <strong>Environment Effects Act 1978</strong> which has been sought by the responsible minister and which has assessed the effect of a proposal on the environment (Equivalent to an EIS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary (cont) Word/s</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFM- Explosives Factory Maribyrnong</strong></td>
<td>The former Explosives Factory Maribyrnong. Now part of the <strong>Defence Site Maribyrnong</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIA- Environment Impact Assessment</strong></td>
<td>In Victoria it is known as environmental affect assessment sometimes culminating in an Environment Effects Statement (<strong>EES</strong> is equivalent to an <strong>EIA</strong>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td>See <strong>Public (or community) engagement</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Footscray</strong></td>
<td>1. A Central Activities District comprising the town centre of Footscray and its environs, or  2. The <strong>Melbourne</strong> suburb, post code 3011 immediately south of <strong>Maribyrnong</strong> and immediately southwest of <strong>Kensington</strong> suburbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends of Maribyrnong Valley</strong></td>
<td>An incorporated community group which takes interest in the whole of the urban <strong>Maribyrnong</strong> River Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAC- General Advisory Committee</strong></td>
<td>A monthly meeting advisory group (1987-1998) for <strong>Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks</strong> made up of local stakeholders including residents of <strong>Kensington</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GFC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Global Financial Crisis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenfield</strong></td>
<td>Not a brownfield or greyfield (US, Canada). Taking its common meaning it is agricultural or grazing land or land in a natural or near natural state not used or previously used for urban settlement. Can mean ex-urban low density settlement where plots are, say, larger than 2 hectare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greyfield</strong></td>
<td>Neologism derived from brownfield which is used in the United States and Canada, meaning land for redevelopment which is not complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant. A disused mall shopping centre is an example. In this thesis it is treated as <strong>Previously Developed Land (PDL)</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highpoint</strong></td>
<td><strong>Highpoint Shopping Centre</strong> is a major mall centre in <strong>Maribyrnong</strong> suburb and one of Melbourne’s Principal <strong>Activity Centres</strong>. Originally a quarry therefore a <strong>PDL</strong>, the centre has now expanded to one of Melbourne’s major mall centres. Adjacent to it are the regional facilities of the Maribyrnong Aquatic Centre and the sports specialising Maribyrnong Secondary College as well as an extensive low intensity retail area. It is in close proximity to the case studies of <strong>Edgewater</strong>, <strong>Waterford Green</strong> and the <strong>Defence Site Maribyrnong</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement</strong></td>
<td>See <strong>Public (or Community) Involvement</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kensington</strong></td>
<td>Suburb of inner <strong>Melbourne</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kensington Banks</strong></td>
<td>The marketing name of that part of the <strong>Lynch’s Bridge</strong> Project southwest of <strong>Lynch’s Bridge</strong> estate (all SW of Epsom Road). Commenced in 1994 as a Public Private Partnership, it is almost entirely residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILAP- Integrated Local area Planning</strong></td>
<td>A form of planning which, at the local/municipal, level which integrates ‘top down’ State and broader than local organisational initiatives with the ‘bottom up’ initiatives of a local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land use</strong></td>
<td>A technical term under the <strong>Planning and Environment Act 1987</strong> which includes use or proposed use for the purpose for which the land has been or is being or may be developed. (Victorian Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary (cont) Word/s</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legibility</td>
<td>The quality which makes a place graspable (Bentley et al). The concept that connectivity and the elements of a place can be readily sensed so that the traveller makes least effort to proceed to a destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lend Lease</td>
<td>The company responsible for the development of Waterford Green and Edgewater prior to 2003. See also DLL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liminal Space</td>
<td>Space that exists on the threshold between two different planes. (Better Cities and Towns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community</td>
<td>A community of place. For this thesis it means the residents and businesses of a neighbourhood or the area encompassing and surrounding one of the case studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localism</td>
<td>The devolution of decisions to local communities. In England this is being advanced through the Localism Act where local communities either at a parish council level or as some other designated community may prepare a Neighbourhood Plan which requires a majority at referendum to be adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch’s Bridge</td>
<td>1. A bridge (historically the first to cross the Maribyrnong River) between Smithfield Road, Kensington and Ballarat Road, Footscray, or 2. The project commenced in 1982 that defined the broad strategies for PDL from the Maribyrnong River to Flemington which included the Newmarket Saleyards, an army ordnance depot and the Melbourne Municipal Abattoirs, or 3. The earliest stages of the Lynch’s Bridge residential development commenced before 1994. Later stages were known as Kensington Banks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks</td>
<td>The name of the estates built between 1987 and 2005 that are part of Kensington 3031 and, combined, make up one of the case studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribyrnong</td>
<td>1. A suburb of metropolitan Melbourne. It encompasses Edgewater, Waterford Green and the Defence Site Maribyrnong case studies. or 2. The City of Maribyrnong a municipal council. Edgewater, Waterford Green and Defence Site Maribyrnong case studies are within its borders. or 3. The Maribyrnong River rising at the Great Divide whose confluence is with the River Yarra at West Melbourne/Yarraville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>The metropolitan area of Melbourne as defined by the Metropolitan Statistical District of the Australian Bureau of Statistics unless otherwise denoted such as the City of Melbourne. Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks is now fully located within the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Municipal Abattoirs</td>
<td>The former abattoirs located on land now occupied by Kensington Banks estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Strategic Statement</td>
<td>That part of a planning scheme in Victoria, Australia which provides strategic guidance for development proponents and for planning scheme administration and amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIP- Neighbourhood Environment Improvement Plan.</td>
<td>In Victoria, a plan prepared to create compliance with appropriate environmental standards under the Environment Protection Act 1970.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPM</td>
<td>National Environmental Protection Measure (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket Saleyards</td>
<td>The name given to the Melbourne City Council run saleyards now occupied by Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary (cont) Word/s</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NPM</strong></td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIMBY</strong></td>
<td>'Not In My Back Yard': A syndrome of individuals or groups of residents brought on when confronted with the prospect of development different from the prevailing character of their street or neighbourhood that engenders outrage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFM- Ordnance Factory Maribyrnong</strong></td>
<td>The former Ordnance Factory Maribyrnong that is now part of Waterford Green estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Major Projects (OMP)</strong></td>
<td>The office established to manage large projects for the Victorian Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Kensington</strong></td>
<td>Those parts of the suburb of Kensington laid-out in Victorian era Melbourne, not being Lynch’s Bridge or Kensington Banks estates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td>An all-purpose term that describes the extent and nature of activities undertaken by those who take part in public or community involvement. (RTPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory democracy</strong></td>
<td>The process of decision making where a community of place is empowered to make decisions. See Participatory Planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory planning</strong></td>
<td>A set of processes through which diverse groups and interests engage together in reaching for a consensus on a plan and its implementation. The different parties need to exchange information to explore areas of common ground and compromise and find ways of reducing the extent and intensity of disagreements (C&amp;LG).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permeability</strong></td>
<td>The extent to which an area’s road and pedestrian network allows residents and others efficient access to destinations within or outside a locality. Can also be referred to as connectivity. High permeability is produced by a ‘fine-grained’ public realm. (Bentleigh et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personalisation</strong></td>
<td>The rearrangement and embellishment of facades and other visible elements of a building that increases variety and legibility. Tension exists between control versus individual choice. (Bentleigh et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td>An area which has common or complimentary elements that signify it as being the same locality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place making</strong></td>
<td>Usually synonymous with the micro-design aspects of Urban Design but can have a broader connotation which transcends the physical nature of urban design through facilitating direct involvement of the community and stimulating recreation and the local economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Places Victoria</strong></td>
<td>Places Victoria: Since late 2011 the Victorian Government’s land development agency, now more specifically directed towards PDL redevelopment. See also Vic Urban.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>The process which defines the future of an area (often at the metropolitan, regional or municipal scale) through displaying its preferred future land use and development. The outcome is usually referred to as a ‘plan’ or ‘planning scheme’ that is often supported by regulations including specific land use and development requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary (cont) Word/s</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning practice</td>
<td>In this thesis includes the legal framework for land use planning and the way planning authorities make decisions about PDL projects within that framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Scheme</td>
<td>In Victoria it comprises a plan prepared under the <em>Planning and Environment Act 1987</em>, comprising the State’s Planning Policy Framework and the Municipal Strategic Statement both of which guide the consideration of planning applications and planning scheme amendments and secondly, other regulatory requirements that are displayed as zoning, overlay maps or universal standards for specific uses and developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning scheme amendment</td>
<td>In Victoria, an amendment of a planning scheme prepared under the provisions of the <em>Planning and Environment Act 1987</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Developed Land (PDL)</td>
<td>Includes both vacant and derelict land and land currently in use with known potential for redevelopment. It excludes land that was previously developed where the remains have blended into the landscape over time. (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (or Community) Engagement</td>
<td>Actions initially taken to establish effective relationships with individuals or groups so that more specific interactions can take place (RTPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (or Community) Involvement</td>
<td>Applies to the wide variety of interactions between planners, decision-makers, individual and representative stakeholders to identify issues and exchange views on a continuous basis; it is often used as a more generic term for the more active forms of participation. (RTPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public participation</td>
<td>See Participation above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat Run</td>
<td>A colloquial term which means a route used by motorists to avoid traffic congestion on the arterial road network by using side streets to reach a destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RemEDIATE</td>
<td>The removal or treatment of contaminants to the appropriate environmental standards. Synonymous with decontaminate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richness</td>
<td>In urban design usage it is designs that create a variety of enjoyable sensual experiences (motion, smell, hearing, touch, sight) (Bentleigh <em>et al.</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robustness</td>
<td>In urban design usage it means a building or place capable of being used for new contemporary activities through economically feasible adaptation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithfield Road/Gatehouse Drive</td>
<td>The location that describes the small neighbourhood activity centre within Kensington Banks. Not the true ‘village centre’ which is viewed by residents as Kensington’s Macaulay Road shops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHO Small Office or Home Office</td>
<td>A business activity located at the same place as a residence; alternatively the office uses the whole of the internal space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Includes: a road or and the liminal (threshold) area between the public realm and the face of buildings; and open spaces contained by escarpments, groups of buildings and lines of trees or copses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary (cont) Word/s</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>The setting of defined objectives for <strong>land use</strong> and <strong>development</strong> in a spatial context. Spatial values (such as distance) may be identified for these objectives or they may be expressed as performance standards (such as need to protect identified objects/places). These values may also be expressed as principles for development or in mapped form. Strategic plans can be influenced by external ‘top down’ or centralist factors such as metropolitan plans (e.g. population to be accommodated), or the intrinsic qualities of a site and its locality (such as the existence of a natural feature or local community needs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCAAP</td>
<td><em>Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant</em>, Minnesota, USA. Now closed down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHC</td>
<td><em>Toronto Community Housing Corporation</em> also shortened to <em>Toronto Community Housing</em>. An institution created by the City of Toronto (Ont. Canada) to manage the public housing stock it owns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tram</td>
<td>Same as a Streetcar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban area</td>
<td>Includes suburbs and industrial areas and other developed areas, major infrastructure such as airports, recreation areas and parks within or adjacent to the contiguous developed area of a town or city but does not include low density peri-urban places, say, where densities are less than one dwelling per two hectares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>The design of places and spaces (including streets, squares, open space and some front yards) for a town or city taking in all scales from street block to a part of a city or town. In this thesis it does not include metropolitan, regional or municipal scale plans. (See Planning and Place making).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban economy</td>
<td>The economic aspects of urban development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Pacific</td>
<td>Originally Carter Homes and then the <strong>Pioneer</strong> group. A building company that became the private partner with <strong>Office of Major Projects</strong> Victoria, for the detailed planning and development of <strong>Kensington Banks</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Valley</td>
<td>That part of the <strong>Maribyrnong</strong> River Valley that is located within urban and suburban Melbourne and is within the Urban Growth Boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>In Urban Design Terms, the mixture of building forms which denote the variety of uses in an area. Implies that mixed use is superior to homogeneous development. (Bentleigh et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCAT</td>
<td>The appellate body for a range of decisions made by <strong>Councils</strong> or other bodies; given power to make final decisions on behalf of the <strong>Victorian Government</strong>. It hears appeals against Council decisions for matters under the Planning and Environment Act 1987 through its Land Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEPA</td>
<td><strong>Victorian Environment Protection Authority</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic Urban</td>
<td>The Former Victorian Government’s land development agency. Now <strong>Places Victoria</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>The State of Victoria responsible for the planning and development of cities, towns and the countryside, and the delegation of responsibilities to Municipal councils or other statutory authorities. It comprises 79 municipal councils, encompasses an area of 237,629 sq. km with a population of 5,603,100 (2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary (cont) Word/s</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Government</td>
<td>The parliament and administration for the State of Victoria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Appropriateness</td>
<td>The design of a building that denotes its use to act as a designator. This adds to legibility, variety and robustness. (Bentley et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Gardens</td>
<td>The small group of shops at the corner of Wests Road and Williamsons Road, Maribyrnong. Part of Waterford Green.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Green</td>
<td>The residential estate located on the former Ordnance Factory Maribyrnong (OFM) and other peripheral areas once under control of the Commonwealth Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSC- Wilson Sayer Corr</td>
<td>The consultants who prepared the EES and planning scheme amendments for Waterford Green and Edgewater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>The designation of future (or planned) broad land use outcomes. Part of the regulation (rules) for a planning scheme in Victoria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendices

Appendix A - Contributors to the research

The following people assisted in the research for this thesis. The ‘group’ column below is an approximate typology that equates with the participant survey categories discussed in Chapter 5. The research has involved a number of other people but this was generally to ascertain some specific information. The people acknowledged here, have all spent time in dialogue with me about the research question. At times this was remotely carried out by e-mail or telephone but in the majority of instances the adduced information was from face to face interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Place/area of interest</th>
<th>Data capture method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Noel Almelda</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Arden Hills, MN, USA</td>
<td>e-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Meagan Beekman</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Arden Hills CC, MN, USA</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Donna Brookes</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Glasgow City Council, Scotland</td>
<td>Interview/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Marjory Brown</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chris Brillinger</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Toronto City Council, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Telephone /memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sue Brownill</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, England</td>
<td>Interview/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Sheila Byard</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Kensington, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Juliet Carpenter</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, England</td>
<td>Interview/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Etive Currie</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>RTPI, London, UK</td>
<td>Interview/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Tom Collins</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>St Paul Port Authority, MN, USA</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Mike Fix</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Arden Hills, MN USA</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Man Gibson</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Gladki</td>
<td>Planner/Urban designer</td>
<td>Regent Park, Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Andrew Gray</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Waterfront Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mark Guslits</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Regent Park, Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Interview/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Peter Haffendon</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Place/area of interest</td>
<td>Data capture method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Dorothy Hanlon</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Lad Hanlon</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Roger Holloway</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Western Suburbs, Melbourne, Vic</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Susan Hoyt</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Twin Cities Metropolitan Council, MN, USA</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Patricia James</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>City of St Paul, MN, USA</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Karen Janiszewski</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Kensington, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Kari</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Twin Cities Metropolitan Council, MN, USA</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Keaney</td>
<td>Planner/resident</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Myra Kitchenman</td>
<td>Resident coordinator</td>
<td>Kensington, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Stephen Koenig</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Telephone/memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Mitch Kosny</td>
<td>Planner/academic</td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription/e-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ian Law</td>
<td>Resident coordinator</td>
<td>Glasgow City Council, Scotland</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Steven Lionarkis</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Telephone/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Les McLean</td>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Bill Morin</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>St Paul Port Authority MN USA</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Wendy Morris</td>
<td>Urban Designer</td>
<td>Melbourne, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Elaine Murray</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Glasgow City Council, Scotland</td>
<td>Interview/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Gary Pendlebury</td>
<td>Planner/developer</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Telephone/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Justin Ray</td>
<td>Urban designer</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Richard Reilly</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Kensington, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Alan Ross</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Lew Sayer</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Andreas Schulze</td>
<td>Planner/academic</td>
<td>University of Manchester, UK</td>
<td>Interview/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Sewell</td>
<td>Housing expert</td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription/memo/e-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Shields</td>
<td>Planner/developer</td>
<td>Kensington, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Matt Shillitto</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Vancouver, BC, Canada</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription/e-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ron Smith</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Glasgow CC, Scotland</td>
<td>Interview/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kevin Snow</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Lyn Sweeney</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Kensington, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Place/area of interest</td>
<td>Data capture method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Paul Syms</td>
<td>Planner/academic</td>
<td>University of Manchester, UK</td>
<td>Interview/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Marcus Terjung</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ian Tippett</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Stephen Turnbull</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Glasgow City Council, Scotland</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Upsher</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Rob Vines</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Walmsley</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ian Walters</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Western suburbs, Victoria</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Geoff Ward</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Telephone/Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Waugh</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Cynthia Wilkey</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Waterfront Toronto, Ontario, Canada.</td>
<td>Interview/Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Karen Wu</td>
<td>Resident coordinator</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Victoria</td>
<td>Telephone/Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1 - Definition of Previously Developed Land

The definition of Previously Developed Land (PDL) is that which is used in the National Land Use Database (NLUD) for England. The definition below is taken from the National Planning Policy Framework 2012:

“Previously developed land: Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill purposes where provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures; land in built-up areas such as private residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time.” (DCLG 2012, p.55)

The definition of PDL has differed little from the 1990s, the most comprehensive version being in the 4th Edition of Planning Policy Statement (PPS: Housing), June 2011 which states:

“Previously-developed land (often referred to as brownfield land):
Previously-developed land is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated fixed surface infrastructure.
The definition includes defence buildings, but excludes:
– Land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings.
– Land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill purposes where provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures.
– Land in built-up areas such as private residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments, which, although it may feature paths, pavilions and other buildings, has not been previously developed.
Land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time (to the extent that it can reasonably be considered as part of the natural surroundings).” (Communities & Local Government 2011, p.26)

Low-demand and vacant housing is considered to be a PDL (Ibid. p.13). The term ‘latent PDL’ is also used which implies a progression from full economic use of land and buildings to that land becoming vacant or derelict. So for example a housing estate being progressively vacated or housing that does not reach today’s occupancy standards may be considered ‘latent PDL’.

Neither Previously Developed Land nor brownfield or greyfield are terms extensively used in Australia although they are commonly recognised words sometimes used in academic literature but seldom in planning practice. Synonymous terms in Australia refer to infill, urban renewal and redevelopment.

References and sources of information:


Appendix 2.1 - A chronology of PDL developments in metropolitan Melbourne

The conversion of sites from one use to another has been a continuing occurrence in Melbourne for over a century. This redevelopment was generally dispersed over smaller sites until the end of World War 2. After the War the Housing Commission of Victoria carried out slum clearance and built a large number of high-rise apartments in inner Melbourne. But it was not until the 1970s that derelict or underutilised land usually previously used for industry and port uses in the inner suburbs began to become available and valuable for redevelopment. This land was, by and large, the result of de-industrialisation. This appendix is to show that de-industrialisation, though widespread had a particular effect on the Maribyrnong River Valley. Sites within the Maribyrnong Valley are **highlighted in bold**.

1. Old quarries began to become valuable sites for redevelopment in the late 1970s. **Highpoint Shopping Centre**, Australia’s third largest shopping mall (2004), was built in one. A little later, Altona Gate Shopping Centre was built partly in a small quarry. Then the filling of the **Niddrie Quarry** with rubble from Whelan the Wrecker was stalled by local political reaction. VicUrban eventually developed the land as a residential estate with a lake in the 2000s.

2. While conversion of urban land from one purpose to another has occurred since the end of World War 2, the most significant changes to the industrial landscape occurred in 1985 when a residential estate was commenced on the previous **Angliss’ Imperial Freezing Works, Footscray**. This was the first significant conversion of a former industry (abattoirs) to residential development and was carried out through the purchase of the land by the State Department of Housing and then subdivided and developed for both private and public housing.

3. Almost immediately after the Angliss redevelopment, the abandoned Newmarket Saleyards and adjoining Melbourne Municipal Abattoirs and army stores were planned for renewal, predominantly with terraces and other medium density housing. The estate, now known as **Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks** was completed about 2005.
4. At about the same time, the Cain Government decided to release approximately 100 Ha of Crown (Government owned) land on the south side of the Melbourne CBD, an area over half the size of the ‘Hoddle Grid’ within Melbourne’s CBD. Known as ‘Southgate’, development was slow due to a general economic recession and the private sector’s reluctance to develop the planned mid-high density private housing. Development commenced initially with commercial office development which then followed the market trend. Eventually during the subsequent Kennett Government years, high-rise and medium-high density perimeter block and high-rise housing and retail development established and a massive casino and exhibition centre were built occupying exclusive frontage to the river.

5. Other redevelopments of old industries with housing were beginning to happen in the 1980s including an ill-fated housing estate at Ardeer that was subsequently found to be heavily contaminated with lead, and which was finally remediated and turned into Ardeer Community Park. This incident prompted the Government to introduce amendments to the Environment Protection Act and a Planning Minister’s direction that land to be rezoned from industrial zones to zones which could permit houses or other ‘sensitive’ uses required environmental auditing stating that the land was clear of contamination or, with works and use conditions, could be used for sensitive uses.

6. The closure of major defence facilities in Melbourne commenced in the late 1980s with the relocation of the Albion Explosives Factory to Benalla and Moama NSW. This huge site of 500 ha (two square miles) located 18 kilometres from the CBD became available for development, subject to environmental cleanup. Most of the site was developed for housing by the Urban land Authority (now Places Victoria). The estate, known as Cairnlea, is now substantially completed as a low density development using ‘smart blocks’ to somewhat increase density above normal detached housing densities.

7. By the early 1990s the trend for families in the professional and management occupations to purchase Victorian housing in the inner suburbs had become well established and these inner suburbs were fast becoming gentrified. This encouraged developers to look in these areas at the old, often vacant or under-
utilised brick factories and industrial sites as prospective ‘warehouse’ residential developments and mid-rise apartments. Key sites in Port Melbourne and along the Yarra River were targeted for rezoning. The largest urban renewal scheme- Beacon Cove, commenced in the early 1990s as a compact housing and warehouse conversion, eventually leading on to the construction of bay-side high-rise apartments. In Richmond, Victoria Gardens mixed use development got underway and in nearby Fitzroy, the MacRobertson confectionary factory was converted to apartments. The old malt-works of CUB in East Melbourne were also converted to mid-rise living as was redundant rail yards at Jolimont. Late in this period the City of Port Phillip sold its incinerator and depot site in St Kilda for a housing development-The Oasis, which set a sustainability benchmark for medium to high density PDL development.

8. The 1990s also saw the State government dispose of many landholdings in the suburbs. The most significant of these was in the enormous mental illness hospital complex of Mont Park, Laurundal and Gresswell in near La Trobe University, Bundoora. This complex was no longer needed when mental illness wards became decentralised to major public hospitals and patient retention rates dropped in favour of home-based care. The hospital sites were largely converted to low density housing with significant areas protected as wildlife reserve. Elsewhere, many school sites became available for low to medium density development when the Kennett Government reformed the State (public) School system.

9. Conversion of old waterfront industries commenced at the turn of this century along the Footscray Wharves. The Castlemaine Cotton Mills became a number of small spaces for artisans, while the waterfront Bradford Cotton Mills was converted to Lonely Planet’s (travel books publisher) world headquarters.

10. The defence manufacturing industry had become inefficient and, in 1989, Australian Defence Industries (ADI) was established as a means of privatising the industry. However, as the inefficiencies continued, this generally meant that many defence manufacturing facilities were closed by ADI and by the mid-90s defence production in Melbourne had virtually ceased. In the suburb of Maribyrnong, three large establishments closed- the Explosives factory Maribyrnong (EFM) in 1990; the Ordinance Factory Maribyrnong (OFM) in 1993; and the
Ammunition Factory Maribyrnong (AFM) in 1994. The last two sites were prepared to be disposed of by the Department of Defence. By the mid-1990s, the OFM was sold to Lend Lease and development commenced. This estate, known as Waterford Green, was almost entirely developed by 2005 with a mixture of detached houses, terraces and medium-high density apartments. In the early 2000s the AFM began redevelopment through Footscray Land Limited a joint company trading for the Commonwealth Government and Lend Lease (now Delfin Lend Lease). The estate known as Edgewater is now mostly developed with detached houses, terraces and other compact housing with a small portion of the land being retailing and offices. Final development on the remaining sites includes more compact housing and apartments.

11. During the 1990s and up to the present day, there have been innumerable small PDL site conversions on previous industrial sites ranging from 10 to hundreds of dwellings and other uses. These have added steadily to the supply of housing, particularly in places within 15 kilometres of the CBD. Amongst these conversions was the significant adaptation of Willsmere, previously a centre for the mentally retarded and severely physically handicapped.

12. The largest PDL development in Melbourne is the Docklands project. Docklands (200 ha and larger than the adjoining Hoddle Grid of the CBD) was the site of Victoria Dock and Yarra River docks upstream of Victoria Dock’s entrance to the Yarra River. These docks were used for general cargo handling that now makes up only a small and diminishing proportion of port trade. The docks became redundant in the late 1980s and being Crown (government owned) land so close to Melbourne became the subject of planning concepts, first as a games village as part the 1996 Olympic Games bid and then for the bid for the Multi-Function Polis (MFP) a concept for a hi-tech urban city financed by Japanese capital. While Melbourne was not successful in securing either the Olympics or the MFP, the State government persisted with planning for Docklands and in 1991 established the Docklands Authority. After much planning, that did not include any continuing public participation; the first development was completed in 2000 as the totally unplanned for Docklands Stadium (now Etihad Stadium). Since then, development activity has increased so that today about two thirds of the massive
site is developed. Docklands is expected to be completed in 2020, a period of over 20 years from the commencement of its development.

The significance of PDL site conversion for the Maribyrnong River Valley can now be seen. Of the 12 significant brownfields phases from 1970 till today no less than 6 are specifically located in or associated with the Valley.

References and sources of information

The information above has been compiled from the researchers own knowledge and reading including:


Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works (MMBW) 1954, *Survey and Analysis*, MMBW.


Ordinance Survey Map ‘Victoria, Melbourne’ 1930 (One Inch to the Mile topographic series)

Appendix 2.2 - The statutory and fiscal framework for the development of PDL in the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom

This Appendix discusses the statutory and fiscal framework for PDL in the countries where the International Case Histories of Chapter 6 are located. This is therefore a limited discussion to illuminate both the discussion in 2.2 and in the International case Histories in Chapter 6.

The United States of America

In the United States of America the term Previously Developed Land is seldom used but two terms- Brownfield and Greyfield differentiate certain types of land use for statutory reasons. This appendix explains these differences; their origins; and the legislative and fiscal framework that has developed to support the redevelopment of PDL.

The beginning of ‘brownfield issues’: the Love Canal tragedy

Love Canal is located at the City of Niagara Falls between its city centre and the outskirts of the City of Buffalo, New York State. Construction started in the early 1890s by an entrepreneur, Fletcher T Love, who dreamt of harnessing the power of the Niagara River and bypassing Niagara Falls by connecting the Upper and Lower Niagara Rivers with a canal. Over time, his plans changed from a power plant, to a shipping canal and finally to a model housing community. Eventually, the project was discontinued after only a one and a half kilometre section of the canal had been excavated. The canal filled with drainage water and by the early 1900s the only active use of the canal was as a swimming hole for local children. Then, in the 1920s the canal, measuring 15 metres wide and 3-12 metres deep, was turned into an uncontrolled and poorly managed municipal and chemical dump site. In 1953, Hooker Chemical Company which owned the site, covered the canal with earth and sold the land to the City of Niagara Falls, USA, for a peppercorn $1.

In the late 1950s a school and about 100 houses had been built on or adjacent to the filled in canal. As a requirement of owning the land, the school board agreed not to sue Hooker for any future liability relating to the site’s contamination. Later, civil works on and nearby the site disturbed the old fill areas, and dumped wastes and
contaminated water began to seep, emerge and overflow onto the surface of the land and into people’s basements.

In 1978, the local homeowners’ association began to monitor the site and correlate the sickness of residents with wastes that filled the canal. It began a series of civil disruptions to make political capital as little was being done to ease residents’ plight by the responsible bodies, which feared that they may be liable for compensation. These civil disruptions engendered a major political concession from President Jimmy Carter who was a candidate for a second term in office. He promised Federal law to overcome ‘one of the grimmest discoveries of the modern era’ alluding to Love Canal and hundreds of similar sites around the USA (Beck 1979 1-4).

During 1979, the health of residents and school children was being seriously considered by the United States Environment Protection Agency (USEPA). Health checks found that residents were being affected by dioxins and other carcinogenic chemicals issuing from the canal causing high white blood cell counts and chromosomal damage, the risk indicators for Leukaemia. The outcome of both President Carter’s declaration and the work of the USEPA, was the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act 1980 (CERCLA) commonly referred to as the ‘Superfund Act’ which:

- Establishes prohibitions and requirements concerning closed and abandoned hazardous waste sites;
- Provides for liability of persons responsible for leases of hazardous waste at these sites; and
- Establishes a trust fund to provide for cleanup when no responsible party can be identified.” (USEPA n.d.a)

The findings of USEPA resulted in most of Love Canal’s residents being evacuated from their land, and the dwellings and the school being demolished. The Love Canal disaster was finally concluded when US$120 Million in compensation was paid out to previous residents. Today, the canal area is fenced off and a pollution monitoring plant is installed. All that remains of the adjoining estate is the old roads and the occasional house still occupied by a 'stay-put' resident. Otherwise, the cleared sites are gradually being reclaimed by nature.
The story of Love Canal was the start to the public’s concern about contaminated land being a health risk. Subsequently, many countries across the world began to assess the extent and nature of their contaminated lands and how they would be cleaned up; by whom; and to what standards.

The meaning of brownfield in the USA

‘Brownfield’ was first coined in 1986 at a U S Congressional field hearing hosted by the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition of 18 states many being the most affected by derelict and vacant industrial sites (also called the ‘rust belt’). The coalition was also instrumental in hosting the first brownfields conference in 1991.

A definition of brownfield eventually made its way into the CERCLA Act through the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Act (2002) which states:

“DEFINITION OF BROWNFIELD SITE- Section 101 of the Comprehensive Environment Response Compensation and Liability Act 1980 (42 USC 9601) is amended by adding to the end the following:

(39) BROWNFIELD SITE-

(A) IN GENERAL- The Term Brownfield site means real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant.” . . . (USEPA n.d.b ). * Then there follows a number of technical and legal exclusions and refinements that do not significantly alter the general meaning [RD].

The meaning of Greyfield in the USA

Brownfield in the USA therefore has a technical meaning which excludes many derelict, vacant and underutilised sites, and so a neologism ‘greyfield’ has come into common usage as land that is derelict, or under-utilised but is very unlikely to be contaminated:

“Greyfield sites are abandoned, obsolete or underutilized properties such as regional shopping malls or strip retail developments.” (USEPA 2007 p.29).
Legislative and fiscal actions to promote the redevelopment of PDL (more specifically ‘brownfield’ land)

The Superfund’s revolving cleanup fund of CERCLA tackled the problem of cleaning up extremely contaminated sites but left a major question about owner’s liability. This left many brownfields undeveloped. The Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalisation Act 2002 (referred to above) was largely a response to freeing the way to redevelop many of these brownfields. It exempted prospective owners from liability and set up a more transparent system for landowners to undertake site inquiry; authorised $200 million for citywide assessments, site planning remediation and revolving loans. It also appropriated funds to establish state remediation programs. Partly as a result of this legislation, there has been considerable funding and tax concessions for brownfields derived from Federal programs including:

- “the Brownfields Tax Incentive which allows the deduction of expenses in the year incurred rather than being capitalised over a much longer period
- USEPAs supplementary funding for State and Tribal response programs
- Seed money by USEPA to local governments for two year brownfield projects
- USEPA grants to a Brownfields program which support revitalisation efforts by funding environmental assessment, clean ups and job training activities.” (USEPA n.d.)

By 2007, USEPA claimed to have leveraged $6.5 billion in brownfields cleanup and redevelopment funding from private and public sectors and created approximately 25,000 jobs (USEPA 2007).

The Department of Housing and Urban Development also has a Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) program through which it dispenses $200,000 grant funds to appropriate projects around the nation (USHUD, 2010). In addition, the Livable Communities Act 2009 can dispense funds to assess environmental and public health needs including the remediation of brownfield sites.
Federal Government block grants may also be used through States or direct to Local Government for urban revitalisation including the remediation and development of brownfields. They can be used to implement development programs at the discretion of a state or local government.

State and local government also provide grants to provide the expenditure of moneys towards the assessment, planning and development of brownfields. Some of these include federal government funds. An example of the funds available is in Minneapolis St-Paul, Minnesota which was researched in 2009-2010. Here there is a range of incentives and help which include:

- “A targeted Brownfield Assessment Grant Program by Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA);
- Assistance in brownfield cleanup by the MPCA;
- Significant funding by the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development to economic development authorities and port authorities to investigate and clean up contaminated land;
- Reduction in property taxes through lowered assessments due to contamination through the Department of Revenue;
- Assistance via the Minnesota Livable Communities Tax Base Revitalization Account that makes competitive grants to clean up contaminated land that have lost commercial/industrial activity to make it available for economic development, job retention and job growth. This is administered through the Twin Cities Metropolitan Council, and
- Assistance from the Great Lakes Regional Online Brownfields Information Network. (MPCA)

In addition to these State initiatives Local Councils (of which there are 286 in the metropolitan area of Minneapolis-Saint Paul alone) are able to both tap these grants and services as well as provide their own incentive schemes.

The discussion above indicates the very complex fiscal system for PDL ‘brownfield’ cleanup, planning and development in the USA which operates at the three levels of government (and also at an intermediate level of regional governance or through qangos). Its effectiveness is not assessed for this research but this system shows a
strong collective awareness of the importance of redeveloping brownfields right through all levels of government and private enterprise which is leading to a renaissance in cities which have suffered through de-industrialisation in their inner areas and the flight of people and jobs to far-flung suburbs.

**Canada**

In Canada, Previously Developed land is largely seen as ‘brownfield’ although the term ‘greyfield’ is also used. In 2003, Canada’s National *Round Table on the Environment and the Economy* considered the need for the reutilisation of brownfields and defined a brownfield as:

> “Abandoned, idle or underutilised industrial or commercial land with known or suspected historical contamination but where there is active potential for redevelopment.” (NRTEE)

The definition was reused by the Canadian Council of Ministers for the Environment (CCME) has established *Recommended Principles on Contaminated Sites Liability for Brownfield Legislation for the Provinces* in 2006 (CCME).

Canada as a commonwealth of provinces divides its powers between the Provinces and territories and the Federal Government. The matters relating to planning and the environment fall within the role of the Provinces. While most provinces have policy or law to clean up and reutilise PDL, and particularly Quebec is noted for its *Revi Sols* programme (De Sousa 2006) this Appendix has concentrated on the policy and law of British Columbia and Ontario as it is in these provinces that the international examples of Chapter 6 are discussed.

**Policy and law in British Columbia**

In British Columbia, the definition of brownfield is as defined by NRTEE’s above although the Metro Vancouver definition is:

> “A site that has been previously used and likely to contain soil contamination.”

(British Columbia 2003)

**Contaminated land**

There is no specific law for PDL ‘brownfields’ in British Columbia. Contaminated PDL is cleaned up through the *Environmental Management Act 2003* (British
Columbia 2003). But British Columbia is very active in promoting PDL redevelopment especially in its urban areas because of the scarcity of land in the Fraser River Delta where the Government supports the regional group of local Governments in protecting Vancouver’s metropolitan sprawl into this immensely important agricultural area. Thus the renewal of PDL industrial sites has been a priority.

The Government sponsors a ‘Brownfield Renewal Strategy’ which is intended to increase brownfield renewal activity by addressing policy, regulatory, tax funding and information barriers through:

- “Creating a more effective public policy regime for liability and risk
- Applying strategic public investments to encourage redevelopment
- Developing a number of approaches to build capacity and awareness of redevelopment opportunities, and
- Leading by example through the development of key Crown brownfield sites.” (British Columbia 2003)

The Province supports brownfield remediation and renewal through the B C Brownfield Renewal Funding Program designed to help revitalise inactive or unused lands thus reducing financial risk and uncertainty normally associated with such sites. Funds are available for site investigations (preliminary and final) and other environmental investigations. In addition, the BC Community Charter provides local governments the opportunity to offer ‘Revitalisation Tax Exemptions’ which are exemptions to land rates levied by the local council (British Columbia 2003).

**Strategic planning in Vancouver and public participation**

An example of citizen participation in PDL is the City of Vancouver, British Columbia. The success of public participation for the municipality (the largest of 22 in the Greater Vancouver Region) was born out of a lack of consensus about what forms of housing development should take place and in what areas. A housing opportunity strategy confirmed that there was a need for a greater diversification of housing but the key to the strategy was the four elements of the strategy two of which were strongly related to the community:

“A new communities programme focussed on surplus or derelict industrial land, and
a neighbourhood centres program to add new housing next to existing shopping and services.” (Punter 2003 p. 151)

This strategy needed to be argued before the citizenry would accept it so the city planners developed a set of small ‘kitchen table circles’ - 250 in all attended by about 3,000 people. This exposed a lot of people to the trade-offs required to resolve the hard choices that had to be made by planners. The second phase of the City Plan was to develop neighbourhood plans with local committees to prepare vision statements that would guide the more detailed planning. These committees are still in operation from their inception in the mid-1990s.

Community participation in urban design and place making has been ongoing since the inception of the Mayor’s Urban Landscape Taskforce (1992) and the later preparation of neighbourhood centre plans. This fusion of broad visionary strategic planning with urban design supported by the council officers and with extensive public participation makes Vancouver an exemplar of urban planning and design processes. The effect of public participation on a brownfield called East is given more attention in Chapter 6.

Policy and law in Ontario

The most reliable definition for Ontario comes from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing which administers the Planning legislation:

“Brownfields are derelict, dysfunctional or under-used industrial and commercial facilities where expansion or redevelopment is complicated by real or perceived environmental contamination. Despite the complexity of developing these properties, they are often in desirable and strategic locations – in the heart of urban communities, on scenic waterfronts, in or near downtowns.

They have the advantage of having infrastructure in place and a variety of potential uses which can contribute to urban intensification, community revitalization, economic development and jobs, and/or new housing to take the pressure off greenfields. As a result, in Ontario, there has been growing interest among municipalities, owners, developers and environmentalists to find ways to clean up these sites and put them to new use.” (Ontario MA&H, 2004)
This definition varies from the narrowly constructed US statutory definition in that firstly, brownfield is portrayed as being both industrial and commercial land and second, that their location is prized for urban development. This is clearly a different emphasis to the term than for the United States, but because the land is perceived or suspected to be contaminated it does not encompass ‘greyfield’ land.

The importance of brownfield planning came to the fore in Ontario in 2001 when the Brownfield Statute Law Amendment Act 2001 was passed and has a similar purpose to the 2002 USA law. The Act and its regulation came into effect in 2004. The law removes barriers to regulatory liability, financing and planning in order to facilitate the development of brownfields (Ontario Parliament 2001). It was further refined in 2009 to put more brownfields into productive use while safeguarding the environment, public health and safety.

The remediation and development of brownfields are of key importance in Ontario for two major reasons:
- Heavy industry has caused major contamination of sites, some within major cities;
- There is a shortage of land in Toronto and the Greater Golden Horseshoe brought about by the severe constraint of the Greenbelt which protects the Niagara Escarpment, Oak Ridges Moraine and rich agricultural lands.

The Province has explained the imperative to use brownfields as:
- improves air, water and soil quality
- curbs urban sprawl
- protects valuable green spaces and agricultural lands
- supports local economies by promoting urban intensification
- encourages efficient reuse of lands, buildings and infrastructure.
(Ontario MoE, n.p.).

The imperative to conserve land has led to innovative use of planning law. Section 28 of the Planning Act (Ontario) permits the creation of Community Improvement Plans (CIPs) that provide for the comprehensive framework for ‘brownfield’ rehabilitation. The framework:
“Addresses property rehabilitation, brownfields cleanup and redevelopment programmes;
Provides for public consultation, which builds public support for municipal rehabilitation projects; and
Permits planning and financial assistance programmes involving lands, buildings, loans, grants and tax (rates) assistance with the approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.” (MA&H 2008, p. 9)

CIPs are detailed plans that are provided for in a Council’s Official Plan (OP). They have implementation capabilities in the form of a number of grants and incentives that a Council may offer to private landowners. In addition, the CIP facilitates other development related programs including the Brownfields Financial Tax Incentives Program (BFTIP), Heritage Property Tax Relief and town planning facilitation through new zoning by-law amendments and development approvals.

The process for a CIP requires the Council to hold a public meeting after a draft plan has been prepared and after consultation with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. While no specific processes for community engagement have been set down, guidelines make it quite clear that the preparation of a CIP requires the process to be one of open consultation and community information that ultimately leads to consensus in the community and its major stakeholders. Finally, in the implementation and monitoring stages of a plan the guideline specifically advocates the need for ‘champions’ in the community to foster the plan and achieve its planned outcomes (Ibid. p.20).

The Province of Ontario also promotes the planning and development of brownfields in publications including the Community Improvement Planning Handbook which reiterates that:

“Repair and rejuvenation of existing places is the highest form of sprawl containment.” (Ibid. foreword)

The importance of CIPs is that they are a key connection to the community through the planning system as well as providing a source of relief to the riskier site preparation and development aspects of brownfield development thus providing some balance to the much cheaper and straightforward development of greenfields.
Waterfront Toronto is a special case which is a government *ad hoc* body set up under the *Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation Act 2002*. The effect of the legislation is to make Waterfront Toronto (the corporation’s trading name) a public development corporation similar to many across the world including Places Victoria. But it has a limited life of 20 years unless the City, Province and Federal Government decide to review and extend it. It is also heavily constrained in what it does without the approval of the above governments. It operates within a designated area which includes about 800 hectares of Previously Developed Land. It is in the process of revitalising this key part of Toronto with a range of residential, recreational and commercial developments in line with a five year plan that is approved by all three levels of government. Waterfront Toronto is funded by a contribution agreement between itself and the City, Province and Federal Government with contributions initially totalling C$1,500 million. More detail of the West Don Lands and Queens Quay projects is included in Chapter 6.

The Toronto Community Housing Company (TCHC) is a body set up by the City of Toronto to manage its public housing stock. It is actively renewing some of its housing estates and this renewal of PDL, which is largely uncontaminated, is discussed with reference to Regent Park in Chapter 6.

**United Kingdom**

While Government Policy does not define ‘Brownfield’ the English *Brownfields Guide*, acknowledging that it is undefined states:

“The definition (of PDL) is often used interchangeably with the term ‘brownfield’ but, for the purposes of this guide, brownfield land refers to land and buildings where reuse may be in some way be constrained by physical or regulatory issues that affect its potential for reuse.” (English Partnerships, 2008, p.9)

Unfortunately this attempted definition does not help the reader understand what brownfield is because just about all land is constrained by regulatory matters even if it is its planned use. However it does imply that it is land with a potential for reuse. Low-demand and vacant housing is considered PDL (Ibid. p.13). The term ‘latent PDL’ is also used which implies a progression from full economic use of land and
buildings to that land becoming vacant or derelict. So for example a housing estate being progressively vacated may be considered ‘latent PDL’. For more discussion about PDL see Appendix 1.1.

The Scottish Executive defines brownfield as:

“Land within urban settlements (with a population over 2000), or within one kilometre of settlements, which is vacant e.g. unused, unsightly, or which would benefit from development or improvement.” (Oliver et al, p. 8)

This definition is similar to the Canadian definition because it implies that brownfields can be redeveloped in a beneficial way. It also considers the aesthetics of land by mentioning ‘unsightliness’, a characteristic of brownfield that has not been considered elsewhere.

The use of brownfield as an undefined (but accepted) term in the context of its usefulness for urban regeneration is clearly different to the United States formal definition that deals with contamination or potential contamination.

Since the accession of the Coalition Government in the UK the definition of PDL still holds true and there is a policy preference for the development of PDL over Green Belt land as shown in the following extracts from the National Planning Framework 2012:

“17 Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These 12 principles are that planning should [inter alia]: encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value; (p.6).

89 A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are [inter alia]: limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. (p.21)
Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. Local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land.” (p.26)

The Government’s current approach is therefore to generally protect green belts and these are associated with most of the large cities in England. Thus expansion of these cities will have to be through the reuse of PDL or ‘latent PDL’. The previous governments approach therefore has continued and in brief this is to:

- promote PDL development through town and country planning by making brownfield land available for development;
- provide technical support by proactively research the topic and develop best practice advice to assist the construction industry;
- provide a focus on the application of new remediation techniques, confidence building exercises in the financial and property sectors, a system of liability for contaminated land, reviewing the licensing system and wider policy development on land assembly and compulsory purchase;
- provide public sector financial support to achieve social and economic policy objectives such as grant aid as gap funding, support for loans, income stream guarantees, risk sharing through partnerships, and tax incentives. (CLARINET 2002 p.24-25).

The major constraints imposed on PDL projects have been centrally imposed budget restraint which has meant that, amongst most other government activities there has been less money flowing into areas of need.

**Contaminated Land**

In the United Kingdom, contaminated sites are considered under Part 2A of the *Environment Protection Act 1990*. The local authority is generally charged with the identification of contaminated land and identifying those liable for its appropriate remediation and any subsequent enforcement if remediation has not taken place (DEFRA 2007). They are connected to the reuse of PDL sites by a requirement to remediate land to a sufficient standard before use. The general philosophy behind
the approach to decontamination is that it is a means to an end to both protect community health generally and to free valuable land to intensify towns and cities so that they do not place pressure on greenbelts and other precious countryside resources.

**References and sources of information:**


Appendix 2.3 - Law and policy as it affects the development of PDL in Australia

The following information is given as background to the different approaches of the five largest States in Australia in evolving their law and policy regarding the development of Previously Developed Land (PDL). Of especial importance is the link between decontamination and the development of PDL.

The link between decontamination and the planning and development of PDL

In Australia there is neither specific legislation nor policy that refers to ‘brownfield’ or PDL. But that is not to say that there was no policy or law that affects PDL development as defined for this research. The issue of PDL development is generally integrated into Australian planning practice through metropolitan policies relating to redevelopment of infill sites or redevelopment of land near activity centres or public transport. A brief explanation of the policies affecting brownfields using ‘urban renewal’, ‘revitalisation’, ‘infill’, ‘transformation’ and ‘redevelopment’ as proxies is given below.

But in the first instance there is a need to examine the strong link between the decontamination of land and planning in Australia. Any rezoning from industry to residential purposes or any development application for housing and other sensitive uses on land previously developed for industry will require initial site investigation and, then if contamination is found, instigation of a remediation process. This process varies to some degree between the States and Territories but contaminated land legislation in the States now contains recognised national processes and standards as set down in the National Environment Protection(Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure 1999 (NEPM) and Australian Standard- AS 4482 (Parts 1 and 2).

The purpose of this NEPM, to which all states and territories are signatories, is to establish a nationally consistent approach to the assessment of site contamination to ensure sound environmental management practices by regulators, site assessors, environmental auditors, land owners, developers and industry. The desired outcome
of the measure is to provide adequate protection of human health and the environment, where site contamination has occurred (NEPC 1999).

The reference to planning authorities places a responsibility on them to:

“ensure a site, which is being considered for change in land use, and which planning authorities ought reasonably to have known to have a history of use that is indicative of potential contamination, is suitable for its intended use.”

(NEPC 1999: Cl. 6 (5))

**Legislation and Policy in New South Wales**

The *Planning and Environmental Assessment Act 1979* is the land use planning legislation for New South Wales. It defines a number of instruments ranging from State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP), Local Environment Plans (LEP) and Development Control Plans (DCP). The latter two types of plans are prepared and administered by local governments. The act lays down the processes for planning a LEP and DCP including the minimal requirements for consultation.

**Contaminated Land Policy**

There is specific provision for contaminated land but this relates only to liability protection for planning authorities and their officers rather than any guidance for remediating sites (Planning &Environmental Assessment Act NSW1979, S.145 A-C). The remediation process is specified in the *Contaminated Land Management Act 1997* administered by the Environment Protection Authority NSW with connections to the work of planning agencies through guidance in *State Environment Planning Policy 55-Remediation of Land*. This SEPP sets down the terms on which remediation does not require planning permission and, if planning permission is required, when public advertising is required such as in sensitive heritage and conservation areas (DUAP, SEPP 55).

**Metropolitan Policy**

*Sydney 2036* is the most recent metropolitan strategy for the metropolitan region and updates the 2005 strategy. It is a ‘high level’ policy document that, amongst other things, sets down integrated land use and transportation policy required to develop the region in an ecologically sustainable way. In particular, it sets targets for people accessing major centres by public transport by aiming for over 70% of all new households to be located within the existing urban fabric. More than 56% of all those new households are also to be within walking distance of an activity centre. This strategy emphasises redevelopment around major centres and renewal of the city with projects on infill and PDL sites such as in Redfern, Waterloo, Green Square and the former CUB site in...
Broadway. The strategy will require major transformation of the metropolitan area particularly on major PDL sites, in and around activity centres and along transport corridors. Targeted government intervention to achieve higher density development will be considered in places where the open market response is likely to be poor. The Sydney Metropolitan Development Authority will develop certain key sites and the Housing Authority will redevelop some of its estates. Affordable housing will be a priority for these agencies. A new urban Renewal SEPP is to be prepared to facilitate more, and better designed, urban renewal projects (DUAP 2010).

**Legislation and Policy in Queensland**

There is no reference to PDL or ‘brownfield’ in the legislation of Queensland.

**Contaminated land policy**

The *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* requires Councils to determine the extent of exposure to site contamination when there is to be a change in land use or when a subdivision application is made. A contaminated site investigation is carried out as stipulated in the *Environment Protection Act 1994* (EPA Qld.). The applicant for the rezoning amendment or a development application would usually provide this as evidence of the appropriateness of the site’s condition for the proposed use. EPA Qld. manages contaminated sites through the approval of ‘Site Management Plans’.

**Strategic land use policy**

The *South East Queensland Regional Plan* (SEQ Plan) is the strategy for Brisbane, The Gold Coast and Sunshine Coast and their environs. Amongst its policies it:

“requires a more efficient use of urban land by redeveloping older and under-used areas that are suitable and ready for renewal. This will be achieved by setting targets for infill development across the region and by improving yields and housing choice in these areas. A significant proportion of future residential growth will be accommodated by infill and redevelopment within the urban framework and established urban areas. Prime locations for infill development are around urban activity centres that have existing facilities, services and amenities, and along public transport corridors and nodes where the public transport system can best service the additional population.” (Queensland Government 2009).
This strategy has very similar urban regeneration policy to both the Sydney and Melbourne strategies and again shows that renewal of PDL is a critical aspect for the three major metropolitan areas.

**City of Brisbane**

The City of Brisbane, Australia’s largest by population municipal government is very proactive in the redevelopment of its PDL and revitalization of its inner areas. Its jurisdiction covers the urbanised reaches of the Brisbane River which were once used in part as docks and a range of industrial uses that relied on the river to provide water and their waste disposal. Apart from Southbank that is developed and managed by the statutory Southbank Corporation, the remainder of the City is a planning responsibility of the Council.

*Urban Futures Brisbane* has been established by the City Council to manage the inner city area. It comprises an overarching board which manages five other entities:

- **Urban Renewal Brisbane** which prepares visions for the several areas of the city requiring renewal or revitalisation. This advises officers about development schemes.
- **The City Centre Task Force** which makes recommendations on the CBD
- The **Inclusive Brisbane Board** which has done a lot of award winning community engagement and also advises on affordable housing and other social issues
- The **Independent Design Advisory Panel** which advises on major proposals for development
- **Oxley Creek** committee which is planning and conserving a unique wedge of land. (Urban Futures 2011).

These entities work in tandem and in particular Urban Renewal Brisbane which is responsible for all the PDL sites along the river and the Inclusive Brisbane Board work together to achieve a very high standard of place making through engaging the local community in each project.

**Legislation and Policy in South Australia**

**Contaminated land policy**

The remediation of contaminated land is handled through the *Public Environmental Health Act 1987* where owners and occupiers may be required to clean up land that is in an unsanitary
condition. The EPA SA may also issue a cleanup order when it is certain it knows the polluter or have the cleanup conducted by a public body with the ability to recover costs from the polluter. The link with planning decisions on potentially contaminated land is proposed to be established through amendment of the Development Act 1993, bringing South Australia into line with other states (EPA SA).

**Metropolitan strategy**

A major vision for the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide is to create a more compact city. Infill development will increase from 50% to 70% of housing development. Urban transformation will occur along transit corridors that will affect approximately 20% of the present built area. A major effort will be made to upgrade 16 major activity centres (including the central core of Adelaide) into vibrant mixed use centres. There will be an identification of urban regeneration areas outside the transit corridors and structure plans prepared by councils. The plan nominates the extent of these regeneration areas.

**Legislation and Policy in Victoria**

**Contaminated land policy**

While there is no specific legislation or policy for PDL in Victoria, there is significant interest in PDL. Its management, through the planning system, is administered in two ways:

- A ministerial direction under S.12 (2) (a) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, whose purpose is to ensure that potentially contaminated land is suitable for a use which is proposed to be permitted though an amendment to a planning scheme and which could be significantly adversely affected by any contamination. (Ministers Direction 1 2001), and


The planning authority (usually a municipal council) has the responsibility of ensuring that potentially contaminated land converting to a more sensitive use such as residential has received proof that the land has been audited to a satisfactory cleanup standard whether this is for a rezoning or planning permit. The tools used in Victoria are an Environmental Audit Overlay in the planning scheme or conditions
requiring an environmental audit (sometimes requiring a planning agreement) in the
planning permit or before a permitted as-of-right use commences.

**Metropolitan Land Use Policy**

*Melbourne 2030* (M2030), is the major metropolitan planning policy which is about
to be superseded by a new policy, currently in draft form to be adopted (as modified)
by the present Government. M2030 Melbourne’s metropolitan strategy (DSE 2005)
was updated by *Melbourne @ 5 million*, a strategy that permitted major extensions
to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and upgraded six major activity centres to
Central Activity Districts (DPCD 2008). Despite the relaxation of the urban growth
boundary, Melbourne is planned to become more compact even though 47% of all
new dwellings are proposed to be built on greenfields. The most recent draft
strategy called ‘*Plan Melbourne*’ still maintains the concept of a UGB and is
indicating it should be a permanent arrangement with towns and cities outside its
limits taking future urban growth. Several corridors and Government holdings along
railway lines have been earmarked for major intensification (Victorian Government
2013). The Government will not settle the plan until after the closure of submissions
in mid December 2013.

*Melbourne 2030* and the new strategy do not mention PDL but refer to ‘strategic
redevelopment sites’ (DSE 2005, pp. 30-31) which include the regeneration of
activity centres and other major redevelopment sites synonymous with PDL. The
Department of Planning and Community Development’s *Urban Development
Program* partially implements Melbourne 2030 by predicting when residential and
business and industrial greenfield and brownfield sites are likely to be developed
and estimating the dwelling yield in the case of future residential areas. This
program shows that there is a considerable amount of PDL in Melbourne which is
sufficient to maintain metropolitan planning aims for housing and employment
opportunities within the existing urban area (DPCD 2009).

Places Victoria, is the Government’s development agency for PDL. It (and its
precursors) has built several estates on PDL sites including Docklands, and Valley
Lake within the Maribyrnong Valley’s research case study area. It has also been
nominated as the Government’s agent for the Defence Site Maribyrnong- one of the
case studies.
Places Victoria now has a more limited remit to inner area urban renewal unless the Minister directs otherwise. The government’s new body will now be focussed on PDL development unless the Minister determines it should develop other places.

**Legislation and Policy in Western Australia**

*Contaminated land policy*

The *Contaminated land Act 2003* administered by the Department of Environment and Conservation, is the vehicle for identifying, managing and remediating contaminated sites. The polluter pays principle applies to decontamination unless there is no polluter identified in which case the West Australian Planning Commission is the body that does the work.

Municipal councils or the West Australian Planning Commission are responsible for placing conditions on development approvals and rezoning where contamination is to be investigated and if remediation is to be carried out. Nearly 40% of contaminated sites are discovered during the development approval process and nearly 80% of all contaminated sites are found in the Swan Coastal Plan where Perth is situated.

*Metropolitan strategic policy*

The West Australian Planning Commission’s *Statement of planning Policy No 3- Urban growth and settlement*, asserts that:

> “Local governments should adopt a systematic approach towards identifying locations for new housing development, redevelopment and infill and opportunities for increased densities particularly around activity centres and close to public transport nodes.” (WAPC, 2006, Gov. Gazette p.1067)

The key point here is that planning authorities are expected to balance future need by searching inside and outside present urban areas to provide for future population needs and this would include the examination of PDL for potential redevelopment.

The renewal of a more sustainable Perth has in part been facilitated by PDL renewal such as ‘Subi Central’ a transit oriented development at Subiaco.

The East Perth Redevelopment Authority (EPRA) is responsible for 220 hectares of land in the East Perth to Northbridge area. This is a development corporation established under the *East Perth Redevelopment Act 1991*. It redevelops land after consultation with the council and community and in the process cleans up the environment and identifies
heritage buildings (EPRA). Landcorp (equivalent to Places Victoria) also develops PDL at Bunbury and Mandurah harbours.

A Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority has recently been established to amalgamate the redevelopment bodies for East Perth, Armadale, Subiaco, and Midland and will also manage the Perth Waterfront project; however locally based Land Redevelopment Committees will carry out the task of urban renewal.

**References and sources of information:**


Brisbane City Council, *Brisbane: Urban Renewal, Urban Futures*, DVD


Appendix 3.1- Extracts from the Aarhus Convention 1998

The following are extracts of the Aarhus Convention of the United Nations that has a direct effect on how members of the Community will comply with public participation in the preparation of plans and programs. It is a strong guide implying that ‘participatory planning’ must be carried out.

**Articles 6-7 of the Aarhus Convention state:**

- Each party shall make appropriate practical and/or other provisions for the public to participate during the preparation of plans and programmes relating to the environment, within a transparent and fair framework, having provided the necessary information to the public [Article 7].

- The public participation procedures shall include reasonable time frames for the different phases, allowing sufficient time for the public . . . to prepare and participate effectively during the environmental decision-making [Article 6 (3)].

- Each party shall provide for early public participation, when all options are open and effective public participation can take place [Article 6 (4)].

- Each party shall ensure that in the decision due account is taken of the outcome of the public participation [Article 6 (8)] (EU 1998).

**Reference:**

Appendix 3.2 - Principles for effective community engagement

This is a set of principles (abridged), prepared by Dr. Wendy Sarkissian for the Urban Development Research Institute (Australia) showing the range of matters that must be taken into account when equitably involving the public for a major project:

1. Make a clear distinction between the work of public relations, communication and marketing personnel and those undertaking community engagement processes.
2. Develop specific approaches to target hard to reach and marginalised groups. Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of those approaches.
3. Actively pursue community education options so that local people are offered genuine opportunities to explore the implications of the sustainability agenda for development.
4. Capacity build by developing community knowledge and literacy about complex technical and environmental issues including sustainability.
5. Go beyond simply identifiable stakeholders by reaching down into communities beyond normal stakeholder groups.
6. Address issues of cultural diversity by actively engaging Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CaLD) communities. Find ways to target non English speaking groups and build bridges between other cultural groups.
7. Have an intergenerational engagement by involving children and young people though appropriate techniques.
8. Ensure that community engagement outcomes are actually fed into the planning and design processes. Therefore ensure that the community can see how their views have been taken into account when refining a proposal.
9. Ensure that participants of the community engagement are representative of the wider community.
10. Have clear relationships between advisory groups and the servicing of these groups. This includes the preparation of terms of reference and protocols.
11. Use skilled engagement personnel to avoid the accusation that the process was a ‘poor relation’ to other more powerful influences.
12. Use a wide range of engagement approaches and select these according to the relevance of the task and the stage in the process.
13. Present reports from community engagement personnel and depict, respect and use the qualitative data.

14. Use creative approaches from the community cultural development realm, community visioning, and creative visualisation. Ensure that the process is inclusionary.

15. Maintain the tempo by finding ways of ensuring community interest over the period of the engagement process.

16. Link to existing council and government engagement and policy processes and exceed best practice protocols if possible.

17. Develop the most appropriate electronic community engagement methods.

18. Create and maintain clear evaluation frameworks for community engagement.

Reference:

Sarkissian, W 2008, Engaging 21st Century Communities: The first Australian handbook for the development, construction and infrastructure industries, Urban Development Research Institute, pp.18-19)
Appendix 4.1- Corridor Development Initiative, Twin Cities, MN

The process for preparing and holding a Corridor Development Initiative (CDI) for a PDL site (often a disused rail corridor) goes this way:

1. Initial meetings of the steering committee (includes residents) to assess where they are in the planning process and to tailor a menu of CDI activities to their situation.

2. A public meeting explaining existing planning and identifying neighbourhood concerns. This and other meetings use ground rules that speak about respect and listening, allowing conflict to be surfaced in safe ways.

3. A focus group with local businesses or with developers who have undertaken projects in the area.

4. A second public meeting with an interactive exercise explaining development conditions- the block exercise (a workshop or charette RD).

5. A third meeting where a panel of local developers and business people talk about opportunities and constraints with residents that are now more knowledgeable about current market dynamics and viable development options.

6. A public or steering committee meeting to finalise a one page development preference sheet. This is to give developers guidelines for future development.

7. Ongoing meetings to implement strategies to attract preferred development.

(Forsyth et al 2010, p. 272).

Reference:

Appendix 4.2 - Caroline Springs ILAP structure
The diagram below is a representation drawn from Pope 2007, p.5. Added material is the external links to the developers ‘The Advisory Board of Directors’- Delfin Lend Lease Department of Victorian Communities and to the Shire of Melton who received recommendations and made recommendations about various aspects of the work as it progressed. Integration across the advisory groups is also feasible via the broker.

Reference:

Appendix 5.1 - Major PDL developments in Australia

The list below includes all the PDL developments found while carrying out the research work. It is not claimed that it includes all significant PDL developments in the nation.

**Australian Capital Territory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status if known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East lake</td>
<td>Fyshwick ACT</td>
<td>Old industrial area and wetlands</td>
<td>Being planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Foreshore</td>
<td>Kingston ACT</td>
<td>Old industrial area</td>
<td>Being developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuggeranong Town</td>
<td>Tuggeranong ACT</td>
<td>District business centre being redeveloped and intensified</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New South Wales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status if known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darling Harbour</td>
<td>Next to Sydney CBD</td>
<td>Recreation and accommodation area built on old docks</td>
<td>Under development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval stores</td>
<td>Randwick CC</td>
<td>Old defence stores, now a housing estate.</td>
<td>Partly completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Park</td>
<td>Homebush</td>
<td>Main 2000 Olympics venue built on old industrial area and disused land. Includes Lend Lease’s Newington Village</td>
<td>Completed as an Olympic venue but being intensified as a business and recreational centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Square</td>
<td>South Sydney Zetland</td>
<td>Major redevelopment of industry and warehousing with dense mid-high-rise housing</td>
<td>Significant development with more to be built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Naval Stores</td>
<td>Meadowbank</td>
<td>Previously a Naval Base</td>
<td>Under development with high and mid-rise apartments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s</td>
<td>Penrith CC</td>
<td>Ex-Ammunition factory. (1st Stage is Ropes Crossing)</td>
<td>Commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorefield</td>
<td>City of Liverpool</td>
<td>Part of army camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status if known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeysuckle</td>
<td>Next to Newcastle CBD</td>
<td>Old port area being developed by the Hunter Development Corporation</td>
<td>Significant largely mid-rise housing and adapted buildings with more to come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith lakes</td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>Old gravel pits turned into a regional recreation area and housing.</td>
<td>Partly developed with medium-high density housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast Point</td>
<td>Breakfast Point, Canada Bay City</td>
<td>Previous AGL site. One of the largest PDL developments in Sydney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbank</td>
<td>West bank opposite the CBD</td>
<td>Old industrial site cleared for the World Exposition 1988, now a combination of civic, open space, residential and commercial uses.</td>
<td>Nearly completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Northside</td>
<td>City side of the Brisbane River stretching six kilometres downstream</td>
<td>Includes the following old industrial and wharf sites: Brisbane Powerhouse, Cutters landing, Macquarie St Teneriffe, Teneriffe Wharfs, Newstead River park, Mariners Reach and Portside.</td>
<td>A range of conditions from developed to brownfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Southside</td>
<td>Southern side of the Brisbane River</td>
<td>River edge and Waterline sites and Bulimba Army barracks.</td>
<td>Under development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>South Brisbane</td>
<td>Largely industrial area that is renewing through spot redevelopment for housing and mixed uses</td>
<td>Under development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvin Grove urban Village</td>
<td>Kelvin Grove</td>
<td>Urban renewal around Queensland University of Technology.</td>
<td>Under development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clipsal/Origin Site</td>
<td>Bowden, City of Charles Sturt</td>
<td>Inner city mixed use development for 3,500 people</td>
<td>Decontamination in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Adelaide</td>
<td>Along Port River</td>
<td>Ex. port area now turned into a predominantly mid-rise housing estate.</td>
<td>Redevelopment continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Depot</td>
<td>Adelaide CBD</td>
<td>High density redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status if known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawson lakes</td>
<td>Northern Adelaide</td>
<td>Very large site on former stockyards</td>
<td>Significant development of housing and business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbank</td>
<td>Adjoins Yarra south of CBD</td>
<td>Melbourne’s first large brownfield development. Old industries once occupied sites.</td>
<td>Nearly completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docklands</td>
<td>West and south of CBD across Spencer Street</td>
<td>Largest brownfield development. Old port along Yarra and at Victoria Dock.</td>
<td>Due to be completed 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks</td>
<td>Smithfield Road, Kensington</td>
<td>Ex-Newmarket saleyards, City of Melbourne abattoirs and ordnance depot. (Case Study)</td>
<td>Completed 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater</td>
<td>Gordon Street, Maribyrnong</td>
<td>Ex-Ammunition factory Footscray (Maribyrnong) (Case study)</td>
<td>Nearly completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Green</td>
<td>Wests Road, Maribyrnong</td>
<td>Ex-Ordnance Factory Maribyrnong. Mostly housing from detached houses to mid-rise apartments (Case Study)</td>
<td>Completed 2004 except for some small sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Site Maribyrnong</td>
<td>Cordite Avenue, Maribyrnong</td>
<td>Ex-Explosives Factory Maribyrnong (Case Study)</td>
<td>Remediation commenced. Being planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Gardens</td>
<td>Victoria Street, Richmond</td>
<td>Shopping centre and housing</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Cove</td>
<td>Port Melbourne</td>
<td>Old petrochemical complex and government land</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Como Project</td>
<td>Chapel St, South Yarra</td>
<td>Predominantly high rise housing</td>
<td>Largely completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springhurst</td>
<td>Plenty Road, Bundoora/Macleod</td>
<td>Ex-mental health and infectious diseases hospitals</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairnlea</td>
<td>Station Road, Cairnlea</td>
<td>Ex-Explosives factory, Deer Park</td>
<td>Mostly completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willsmere</td>
<td>Princess St, Kew</td>
<td>Ex-mental health establishment</td>
<td>Mostly completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village 3175</td>
<td>Cheltenham Road, Dandenong</td>
<td>Ex-Council depot and saleyards</td>
<td>More than half completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rippleside</td>
<td>Geelong</td>
<td>Old shipyard</td>
<td>Status not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley Park</td>
<td>Wellington Road, Mulgrave</td>
<td>Former AFL stadium</td>
<td>Nearly completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status if known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subi-Central</td>
<td>Subiaco</td>
<td>Redevelopment of an industrial complex with housing</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunbury Waterfront</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Landcorp development of port area</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere precinct</td>
<td>East Perth</td>
<td>EPRA residential project. 4.5 ha</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claisebrook Village</td>
<td>East Perth</td>
<td>EPRA residential/mixed use project. 146 ha</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlston Hill</td>
<td>Bunbury</td>
<td>15 ha residential development on old port related industries</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland Town Centre</td>
<td>Midland, City of Swan</td>
<td>120 ha rejuvenation and expansion of the town centre with a range of uses.</td>
<td>Under development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Coogee</td>
<td>City of Cockburn</td>
<td>120 ha mixed use and marina on old industrial land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.2 - List of PDL sites in the Maribyrnong Valley

Assessment for Case Study selection

This assessment considers all sites examined in the following Table and judges each by the following criteria:

1. The site should be large enough to have had a real impact on creating a new community and affecting existing communities
2. Site contamination and remediation should have been a consideration in the release of the land for the intended purposes
3. Planning processes would have enabled people to participate in the planning or development of the site (albeit within formalised processes that enabled objection or submissions against a well-developed proposal).
4. The site was in Government ownership or control (at the planning stage) that would have added to the possibility of involving local communities in the early processes of planning.

The assessment is quite qualitative, giving only a broad ‘score’ ranging from ‘Very suited’ to ‘Not at all suited’ for the study as follows:

5- Very suited
4- Suited
3- May be suited
2- Not Suited
1- Not at all suited

The following table shows the scores. The ‘General Comment’ is the original notes used to aid in the final selection of the case study sites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Reference</th>
<th>Melway Reference</th>
<th>Common Description</th>
<th>Fronts</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Site contamination and remediation</th>
<th>Planning processes enabling of community input</th>
<th>Government owned</th>
<th>General comment</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15E11</td>
<td>Pavilion Estate</td>
<td>Milleara Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Developed in the 1990’s in a similar vein to surrounding housing.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 D2</td>
<td>Milleara Redevelopment</td>
<td>Milleara Road Avondale Heights</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The redevelopment initiative took place in the 1960s when there was virtually no surrounding community.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27F2</td>
<td>Templewood Cres</td>
<td>Military Road Avondale Heights</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small and only partly affected by quarry</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27 G8</td>
<td>Canning Street Retirement Village</td>
<td>Canning Street Avondale heights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Too small and specialised to consider.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Reference</td>
<td>Melway Reference</td>
<td>Common Description</td>
<td>Fronts</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Site contamination and remediation</td>
<td>Planning processes enabling of community input</td>
<td>Government owned</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Average Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 H12</td>
<td>Valley Lake Estate</td>
<td>The Avenue Niddrie</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 3 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28 H7</td>
<td>Moonee Ponds</td>
<td>Puckle Street Moonee Ponds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Activity centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28E10</td>
<td>Former ORICA</td>
<td>Doncaster Street Ascot Vale West</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>28G11</td>
<td>Ascot Vale Public Housing Estate</td>
<td>Epsom Road Flemington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 1 5</td>
<td>Site developed before site remediation necessary by law, and before strong 3rd Party responses both available in law or expected by nearby communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28 F11</td>
<td>Royal Agricultural Society Showgrounds (RAS)</td>
<td>Epsom Road Flemington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 1 5</td>
<td>The redevelopment was treated as an as of right development under the planning scheme and because of the nature of the existing and proposed use did not require auditing for contamination or remediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>42 D1</td>
<td>Fisher Parade</td>
<td>Fisher Parade Ascot Vale West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>Site redevelopments within this small area are intensive but generally the overall impact on the local community has been minimal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks</td>
<td>Smithfield Road Flemington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Now developed. Clearly a very good site for investigation.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>J3</td>
<td>Kensington Estate “Kensington Village” being marketed as “Parkside”</td>
<td>Derby Street Flemington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Site contamination issue not present as the previous use was a “sensitive use”- residential.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Yarra Village</td>
<td>Berry Street Yarraville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Too small</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Riverside Precinct</td>
<td>Maribyrnong Street Footscray</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Small and did not go through major public participation based on existing processes. Conversion from industrial to commercial purposes. Remote from residents.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Saltwater Crossing project</td>
<td>Moreland Street Footscray</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>On the small side and planned over 20 years ago.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Joseph Road Precinct</td>
<td>Hopkins Street Footscray</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>This project is still in its early planning phases with the Council and landowners cooperating.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Footscray Principal Activity Centre and Transit City</td>
<td>Barkly/Hopkins Streets Footscray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A small number of sites within the larger centre have little impact by themselves on surrounding communities.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Angliss Estate</td>
<td>Ballarat Road Footscray</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A medium sized estate that sits on a peninsula with only one side impacting on the local community. The estate has been developed for nearly twenty years and its story may not be representative of current community values/action.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Reference</td>
<td>Melway Reference</td>
<td>Common Description</td>
<td>Fronts</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Site contamination and remediation</td>
<td>Planning processes enabling of community input</td>
<td>Government owned</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Average Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>42 C3</td>
<td>Victoria University, Ballarat Road Campus</td>
<td>Ballarat Road Footscray</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>While Victoria University has undoubtedly had an effect on surrounding communities, it is an unusual and ‘special’ use of land which may not be sufficiently regular to provide a basis for study.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>42 B2</td>
<td>Kinnears former rope-works</td>
<td>Ballarat Road Footscray</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small site, although it may have some impacts on surrounding housing because of its likely higher density.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>41 J4</td>
<td>Dunlop Olympic Tyres and National Forge sites</td>
<td>Cross Street Footscray</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Medium sized area which displays good potential for study but is in private ownership.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>42 A3</td>
<td>Public housing Gordon Street.</td>
<td>Gordon Street Footscray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very small site and development is now 40 years old when little if any public involvement occurred.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>41 K2</td>
<td>Western Hospital (Footscray Campus)</td>
<td>Gordon Street Footscray</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Small site although amenity impacts from traffic expected to affect local communities.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>42 A1</td>
<td>Empire/Eldridge St Precinct</td>
<td>Gordon Street Footscray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Most development occurred here in the 1970s and therefore is of another era and as a number of small spot projects within the larger area.</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28B12</td>
<td>Edgewater Estate</td>
<td>Gordon Street Footscray</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Now partly developed (2008). Community input was restricted to a planning scheme amendment process based on an EES.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28A12</td>
<td>Birdwood Estate</td>
<td>Bird-wood Street Maribyrnong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small area. Community input limited to comment at the planning scheme amendment stage.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>27K12</td>
<td>Allara Estate</td>
<td>Mephan Street Maribyrnong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small area. Community input limited to comment at the planning scheme amendment stage (which included a detailed Development Plan)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27 J12</td>
<td>Essence Estate</td>
<td>Mitchell Street Maidstone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small area. Community input limited to comment at the planning scheme amendment stage, and later the ability to comment on a proposed Development Plan.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>28 B9</td>
<td>Horizon Apartments</td>
<td>Warrs Road Maribyrnong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small area and not Government owned land.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>28B10</td>
<td>Pipemakers Park</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue Maribyrnong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>This is a development of a parkland from an industrial site and is not a regular use of land in an urban area.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>28 B9</td>
<td>Palm Court and Melaleuca Close</td>
<td>Warrs Road Maribyrnong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Developed many years ago and would not be representative of current development proposals. Small site.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>28 A9</td>
<td>Highpoint Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Rosamond Road Maribyrnong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Its development over the last 30 years as a free-standing car-orientated mall centre would not be representative of most brownfield site redevelopments.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>27 K9</td>
<td>Home Maker and Harvey Norman Centres plus other smaller commercial and service industrial premises.</td>
<td>Rosamond Road Maribyrnong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A long term planning proposal only, which may see the area converted to mixed uses.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>27K10</td>
<td>Bunnings Site</td>
<td>Rosamond Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Long term proposal to convert to mixed uses.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>27 K6</td>
<td>Naval Stores and CSIRO estates</td>
<td>Randall Street Maribyrnong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Already developed. Public comment only available when proposed to be rezoned.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Reference</td>
<td>Melway Reference</td>
<td>Common Description</td>
<td>Fronts</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Site contamination and remediation</td>
<td>Planning processes enabling of community input</td>
<td>Government owned</td>
<td>General comment</td>
<td>Average Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 27J6</td>
<td>27 J6</td>
<td>Defence Site Maribyrnong (Explosives Factory Maribyrnong)</td>
<td>Cordite Avenue Maribyrnong</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>While the site is not yet sold to Victoria, it is most likely the Defence Site will be a major development for a range of uses but primarily residential. Site contamination and heritage/natural conservation issues as well as interface and traffic issues will be dominant concerns.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 27J8</td>
<td>27 J8</td>
<td>Waterford Green Estate</td>
<td>Wests Road Maribyrnong</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A good example of a PDL site redevelopment. Its isolation from existing residential communities made it a relatively non-contentious development.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 27H10</td>
<td>27H10</td>
<td>Student Village, VU</td>
<td>Hampstead Road Maidstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium sized site which is in all probability going to be developed for housing (which is its current use)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 27H11</td>
<td>27H11</td>
<td>Hampstead Road (East)</td>
<td>Hampstead Road Maidstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This site of large warehouses may not be converted to housing but rather be a transition between housing to the east and commercial/industrial opportunities along and near Hampstead Road.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 27H10</td>
<td>27H10</td>
<td>Ulmara and JPT property</td>
<td>Hampstead Road Maidstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Being converted to housing and some mixed uses along Hampstead Road. Medium sized site.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 27F10</td>
<td>27F10</td>
<td>Medway Golf Course</td>
<td>Omar street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A prospective site only. No contamination issues likely.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Address Details</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>27D12</td>
<td>Braybrook Urban Renewal</td>
<td>Churchill Avenue Maidstone/ Braybrook</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>While a large area covered by the scheme, the redevelopment is on a number of small separated sites.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>27C10</td>
<td>Riverside Estate</td>
<td>Cranwell Street Braybrook</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>While Government owned, the land was rezoned from a school and minimal participatory processes were used.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>27C10</td>
<td>Kreglinger Site</td>
<td>Cranwell Street Braybrook</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not yet included as an amendment. Potential residual air emission buffer issues.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>26 B6</td>
<td>River Valley estate</td>
<td>Duke Street Sunshine North</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A true brownfield site with a range of issues. Deserves consideration due to its size, location and environmental issues.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>27A6</td>
<td>Melbourne Knights Soccer Club</td>
<td>Somers Street Sunshine North</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Important venue but small in area and has not a contaminated site issue</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>14 H1</td>
<td>Sunshine and Mountain View quarries</td>
<td>McIntyre Road Kealba</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not yet available for development.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END APPENDIX 5.2
Appendix 5.3 - Questionnaire used largely as a guide

This set of questions was presented as a guide to ensure that all aspects of the study were covered. Many interviews did not cover this range as they concentrated on specifics of a particular place or issues which the interviewee understood.

PART A- INITIAL SITE PLANNING AND RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT

Tell me what you remember about the situation which led up to the site being proposed for development (prompt here to ensure that it is understood that this question is to do with the early characterisation of the site as fit for redevelopment not the detailed later design of the estate).

Was there any involvement with the surrounding residents and other interests in the examination on the future use of the land (for example in seeking local resident responses, advisory committee, press releases, call for submissions etc). If so tell me about it and what your view was at the time of the involvement.

What is your view now about the extent of that involvement and whether you feel that it was adequate or inadequate?

If you answered inadequate (to the above question) why do you say that and also could you tell me what you would prefer to have happened to involve residents and other potentially affected people in the initial visioning for the future use of the site?

If you answered adequate, why do you say that?

PART B- CONTAMINATION STUDIES AND REMEDIATION

What do you understand was/is the extent of land contamination on the land? Were/are you concerned about any contamination.

Were/are, the public processes relating to residents having a say in site cleanup adequate? If not, please give your view on how this could have happened.

Does/did site decontamination affected the design of the site?

PART C- RESIDENTS’ INVOLVEMENT IN THE STATUTORY PROCESS

Tell me if you consider on the scale of 1-5 if you have an excellent understanding (5) or a poor understanding of the planning process (1) (prompt or explain more)

What happened when the official plan for the estate was exhibited as an amendment to the planning scheme?
Was there a coordinated attempt to provide residents’ response to the amendment?

After approval of the amendment do you consider that residents had sufficient involvement in the ongoing development of the estate?

PART D- THE ESTATE TODAY

How does the estate relate to the surrounding area? What works well and does not work well in terms of its integration with the surrounding area.

Do you think that the local residents had an adequate voice in achieving changes in the estate? Who helped to do this?

Are the spaces created by the roads and open space area attractive and utilitarian? If not please give me some ideas about how they should have been designed and if anything could be done to improve them?

PART E- OVERALL

Lastly, thinking back on this interview, would you change the way planners, developers and residents should have collaborated in the planning and development of the estate.

END
Appendix 5.4 - Word search method

The detail below shows how the word search was conducted and the method used to patterns relating to word frequency. This was the first step of analysing the participant survey.

GROUP A: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT - Consultation, Engagement, Participation, Capacity Building and Involve.


GROUP C: PLANNING - Plan and Amendment, Strategy

Group D: URBAN DESIGN- Design, Layout, Space, Place, Connectivity.

GROUP E: DEVELOPMENT- Develop, Build, Construct.

GROUP F: PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND - Brownfield, Greyfield, Contamination, Rehabilitate, Remediate, Pollution and Health.

Like words were classified as having the same meaning for example ‘participation’ was taken to mean participate, participant etc. However, the word was excluded if out of context. The admitted words were highlighted in the text in a different colour to allow easy visual identification.

In the first instance more interest was taken in the words used by the interviewee, but sometimes responses which did not use a key word were linked to it through the question. An example is: Question- How was that participation accomplished? Response- We held a public workshop. If the dialogue was reduced to one sentence, it would read: Participation was accomplished by holding a public workshop. So question and answer were linked together for analysis purposes.
## Appendix 6 - PDL sites researched in the UK, USA and Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City /State</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Selection reason</th>
<th>Data capture type</th>
<th>Analysis tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow, Scotland</td>
<td>Crown St (Gorbals)</td>
<td>Successful urban renewal involving the community</td>
<td>Site inspection, Reading, Interviews</td>
<td>Monograph, Photographs, Field notes, Transcriptions, Memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow, Scotland</td>
<td>Oatlands (south side)</td>
<td>Successful urban renewal involving the community</td>
<td>Site inspection, Reading, Interviews</td>
<td>Monograph, Photographs, Field notes, Memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow, Scotland</td>
<td>East End of the city #</td>
<td>Neighbourhood renewal involving the community</td>
<td>Site inspection, Reading, Interviews</td>
<td>Monograph, Photographs, Field notes, Memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester, England</td>
<td>Salford Quays</td>
<td>Urban regeneration of a docklands</td>
<td>Site inspection, Reading</td>
<td>Memo, Photographs, Field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis- St Paul, Minnesota, USA</td>
<td>Payne Phalen Corridor Urban Renewal</td>
<td>Participatory democracy in an urban renewal area</td>
<td>Site inspection, Reading</td>
<td>Memo, Photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis- St Paul, Minnesota, USA</td>
<td>Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant</td>
<td>Consultation with the community about site remediation on a defence site</td>
<td>Site inspection, Reading, Interviews</td>
<td>Monograph, Photographs, Transcriptions, e-mails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Regent Park</td>
<td>Successful urban renewal of an existing public housing estate involving the residents</td>
<td>Site inspection, Reading, Interviews</td>
<td>Monograph, Photographs, Field notes, Transcriptions, e-mails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Queens Quay</td>
<td>Redevelopment of a road in an urban renewal area and impact on existing residents/infrastructure</td>
<td>Site inspection, Reading, Interviews</td>
<td>Monograph, Photographs, Field notes, Transcriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>West Don Lands*</td>
<td>Regeneration of a brownfield where the community took the lead role</td>
<td>Site inspection, Reading, Interviews</td>
<td>Monograph, Photographs, Field notes, Transcriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada</td>
<td>East *</td>
<td>Regeneration of a brownfield similar to Maribymong Valley with significant resident participation</td>
<td>Remote sensing, Reading, Interviews</td>
<td>Monograph, Transcriptions, e-mails</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** * Denotes added as a described site in 2010  
# Denotes site inspected (2009) and read about but not specifically described in Chapter 6.
Appendix 7.1 - Selected statistics for Maribyrnong Valley Suburbs- 2006 Census

The table gives a broad overview of the population and dwelling statistics for comparison with one another and the Melbourne Statistical Region, Victoria and Australia.

Some suburbs are entirely or more than 90% within the urban area of the Maribyrnong valley as defined by the criteria for the study. These suburbs are Aberfeldie, Avondale Heights, Braybrook, Essendon West, Footscray, Kealba, Keilor, Keilor East, Keilor Park, Maidstone, Maribyrnong and Seddon. Other suburbs that are partly within the catchment are Ascot Vale (70% within valley), Braybrook (80% within valley), Essendon (50% within valley), Flemington (25% within valley), Kensington (50% within valley), Moonee Ponds (50% within valley), Niddrie (70% within valley) and Sunshine North (60% within valley). Their population has been reduced as a proportion to the above percentages. The table is therefore only indicative of that part of the Valley.

The population of the urban part of the Maribyrnong Valley as defined in this study is approximately 125,000 people (2006) within the contiguous urban area of Melbourne. This is 3.5% of the metropolitan population which is equivalent to an average sized metropolitan municipality.

Some data has been highlighted that is significantly above the average or median for Melbourne as follows: 20.1

Some data has been highlighted that is significantly below the average or median for Melbourne as follows: 6.3

These highlighted figures are used in this and subsequent tables in Appendices 7.2-4.

References and sources of information:


Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2006b, Quickstats 2006 (various Census Collection Districts in the case study area).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Total Persons</th>
<th>% 65+ age group</th>
<th>% Australian born</th>
<th>Families with children</th>
<th>Number of occupied dwellings</th>
<th>Persons per dwelling</th>
<th>% apartments</th>
<th>Median weekly Household Income $</th>
<th>% of dwellings rented</th>
<th>% of dwellings by housing auth’y.</th>
<th>Median rent $ per week</th>
<th>Median Housing loan $ weekly</th>
<th>% Workforce unemployed</th>
<th>% Workforce professionals/managers</th>
<th>SEIFA Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberfeldie</td>
<td>3,453</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascot Vale</td>
<td>12,398</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>5,294</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avondale Heights</td>
<td>11,079</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>4,021</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braybrook</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendon</td>
<td>18,213</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>7,290</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendon West</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemington</td>
<td>7,376</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>3,562</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footscray</td>
<td>11,401</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>4,764</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kealba</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keilor</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keilor East</td>
<td>13,069</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>4,712</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keilor Park</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>8,676</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>4,026</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>1093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribyrnong</td>
<td>8,242</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonee Ponds</td>
<td>12,636</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>5,297</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niddrie</td>
<td>4,531</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seddon</td>
<td>4,651</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine North</td>
<td>10,162</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>3,518</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>151,734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Melbourne</strong></td>
<td>3.593M</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>1.352M</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria</strong></td>
<td>4.932M</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>1.869M</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia</strong></td>
<td>19.855M</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>7.596M</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Melbourne Major Statistical Region (Metropolitan Area) # Not available from the statistical set used.
Appendix 7.2 - Additional information about Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks

The following data adds to the key information for the case study site which is contained in Chapter 7 (7.3.1); namely the planning, design and development processes that occurred and the community involvement in those processes for Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks. The data below has been used, where applicable, when making comparative assessments of the case study sites in later chapters of the research.

**Geography**

Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks lies partly on the old delta of the Maribyrnong-Yarra Rivers. The rest of the estate is located on soils derived from old basalts that form the edge of the delta. Parts of the site are quite steep which mark the old coastline of Port Phillip between 9,000-13,000 years ago. Part of the delta has also been a swamp- ‘Seagull Swamp’. The estate’s south-western boundary adjoins the Maribyrnong River.

Kensington is rich in infrastructure. Newmarket, Kensington and South Kensington railway stations are all within a kilometres walk of most of the suburb, and the No 57 Maribyrnong tram passes the northern edge of the estate. The two neighbourhood activity centres of Racecourse Road Flemington, and Macaulay Road Kensington, are also within walking distance. Catholic and State primary schools are also located within easy child walking distance. It is also adjacent to Flemington Racecourse, one of Australia’s great sporting venues.

**Principles derived from The Fixed Elements of Lynch’s Bridge Redevelopment Strategy [referenced in 7.3.1]**

- The new residential area should be compatible with the surrounding streetscapes and houses;
- designs for the site should maximise housing whilst taking into account the requirements for medium density dwellings;
- The majority of houses should be one or two storeys high, whilst allowing for a limited amount of three storey development;
- Sixty elderly persons units should be included in the northern part of the redevelopment to be built by the Ministry of Housing;
• In addition to the elderly persons units, a proportion of public housing should be built on the remainder of the saleyards site;
• Within the Lynch’s Bridge Project the majority of open space will be provided between Epsom Road and the Maribyrnong River, but a limited amount of open space should be provided on the Newmarket Saleyards;
• The historic stock route should be conserved for use by pedestrians and bicycles;
• The rural character of Main Lane should be conserved;
• Established trees should be retained wherever feasible;
• The historic administration building and some adjacent stock pens should be conserved; the redevelopment should begin before the end of 1987, starting with the land at the corner of Epsom Road and Market Street (Loder & Bayly 1987, p.3).

History

Aboriginal occupation of the Maribyrnong Valley has been postulated as being at least 40,000 years, but in scientific terms, carbon dated artefacts at Keilor indicate an occupation of about 17,000 years. The area was occupied by the Woi wurrung and Bun wurrung language groups. These identified with a larger grouping of clans in central Victoria known as the Kulin nation.

Saleyards were established on the site of Lynch’s Bridge estate from 1856 with a Crown Grant was to the Melbourne City Council for saleyards and abattoirs. The abattoirs were established in 1861. However there was much concern about the saleyards, abattoirs and associated animal processing industries which led to a Royal Commission in 1870 condemning the use of the river and environs as a foul dumping ground for animal waste (Lack J, p.96).

The Newmarket Saleyards grew to be one of the world’s largest saleyards. At its peak in 1944 its annual throughput was 6.45 million sheep and lambs with a record daily throughput of 146,000 head in 1953. But its days were numbered because of lack of transport infrastructure, traffic conflict, competition from regional yards and, above all, offensiveness.

The imminent closure of Newmarket saleyards in the early 1980s and associated animal product processing including Melbourne Municipal Abattoir and the Nearby Angliss’ Imperial Freezing Works, Footscray, now provided an enormous opportunity to regener-
ate the suburbs of Kensington, Flemington and adjacent Footscray. The State Govern-
ment in conjunction with the City of Melbourne and City of Footscray began to plan a
redevelopment that in part covered the previous saleyards, municipal abattoirs and the
army stores then surplus to Defence needs. It was called the Lynch’s Bridge Project.

People: past and present

Before 2006

In 1981 the area was characterised by low income households with a large proportion of
the workforce engaged in manufacturing industry. The Housing Commission’s high rise
flats at Debneys Paddock in Flemington, and its Hotham Estate in Kensington reinforced
this as an area of low socio-economic status (VGPO 1985). But the closure of the sale-
yards and the stalling of further slum reclamation due to a widespread reaction by
Melbourne people at large to high density public housing development changed the
suburb’s potential.

The Kensington Association was formed in 1977. It is an incorporated residents’ action
group for the suburb. Its purposes were aimed at protecting Kensington’s social, cultural
and community infrastructure; built and natural environment; assisting people in becom-
ing involved in their life and work; to be an effective voice at all levels of government
and to hold government accountable; and to cooperate with others with similar aims and
objectives (Kensington Association).

At 2006

In the 25 years from 1981 the 2006 Census shows a major change in the character of both
Flemington and Kensington. This has been partly due to the population boost given by
the development of Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks.

The 2006 population of Lynch’s Bridge/Kensington Banks if compared with the
Melbourne metropolitan average is characterised as having:

- a very low proportion of people over 65 years (0.6-3.5%), being less than a quarter of
  the metropolitan average, the exception being where aged accommodation is
  provided (23.4%).
- a higher than average number of Australian born (ranges from 53.1% -72.5%)
- a much higher family income in Kensington Banks ($1,419-$1,938), dipping only to
  just above average where there is public housing for the elderly ($1,307).
• a higher proportion of rented dwellings (35.8%-60.5%) and a higher than average rental ($240-$320 per week) except where there is much public housing ($110-125 per week).

• low to average unemployment (1.9%-7.8%), with the lowest occurring in Kensington Banks itself (1.9%-6.6%), and

• a very high proportion of the workforce employed as managers and professionals (43.2%-60.3%).

• a generally high SEIFA (socio-economic index) of between 970 & 1173.

This clearly indicates that Kensington Banks and surrounds has changed significantly and is very high in socio-economic (SEIFA) terms. The Table to this Appendix shows some selected statistics for Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks and surrounding Collection Districts.

**Decontamination of buildings and land**

The river flats of Kensington Banks were contaminated with building materials from previous derelict buildings and spillages, including asbestos and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). These were removed and the ground remediated to a residential standard. A *Statement of Environmental Audit* was issued on 28 May 1996.

Kensington Banks was also a filled site from material brought from the construction of the Royal Melbourne Hospital project. This raised ground levels above flood levels and created local drainage systems. Much of the original Coode Island silt which may have become contaminated if exposed to the atmosphere was therefore buried.

**References and Sources of information:**


Department of Planning Victoria, Facts and Figures (undated of the 1986 Census information) and Melbourne- Comparative Local Statistics (June 1985) The VGPO Melbourne.


# Table to Appendix 7.2 - Selected statistics for Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks and surrounds. 2006 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection District</th>
<th>Total Persons</th>
<th>% in 65+ age group</th>
<th>% Australian born</th>
<th>% Families with children</th>
<th>Number of occupied dwellings</th>
<th>Persons per dwelling</th>
<th>% of dwellings rented</th>
<th>Median weekly Household Income $</th>
<th>Median rent $ per week</th>
<th>Median Housing loan $ per week</th>
<th>% Workforce unemployed</th>
<th>% of workforce Professionals + managers</th>
<th>SEIFA Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On Site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2290108</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2290109</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2290110</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2290111</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2290113</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311316</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311317</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>3881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Around site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2290104</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2290105</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2290106</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311301</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311302</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311303</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311304</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>3266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Across River</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300308</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Melbourne</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.593M</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>1.352M</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia</strong></td>
<td>19.855M</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>7.596M</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Melbourne Major Statistical Region (Metropolitan Area) # Not available from the statistical set used.

Note 1: No data available due to very small population. Note 2: No private dwellings (University Hostel and Maribyrnong Detention Centre)

69.0 = significantly above the Melbourne average or median value. 48.1 = significantly below the Melbourne average or median value
Lynch’s Bridge-Kensington Banks and surrounds- Notes relating to historical and existing development of land use

**Collection District (CCD)**

**2290108**  
On Site  
Mostly within Kensington Banks Estate. Includes an industrial area and stables to its west that is outside the estate which does not include any housing. This includes housing developed in the last stages of the estate.

**2290109**  
On Site  
Within Kensington Banks Estate. Includes a range of housing developed during the middle stages of development.

**2290110**  
On Site  
A district that was developed in the middle stages of the estate in the mid-1990s.

**2290111**  
On Site  
Includes a range of housing developed during the middle stages of development.

**2290104**  
Site surrounds  
Part of the Kensington Estate (1960s Housing Commission Victoria), once a public housing estate but now redeveloping as a mixed public/private estate with mid-rise housing. The southern part of the CCD is Holland Park that has no habitation.

**2290105**  
Site surrounds  
Part of old Kensington adjacent the site, comprising mainly Victorian era ‘workers’ cottages. The SW part of the CD is part of Kensington Banks (approximately 60 dwellings).

**2310808 2310809 2311007 2311010 2311010**  
Site surrounds  
Largely Victorian era housing with some walk-up apartments.

**2311301**  
Site surrounds  
Separated from Kensington Banks by busy Racecourse Road. Part of the old Flemington. Contains a major nursing home. Safeway supermarket on Racecourse Road a ‘bookend’ to Flemington Neighbourhood Activity Centre, which is the common local centre for Flemington (Newmarket) and Kensington suburbs.

**2311302**  
Site surrounds  
Separated from Kensington Banks by busy Racecourse Road. Part of the old Flemington.

**2311303**  
Site surrounds  
The Victorian heart of old Kensington. Includes the Kensington village shops in Macaulay Road and adjacent Kensington Railway Station as well as some significant community facilities.

**2311304**  
Site surrounds  
Also part of the heart of old Kensington. Includes Kensington North Melbourne State primary school.

**2300308**  
Across River  
Includes the Angliss Estate, constructed in the late 1980s on the site of the Imperial Meat Works (Angliss). Its western section also includes some Victorian housing of the old Footscray. Nearly half the CCD is within Newell’s Paddock Wetland Park, once stock holding paddocks where there is no habitation.
Appendix 7.3 - Additional information about Edgewater

Geography

Edgewater is built on three distinct physiographic units. The flood plain has been modified by creating a 7 hectare lake using its spoil to create a fill platform for urban development. The escarpment has been caused by river erosion. The top of the escarpment is the flat volcanic plain. The result is a split level development, the upper section being about 30 metres above the lower valley section. Extensive views to the river and central business district are obtained from the escarpment and its rim.

The estate is well serviced with infrastructure including the No. 82 tram which leads to Footscray Central Activity District; the nearby Highpoint Principal Activity Centre; and Moonee Ponds Principal Activity Centre. It overlooks Flemington Racecourse and is close to two high schools and the main campus of Victoria University.

History

Little is known of pre-European settlement. It can be inferred that Kooris would have used the river’s abundant salt water fish and other animals and herbs as a food source, and it was also a trade route. The first white settlement occurred in adjoining Pipemakers Park where Joseph Raleigh, also the first settler in Maribyrnong, built animal boiling down works beside the river in 1848-9 (Ford et.al.1989).

In 1878, a substantial complex of earthworks (blast mounds), bluestone walls, stores and a canal was built by the Colony of Victoria. Originally called the Saltwater Gunpowder Magazine it became known colloquially as ‘Jacks Magazine’. It was used to store explosives that were transported by barge along the river to a purpose built canal; and by horse drawn trolley up and down the escarpment on which it is built (Maribyrnong C C, n.d.). Jacks Magazine, which is registered on the National Estate, has been transferred to Parks Victoria to ensure its preservation.

In 1888 the Colonial Ammunition Works were founded on the site. The works were established by a private company (the Colonial Ammunition Company) that was eventually acquired by the Commonwealth Government in 1928 (ibid.) and renamed the Ammunition Factory Footscray (Also referred to in this research as the Ammunition Factory Maribyrnong or AFM).

By the 1960s, the Maribyrnong River and its environs was a forgotten place, especially around the ammunition works. Upstream, the rendering plants of Braybrook were polluting the river and neighbouring Humes Pipes carried on its noisy works. The nearby ordinance factory contributed
to the heavy manufacturing character of the area, reinforced by its near neighbours- Kinnears Ropeworks, the Footscray municipal quarry, and whitegoods manufacturer- Metters, and other concrete products and chemical manufacturers. Strengthening the non-residential character of the place were major power transmission lines built right up the valley between Footscray and Aberfeldie.

The plight of the Maribyrnong, Melbourne’s ‘forgotten river’, was at last recognised in the 1980’s through the newly-formed Living Museum of the West which researched and recorded the history, culture and environment of the river. The museum worked with the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works (which at that time had responsibility for planning, metropolitan open space, and main drainage) to protect and enhance the River Valley. In 1984, the Board introduced built form controls along the whole urban length from Keilor Township to Footscray. Associated with these planning controls, the Board began to rezone land for additional open space including the adjacent Humes Pipes manufacturing plant. The plant was purchased with part of a bicentenary grant of $2,000,000. Eventually, the Humes site was developed as an historic park, celebrating aboriginal culture and its industrial past of meat canning, railway engineering and concrete pipe manufacture. Named Pipemakers Park, it became the workshop, office, repository and exhibition centre for the Living Museum of the West. The park adjoins the northern boundary of Edgewater.

During the 1980s this part of the River Valley began its transformation. A pedestrian bridge was built over the river to connect Pipemakers Park with Fairburn Park in Ascot Vale and part of a future regional pedestrian/cycle linear trail was established along the river.

The ammunition factory was taken over by Australian Defence Industries (ADI) in 1989 but closed in 1994. Planning and environmental studies were carried out between 1990-1993 culminating in an Environment Effects Statement and amending planning schemes for the site in readiness for its disposal to a developer.

Little now remains of the factory’s buildings and works except workshop along Gordon Street occupied by Thales (ADI’s successor), the old administration building, former canteen and the preserved Jacks Magazine. The estate today is nearly completed with medium density development now being constructed on the steep escarpment area.

People past and present

Before 2006

The Colonial Ammunition Works was very significant as an early employer, particularly of women who in the 1890s depression were often the only breadwinners for a family (Lack, p.138).
By 1917, when production increased due to the War effort, the workforce had risen to 2,500 with a significant proportion still being women. During World War II this number had risen to 9,000 (Maribyrnong CC n.d.) Other employment opportunities arose from industries established in the immediate area of the site including Mephan Fergusons and Humes Pipe-works, Metters whitegoods factory and Olympic Products factory.

The area around the Ammunition Factory remained sparsely populated until the inter-war years (Ordinance Survey C of A) when a substantial War Service Homes estate opened opposite in Gordon Street.

By the 1960s the population had grown substantially to the west of the ammunition factory as the older subdivided area around the war service homes estate developed with small cottages. To the south, the population rose significantly as old dwellings on very large allotments were bulldozed for rows of basic walk-up flats.

Opposite the ammunition works, across the river, ‘Whisky Hill’ at Ascot Vale was a well-populated residential area interspersed with horse stables. Many of the old stables along the River were eventually bulldozed and redeveloped as low-midrise apartments.

At 2006

By 2006, development had consolidated around the Edgewater site and with it the characteristics of the population had changed. No longer could these parts of Maribyrnong and Footscray suburbs be considered purely a place for people working in manufacturing industries. Several factories had been demolished and the residential estates of Birdwood, Allara and Essence developed on them. The old ammunition factory had been cleared and the land decontaminated. Edgewater was partly developed.

The 2006 (Census) population of the estate was 687 with 4,238 in its surrounds. If the estate and surrounds are compared to each other and the Metropolitan average the estate and environs is characterised as having:

- low proportions of Australian born (14.3%-53.5%), with the exception of Whisky Hill in Ascot Vale.
- a high proportion of families with children at Edgewater (74%) and the area immediately west which contains the new brownfield developments of the Birdwood and Allara estates (71.2%), with significantly lower than average children in the apartment areas to the north (42.6%) and the apartments area between Gordon Street and Empire Street (48.1%).
• significantly higher weekly household incomes at Edgewater ($1,879) and, to a lesser extent, in Whisky Hill ($1,428). Weekly incomes were much lower in the apartment areas to the south of the estate ($584).
• very high unemployment in the apartment areas to the south of Edgewater (14.6-22.4%) but low unemployment at Edgewater (3.2%-7.5%) and across the river in Whisky Hill (1.0%-4.0%);
• no parts of the estate or its surrounds with a significantly high workforce in managerial or professional categories.
• A high SEIFA index score for the estate and low scores for the apartment area to the south. (See Table to this appendix)

These characteristics of Edgewater Estate and its surrounds indicate that it is a widely varying place. Poverty can be inferred for the apartment area to the south of the estate due to its low household incomes; high level of unemployment; and low proportion of managers and professional occupations. On the other hand, there appears to be a degree of wealth for new settlers on the estate and in Whisky Hill due to high family incomes and low unemployment.

**Decontamination of buildings and land**

The site was contaminated in a number of areas across the site and this required the developer and Commonwealth Government to remediate it generally to a residential and open space standard before development could take place. This entailed a number of actions including taking earth and materials off site for entombment under sections of the under-construction Western Ring Road and burial in a ‘repository’ on the site. Some heavily polluted material was taken to special wastes treatment facilities. Also, Coode Island Silt was treated with lime during the fill platform development to stabilise it as foundation material and to prevent it from becoming potentially toxic.

**References and sources of information:**


Ordinance Map ‘Melbourne’ 1932 (1 inch to the mile series)

Table to Appendix 7.3- Selected statistics for Edgewater and surrounds- 2006 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection District</th>
<th>Total Persons</th>
<th>% in 65+ age group</th>
<th>% Australian born</th>
<th>Families with children</th>
<th>Number of occupied dwellings</th>
<th>Persons per dwelling</th>
<th>% apartments</th>
<th>Median weekly Household Income</th>
<th>% of dwellings rented</th>
<th>Median rent $ per week</th>
<th>Median Housing loan $ weekly</th>
<th>% Workforce unemployed</th>
<th>% of workforce Professionals/Managers</th>
<th>SEIFA Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On Site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300111</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300115</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>1129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Around site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300103</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300104</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300105</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300107</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300110</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300112</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300114</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>1085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Across River</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2310807</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2310808</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Melbourne</strong></td>
<td>3.593M</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>1.352 M</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia</strong></td>
<td>19.855M</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>7.596M</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Melbourne Major Statistical Region (Metropolitan Area)  # Not available from the statistical set used.
Note 1- No data available due to very small population. Note 2- No private dwellings (University Hostel and Maribyrnong Detention Centre)
69.0 = significantly above the Melbourne average or median value.  48.1 = significantly below the Melbourne average or median value
**Edgewater and surrounds - Notes relating to historical and existing development of land use**

**Collection District**

**2300111**
Part of Site

Part of Edgewater Estate. Development commenced in 2004. The northern part of the CCD is Pipemakers Park with no habitation. Eastern part given over to a lake, open space and Jacks Magazine. At the time of the 2006 Census, the CCD had been occupied to about 20% of future potential. Major medium-high density development on the escarpment area was not commenced at the time of the Census. Previously site of the Ammunition Factory Maribyrnong.

**2300115**
Part of Site

Part of Edgewater Estate. Occupation of buildings occurred over period 2001-2005. At the time of the 2006 Census development was nearly completed with the exception of two medium-high density sites around the estate’s small commercial centre.

**2300103**
Site Surrounds

Located to the west of Edgewater and north of Mitchell Street. Development commenced in the early 1930s and the area was substantially developed by the early 1950s. Almost entirely small timber and brick cottages.

**2300104**
Site Surrounds

A largely industrial area with pockets of housing particularly away from the site and towards Ballarat Road. An open space, once a bluestone quarry, is at its centre, its eastern part was developed with houses in the 1930s. Warehouses were built on an old pipe-works in the 1970s. It contains Footscray North State Primary School.

**2300105**
Site Surrounds

An area of two parts: The western part contains a residential estate of large detached houses built from the 1950s; while the eastern section includes a set of apartments built in the 1990s and surrounded by Footscray Park (Most apartments are located here). Only weakly connected to Edgewater because its main access is via Ballarat Road, although pedestrian and cycle connections are more direct.

**2300106**
Site Surrounds

**NOT INCLUDED:** This CCD at the NW edge of Edgewater contains Maribyrnong Secondary College and Highpoint Shopping Centre which separate the residential area in Bloomfield Avenue to its north. Thus the residential development in this CCD does not relate to Edgewater.

**2300107**
Site Surrounds

To the south of Edgewater, this is now an area predominantly of walk up apartments built in the 1960s and 1970s. Once developed as cottages constructed before the 1930s on large deep allotments. Adjoins CCD 2300110.

**2300110**
Site Surrounds

To the south of Edgewater, this is now an area predominantly of walk up apartments built in the 1960s and 1970s. Once developed as cottages constructed before the 1930s on large deep allotments. Adjoins CCD 2300107.

**2300112**
Site Surrounds

To the west of the estate, an area of industries and houses established by the early 1930s. Includes a War Service Homes estate now protected as a heritage precinct. Recent housing estates- Allara and Birdwood have all but replaced industries.

**2300114**
Site Surrounds

This is an area that developed in the 1980s through to the early 2000s It relates to Highpoint Shopping Centre having Warrs Road as common main access. Is established on the former City of Essendon Quarry that supplied Humes Pipe works. Contains mostly row housing and mid-rise apartments.

**2300801**
Across River

**NOT INCLUDED:** While this Collection District abuts one of the site’s CCDs, it is separated from it by a golf course and Fairburn Park which is part of the Maribyrnong Regional Parklands.

**2310807**
Across River

Whisky Hill, Ascot Vale West is a well-established area that was built in the Victorian Period, and has seen much re-subdivision and renewal over the years. However it still retains much of its old character. Overlooks Edgewater but is not directly connected to it.

**2310808**
Across River

The site of some former stables for Flemington Racecourse, this area is wedged between the racecourse/showgrounds and the river and is part of Whisky Hill. The area has been partly redeveloped with mid-rise apartments but there are no stables left. It is reasonably well connected to Edgewater via Farnsworth Avenue Bridge.
Appendix 7.4 - Additional information about Waterford Green

**Geography**

Waterford Green sits in the transition between the flat basalt Keilor Plains and the eroded valley of the Maribyrnong River that has exposed earlier deposits of gravels and the Silurian bedrock formed 400 million years ago. It is generally flat at its southeast corner, progressively dipping down to the valley to the north and west. Closer to the river the slopes increase until they can be described as steep and it is at these points that the river becomes visible in an enclosed landscape along its reach south of Canning Street Bridge. The River flood plain is narrow here and generally confined to the other side of the river.

The estate is located close to Highpoint Principal Activity Centre. The No 82 tram route (Footscray to Moonee Ponds) runs along its eastern edge. It is also opposite the terminus of the No 57 tram that goes to Melbourne’s CBD (a 35 minute trip). Otherwise, the amount of local infrastructure is rather limited; the nearest State Primary School is two kilometres away.

Waterford Green remains isolated from other residential areas by the River, low intensity commercial development that faces away from it and the vacant Defence Site Maribyrnong. On the southern edge are the Student Village of Victoria University and the high security Maribyrnong Migrant Detention Centre. Part of the southern boundary is now a residential estate but there is no effective connection between the two places.

**History**

Koori people used the valley as a place for gathering food as well as a trade route for at least 13,000 and possibly up to 40,000 years. The nearest physical evidence is about two kilometres upstream where there are remnants of an eel trap at what today is known as Solomon’s Ford and artefact scatterings on the Defence Site Maribyrnong.

The earliest record of European settlement is a map of suburban land published in 1852 which shows the northern part of the site owned by James Johnston. A later map produced in 1876 shows the land owned by WJT Clarke and was probably owned by one of his successor sons- William or Joseph Clarke, when it was used to agist stock moved from the family’s extensive Western District pastoral runs.
The site was used for horse training when the Army Remount Depot was established in 1912 on the defence lands to the north adjoining the Explosives Factory Maribyrnong. The Remount Depot was strung along Wests Road that runs along the eastern part of the site and Williamsons Road on the south side of the site. Imposing barracks for the Royal Australian Field Artillery (RAFA) were also constructed along Wests Road.

In 1922 the RAFA barracks were vacated by the Department of Defence and reoccupied by the Department of Munitions to be used for ordnance and shell production although significant proportions of the site remained as an artillery drill ground.

The inter-war period initially saw a reduction of ordnance production on the site as military requirements reduced. However the ordnance factory was able to sell product in the open market and for some items it had a competitive advantage, including motor vehicle parts.

1933 saw the threat of war with Nazi Germany increase, and the Ordnance factory tooled up to produce armaments and other war materials. Buildings were constructed and extended until the whole site was virtually covered with structures and connecting roads. Even a five storey Central Drawing Office was constructed. It also became the hub of war material research with the establishment of the Munitions Supply Laboratories as well as a number of other Defence administrative functions.

The Second World War effort required that the ordnance factory work around the clock. But war production was greatly curtailed and virtually ceased after the Vietnam War (1972). The workforce declined as retirements and redeployments took place.

Australian Defence Industries (ADI) took over the factory in 1989 and the Ordnance Factory was targeted for phased closure. By 1993 all manufacturing had ceased and the land was earmarked for disposal for development as a housing and mixed uses estate. An Environment Effects Statement was prepared and a planning scheme amendment was approved in November 1994 after a planning panel enquiry that was jointly heard with the EES and planning scheme amendments for Edgewater. Lend Lease purchased the land and built Waterford Green Estate with development commencing in 1997.

Later, adjoining Defence land was added to the estate. It is the combination of both the original estate and the extensions that is now referred to as Waterford Green.
People past and present

Before 2006

The Ordnance factory Maribyrnong not only had a key role in defence supply and standards both in wartime and peace, but it was a very significant employer. During World War 2 the maximum employment rose to 6,262 (1943) over half of whom were women (Ford O et.al, p. 48). The peacetime workforce steadily declined until the OFM’s final closure.

After 2006

The 2006 Census does not provide any detail of land to the north (Defence Site Maribyrnong) or the south (Student Village and Detention Centre). The data is therefore incomplete however when compared with the metropolitan average the estate and surrounds has a:

• low to very low proportion of Australian born people both on the estate and in its surrounds (43.0%-55.1%).

• a high number of families with children at Waterford Green where there are few apartments (74.0%-78.9%) and conversely a low number of families with children where there are a high proportion of apartments (24.1%-31.1%).

• high household incomes on Waterford Green where there is a preponderance of detached and attached houses ($1,509-$1,592), but significantly low household incomes in a predominantly detached houses Avondale Heights ($725 & $821).

• generally average number of the workforce in management and professional positions but lower in the Wests Road apartment area (30.2%) and Avondale Heights (27.5-29.8%).

These figures indicate a lot of internal variety in the area’s population that reflects both the age of development with an aging and migrant settled Avondale Heights and a lot of internal variety at Waterford Green with its high amenity detached and terrace house areas and its rather crammed apartments in the compact housing areas. See the Table to this Appendix for selected statistics for the Census Collectors Districts of and surrounding the estate.
Decontamination of buildings and land

The factory site was contaminated but not to any great extent. It was a heavy, largely metal fabrication place and there were few chemicals on site. Nevertheless, the land was thoroughly examined first along the verges of roads and again when the buildings were demolished.

References and sources of information:


Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2006b, Quickstats 2006 (various Census Collection Districts in the case study area).
Table to Appendix 7.4- Selected statistics for the Waterford Green and surrounds- 2006 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection District</th>
<th>Total Persons</th>
<th>% in 65+ group</th>
<th>% Australian born</th>
<th>Families with children</th>
<th>Number of occupied dwellings</th>
<th>Persons per dwelling</th>
<th>% apartments</th>
<th>Median weekly Household Income $</th>
<th>% dwellings rented</th>
<th>Median rent $ per week</th>
<th>Median Housing loan $ weekly</th>
<th>% Workforce unemployed</th>
<th>% of workforce professionals managers</th>
<th>SEIFA Index^</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On Site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23001113</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>1093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301818</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.509</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301819</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.530</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301820</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301821</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301822</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>2705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>967</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Around site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301814</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301816</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Across River</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311109</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311110</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>1225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>502</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Melbourne</strong></td>
<td>3.593M</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>1,352M</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia</strong></td>
<td>19.855M</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>7.596M</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Melbourne Major Statistical Region (Metropolitan Area)  # Not available from the statistical set used.
Note 1- No data available due to very small population. Note 2- No private dwellings (University Hostel and Maribyrnong Detention Centre).

69.0 = significantly above the Melbourne average or median value. 48.1 = significantly below the Melbourne average or median value.
## Waterford Green and surrounds- Notes relating to historical and existing development of land use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection District</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2300113 On Site</td>
<td>The CCD contains a very significant range of commercial uses associated with Highpoint Shopping Centre and also two major groups of apartments on its western flank that are part of Waterford Green. While there are some houses off the estate, the great majority of dwellings are within it. A balance of large detached houses grouped near the river with substantial river views and rows of smaller three bedroom terraces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301818 On Site</td>
<td>Contains some very large houses on small plots and a range of smaller 3 bedroom terrace housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301819 On Site</td>
<td>Contains some very large houses on small plots. Accessibility between the site and Maribyrnong Defence Site at this location will be severely restricted because all buildings face away from Cordite Avenue and there is a dedicated tree buffer plantation between the rear of dwellings abutting Cordite Avenue. Compact terrace housing and apartments. Includes apartments in the former Royal Australian Field Artillery barracks and parade ground. A very high density development in places that has produced ‘a very low standard of amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301820 Site Surroun</td>
<td>A compact CCD that includes a large number of mid-rise apartments that partly utilise former defence offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301821 On Site</td>
<td>This CCD covers the whole of the Defence Site Maribyrnong and follows its current boundaries. No data is displayed because of the low population on site thus affecting confidentiality. For the purposes of this study it can be regarded as zero as there are no separate dwellings on site to my knowledge. <strong>NOT INCLUDED:</strong> Land adjoining the site is the Medway Golf Course that separates residential areas to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301822 On Site</td>
<td>At the time of the Census the only habitation was at Victoria University’s student village and the Maribyrnong Detention Centre. This was once the Maribyrnong Migrant Hostel and in the case of the hostel comprises a number of small apartment buildings located within garden settings. The detention centre is a high security complex surrounded with security fencing. The population split between hostel and detention centre has not been given, nor has any other information been provided. Since 2006 a number of detached houses and row houses have been established on the site the AV Jennings estate ‘Ulmara’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301814 Around Site</td>
<td>One of the oldest parts of Avondale Heights, developed in the 1960s and 1970s primarily with detached houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301815 Around site</td>
<td>Developed in the 1970s and 1980s as a purely residential area with detached dwellings overlooking the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311109 Across River</td>
<td>One of the oldest parts of Avondale Heights, developed in the 1960s and 1970s primarily with detached houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311110 Across River</td>
<td>Developed in the 1970s and 1980s as a purely residential area with detached dwellings overlooking the river.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7.5 - Additional information about the Defence Site Maribyrnong

Geography

The Defence Site Maribyrnong is situated at and about ‘Horseshoe Bend’ of the Maribyrnong River. This major site joins 3 kilometres to the river and has a further frontage of 1,200 metres to Cordite Ave-Raleigh Road Maribyrnong. It has three main physiographic features:

- The river valley floodplain covers the whole of Horseshoe Bend and two other indents into the site. The floodplain consists of recent silts. Horseshoe Bend was made available for explosives manufacturing and storage works through construction of a flood protection levee around the river.
- The alluvial terrace formation generally 5-10 metres above the water level is a feature deposited approximately 9,000 to 13,000 years ago when sea levels were higher and Port Phillip Bay penetrated far inland as a narrow estuary.
- Remount Hill is a peculiar flat topped basalt capped hill which owes its presence to the shifting course of the river. When the river changed its course to the north it created another gorge which in turn produced a dissected part of the basalt plains.

History

Similar to the other three estates, the River, at this point, was a key transportation route for aboriginal people. There is some evidence of aboriginal occupation on the site with some artefact scatters and of quarrying silcrete (a type of hardened soil) used for the manufacture of tools. Also, it is about three kilometres downstream of Solomon’s Ford where there is evidence of eel traps.

In 1847, Joseph Raleigh along with James Johnston took occupation of the site. Raleigh built a large mansion ‘Maribyrnong House’ near the top of Remount Hill with expansive views down the river. Unfortunately the house was burnt down in 1872 and nothing remains of it with the possible exception of some basalt foundations.

In the 1860s, the Fisher brothers established a horse stud on the site. The stud was rebuilt after a disastrous fire and this included the Fisher Stables (1880). The stables remain as a
key reminder of the site’s former importance to the racing industry. Later, the Fishers sold to Sir William Clarke and the Cox brothers who continued breeding horses on the site. In 1892 the Cox brothers established a private racecourse on the terraced flats in the western part of the site. In 1904 the racecourse was used for Victoria’s first motor sports meeting.

The need for more defence production to make Australia independent of other countries led the Commonwealth Government to acquire the land in 1908 for explosives manufacture. Cordite manufacture commenced in 1911. The site was known as the Explosives Factory Maribyrnong (EFM). It eventually spread to the other side of the river connected by its own bridge near Afton Street Essendon West, and onto land to the south of Cordite Avenue for some distance up the river valley (now part of Waterford Green).

The importance of the new factory was in the manufacturing processes it employed for the production of cordite and other chemicals. When the Great War finished, manufacturing continued because the EFM was enabled to sell products to the open market. Chemical production diversified including the manufacture of acids, paints and TNT. This created competition with ICIANZ (Now ORICA) at its plant in nearby Deer Park.

Not all the site was given over to the chemical and explosives industry. In 1912 the hill area became a remount paddock for wartime preparation of horses. It was associated with the Royal Australian Field Artillery (RAFA) whose barracks and drill ground was on the present Waterford Green (Refer to Appendix 7.4). A large proportion of the 169,000 horses sent to war from Australia passed through the remount paddocks on their way to the Middle East, Europe and India. So Remount Hill is named after this activity. The facility was closed in 1945.

During World War 2, explosives and associated production increased, thus the workforce increased dramatically. After the war the EFM adapted to new processes including the production and testing of rocket propellents. Research laboratories were built for the Defence Science Technology Organisation (DSTO), and other Defence enterprises including vehicle and machinery testing and canteen services took up the frontages of the site.
In 2001, the Department of Defence decided to carry out ‘characterisation studies’ as a prelude to disposing of the site. Environmental (soil/groundwater contamination) studies were conducted. A major heritage study confirmed that the site contained many key cultural places including remnant White Cypress Pine, aboriginal heritage places and artefacts and several notable buildings and groups of buildings that depicted the site’s important industrial past.

In 2004, the Assistant Minister for Defence and Victoria’s Major Projects Minister commenced negotiations for a ‘priority sale’ of the land to the State of Victoria. These discussions nearly foundered but were recommenced in 2008 after the Rudd Labor Government came into office. In April 2009, a decision was made to dispose of the site to the State of Victoria eventually to be planned and developed by Vic Urban (now Places Victoria) its redevelopment agency. The land is currently being remediated by a contractor to the Defence Department.

Places Victoria estimates that work on the site will not begin until at least 2015. In the meantime, Places Victoria has commenced preliminary strategic planning work which, to-date, has produced a joint vision with the community.

People past and present

Before 2006

The Defence Site Maribyrnong is not inhabited but its past importance lies in its role as a major employer. This increased to a maximum during World War 2, when the workforce swelled to over 8,000, over 45% being women (Foresite Ltd). Thereafter decline took place until in the 1990s chemical production ceased and only research organisations occupied the front part of the site.

By 1951-2, the area to the west of the Defence site was occupied by a CSIRO research establishment and Naval Stores areas. At this time, Maribyrnong Township would have been a thousand or so souls. Every second block was vacant and the vestiges of the areas rural past of stables, vegetable gardens and dairies were still present. Pam Lewis in *Maribyrnong- Action in Tranquillity* writes of the post war Maribyrnong: “The (Maribyrnong) area seemed rural and isolated even in the late sixties. Anne Hurley remembers a dairy in Bloomfield Avenue and a horse and cart delivering milk. People were friendly. Yet it was a rural area with a difference. Trams ran a
twenty four hour service for workers on night shift (at the Defence factories).
People put up with blasting from the quarries. Nissen huts occupied the grounds of
the migrant hostel and new arrivals filled the classrooms of the local schools.”
(Ford, O et. al.1989, p.70)

This word picture signifies a most unusual place- not yet a suburb.

The opening of Highpoint Shopping Centre in 1976 marked a major change in the
character of the Defence Site and its surrounds. Heralded as one of the largest shopping
centres in Australia, it was built in the former City of Essendon quarry. Its trade area was
the whole of Melbourne’s western and north western suburbs and, from the outset, it
relied largely on patrons driving their cars. From that time onwards the old Maribyrnong
Township consolidated and expanded largely through infill development but with
additional estates on the former CSIRO and Naval Stores sites.

Within the immediate surrounds of the Defence Site, blocks of walk up flats and villa
units were built in Middle Street, significantly changing it to a more urban character.
Similar changes began to happen along the escarpment of the river valley near Highpoint.
Later, Waterford Green with its mix of medium and low density housing was established
south on the former Ordnance Factory.

In 1981 the surrounds of the Defence Site appear to have a population that was more aged
than the metropolitan average. The situation had changed in the generation between 1981
and 2006.

At 2006

The 2006 population surrounding the Defence Site Maribyrnong, when compared with
the metropolitan average is characterised as having:

- fewer Australian born residents in the Wests Road apartments (43.0%), but higher
  than average Australian born in Essendon West (78.0%) and Maribyrnong Township
  along the river and on Remount Hill (68.2%).
- High household income in Waterford Green ($1,530-$1,592) and low in the apart-
  ment area of Maribyrnong Township ($778) and the part of Avondale Heights
  subdivided before 1968 ($725-$821).
- High unemployment in the apartments along Wests Road (14.3%) and low in Essendon West (1.7%) and Maribyrnong Township along the river and on Remount Hill (2.6%).
- High representation of managers and professionals in the workforce in Maribyrnong Township along the river (46.8%) and across the river in Essendon West (46.6%).

Thus where there are low numbers of apartments and there are views and proximity to the river it appears that incomes are high and the proportion of the workforce occupied as professionals and managers is higher. Where development is more recent (such as the western part of Waterford Green) household incomes are high as are the number of families with children (See the table to this appendix).

**Decontamination of buildings and land**

The land has had little done to it to decontaminate the soil although some contaminated building materials such as roofs impregnated with TNT and built with asbestos have been removed. The preliminary site contamination analysis carried out to-date by consultants on behalf of the Department of Defence show some significant areas of contamination but large areas of the site appear to be uncontaminated and groundwater and the River also appears not to be heavily contaminated. Cleanup to residential (sensitive use) levels has therefore been considered to be quite feasible. However, there has been some speculation in the press that contamination is serious in some parts of the site and whilst there has been minimal impact on the river, 12 areas will need to be cleaned of a range of contaminants including lead, TNT, mercury ammunition asbestos and other metals (Moonee Valley Leader 2005).

Remediation of the site is being undertaken by the Commonwealth Department of Defence and the land will be transferred to Places Victoria only when it has been appropriately remediated. The site will be remediated to standards set by the Victorian Environmental Protection Authority. Remediation will be in accordance with the Heritage Management Plan prepared under the Federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act. (Vic Urban October 2011).

**References and sources of information:**

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2006b, *Quickstats 2006* (various Census Collection Districts in the case study area)


### Table to Appendix 7.5 - Selected statistics for the Defence Site Maribyrnong and surrounds- 2006 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection District</th>
<th>Total Persons</th>
<th>% in 65+ age group</th>
<th>% Australian born</th>
<th>Families with children</th>
<th>Number of occupied dwellings</th>
<th>Persons per dwelling</th>
<th>% apartments</th>
<th>Median weekly Household Income $</th>
<th>% dwellings rented</th>
<th>Median rent $ per week</th>
<th>Median Housing loan $ weekly</th>
<th>% Workforce unemployed</th>
<th>% of workforce Professionals/managers</th>
<th>SEIFA Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On Site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301814</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Around site</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23000106</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>1045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23000113</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>1093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301801</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301813</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.562</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>1119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301819</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.530</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301820</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>2791</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Across River</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311106</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311109</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311110</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311113</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311114</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>3,935</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6,726</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne*</td>
<td>3,593M</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>1,352M</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>19.855M</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>7.596M</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69.0 = significantly above the Melbourne average or median value.  48.1 = significantly below the Melbourne average or median value

^ The SEIFA Index is a measure of Socio Economic Status prepared by ABS from the Census of Population and Housing from four composite indexes. 1000 is the average
**Defence Site Maribyrnong and Surrounds - Notes relating to historical and existing development of land use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection District</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2301814 On Site</td>
<td>This CCD covers the whole of the Defence Site Maribyrnong and follows its current boundaries. No data is displayed because of the low population on site thus affecting confidentiality. For the purposes of this study the site can be regarded as uninhabited as there are no separate dwellings on the site to my knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300106 Site Surrounds</td>
<td>Comprises Highpoint Shopping Centre and a residential area south of Raleigh Road, including Bloomfield Ave. The estate has existed since before the 1920s. It is mostly detached houses on large blocks. Some sites have been redeveloped for medium density housing (32% at 2006). The CCD contains a very significant range of commercial uses associated with Highpoint Shopping Centre and also two major groups of apartments on its western flank that are included in Waterford Green. These commence approximately 300 metres from the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301801 Site Surrounds</td>
<td>Primarily a residential area with a Catholic primary school. Has seen development over a protracted period from the 1930s but was substantially developed by the 1960s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301813 Site Surrounds</td>
<td>A residential area that has been in part developed since the 1920s. The area around The Esplanade contains deep allotments. Houses were built on the raised terraced land and stables on the lower floodplain. There are no stables remaining (except a disused one owned by the Council and protected by a Heritage overlay). A very sort-after part of the valley because of its views of and proximity to the River. The Riverbank Estate, completed about 2006, is located on land formerly occupied by CSIRO research laboratories and Naval Stores. This comprises some row housing and a majority of large detached houses on small allotments. A very sort-after part of the valley because of its views of the River Valley. Part of Waterford Green Estate. Contains some very large houses on small plots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301819 Site Surrounds</td>
<td>Part of Waterford Green estate. Contains some very large houses on small plots. Accessibility between the site and Waterford Green at this location will be severely restricted because all buildings face away from Cordite Avenue and there is a dedicated tree buffer plantation between the rear of dwellings abutting Cordite Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301820 Site Surrounds</td>
<td>A residential area surrounding Bloomfield Avenue comprises a mixture of villa unit developments and older housing dating from the 1920s. One special accommodation home is located midway along Bloomfield Avenue which by its nature may have raised the number of children and young adult females recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300106 Site Surrounds</td>
<td>A residential area primarily of detached houses perched high above the river in Essendon West. Some parts have extensive views of the River Valley and beyond to the city centre. Development is post 1950s detached housing of variable size varying from original weatherboard cottages to mansions. One of the oldest parts of Avondale Heights, developed in the 1960s and 1970s primarily with detached houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311106 Across River</td>
<td>Developed in the 1970s and 1980s as a residential area with detached dwellings overlooking the River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311109 Across River</td>
<td>Comprises new estate development that occurred from the 1980s to the end of the century. Part of the development is within the St Bernard's estate. Houses in this latter estate are often large and possess expansive views over the River, Defence Site and the city skyline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311110 Across River</td>
<td>Comprises relatively new housing estate developed in the 1980s. Mostly detached housing with some town houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311113 Across River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311114 Across River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7.6  Shared Vision for the Defence Site Maribyrnong

This Vision Statement was prepared after a number of community consultations and will form the basis for preparing more detailed plans for the Defence Site Maribyrnong. It is very broad in its nature and has no relative values attached to it:

“The Maribyrnong Defence Site will be a place which celebrates the riverfront location; recognises and celebrates the site’s rich history and natural landscape; while adding a new dimension to Melbourne’s west with diverse and welcoming neighbourhoods for people now and into the future:

THEME 1: Celebrating the river and landscape:
Providing public access to the riverfront with opportunities for people to meet and enjoy the unique environment;
Creating a continuation of the open space corridor in the region;
Ensuring diversity of open space opportunities and functions (including opportunities for relaxation, walking and cycling).

THEME 2: Building on the histories of the site:
Celebrating indigenous heritage;
Recognising munitions history, and the significant contribution of women’s work;
Celebrating racing and equine heritage;
Embracing heritage adaption, re-use and interpretation;
Creating a valued place.

THEME 3: A new dimension for Maribyrnong- Building on the strengths of the existing community:
Contributing to the new energy of the west;
Streets which are safe for walking and cycling;
Connections which are sympathetic with the surrounding neighbourhoods
Reduce reliance on cars;
Creating a great main street, with a mix of community and commercial opportunities.

THEME 4: A diverse and inclusive community:
Providing a wide range of housing options;
Creating opportunities for jobs, education and business in the local area;
Developing a safe and welcoming environment;
Delivering community facilities that respond to the diversity of community needs.

THEME 5: An eye to the future:
Investigating and investing in environmental innovation;
Reducing potable water consumption and carbon pollution;
Healthy lifestyles;
Sustainable lifestyles.” (Vic Urban, 2010)
Appendix 8 - Urban Design Charter for Victoria and Planning scheme requirements

Urban Design Charter

The Urban Design Charter for Victoria (2009) sets down ‘12 Principles of Good Public Environments.’ These are as follows:

- **Structure:** Organise places so their parts relate well to one another
- **Accessibility:** Provide ease, safety and choice of access for all people
- **Legibility:** Help people to understand how places work and to find their way around
- **Animation:** Stimulate activity and a sense of vitality in public places
- **Fit and function:** Support the intended uses of spaces while also allowing for their adaptability
- **Complementary mixed uses:** Integrate complementary activities to promote synergies between them
- **Sense of place:** Recognise and enhance the qualities that give places a valued identity
- **Consistency and variety:** Balance order and diversity in the interests of appreciating both
- **Continuity and change:** Maintain a sense of place and time by embracing change yet respecting heritage values
- **Safety:** Design Spaces that minimise risks of personal harm and support safe behaviour
- **Sensory pleasure:** Create places where all people are free to encounter each other as equals
- **Inclusiveness and interaction:** Create spaces that engage the senses and delight the mind (DPCD 2012, n.p.n.).

In addition to these principles there are Urban Design Principles embedded in the State Planning Policy Framework of all planning schemes:
Clause 15.01-2 Urban design principles (in all planning schemes)

Objective
To achieve architectural and urban design outcomes that contribute positively to local urban character and enhance the public realm while minimising detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.

Strategies
Apply the following design principles to development proposals for non-residential development or residential development not covered by Clause 54, Clause 55 or Clause 56:

Context
- Development must take into account the natural, cultural and strategic context of its location.
- Planning authorities should emphasise urban design policies and frameworks for key locations or precincts.
- A comprehensive site analysis should be the starting point of the design process and form the basis for consideration of height, scale and massing of new development.

The public realm
The public realm, which includes main pedestrian spaces, streets, squares, parks and walkways, should be protected and enhanced.

Safety
New development should create urban environments that enhance personal safety and property security and where people feel safe to live, work and move in at any time.

Landmarks, views and vistas
Landmarks, views and vistas should be protected and enhanced or, where appropriate, created by new additions to the built environment.

Pedestrian spaces
Design of interfaces between buildings and public spaces, including the arrangement of adjoining activities, entrances, windows, and architectural detailing, should enhance the visual and social experience of the user.

**Heritage**

New development should respect, but not simply copy, historic precedents and create a worthy legacy for future generations.

**Consolidation of sites and empty sites**

- New development should contribute to the complexity and diversity of the built environment.
- Site consolidation should not result in street frontages that are out of keeping with the complexity and rhythm of existing streetscapes.
- The development process should be managed so that sites are not in an unattractive, neglected state for excessive periods and the impacts from vacant sites are minimised.

**Light and shade**

- Enjoyment of the public realm should be enhanced by a desirable balance of sunlight and shade.
- This balance should not be compromised by undesirable overshadowing or exposure to the sun.

**Energy and resource efficiency**

All building, subdivision and engineering works should include efficient use of resources and energy efficiency.

**Architectural quality**

- New development should achieve high standards in architecture and urban design.
- Any rooftop plant, lift over-runs, service entries, communication devices, and other technical attachment should be treated as part of the overall design.

**Landscape architecture**
Recognition should be given to the setting in which buildings are designed and the integrating role of landscape architecture.

**Policy guidelines**

Planning must consider as relevant:

- *Design Guidelines for Higher Density Residential Development* (Department of Sustainability and Environment, 2004) in assessing the design and built form of residential development of four or more storeys.

- *Activity Centre Design Guidelines* (Department of Sustainability and Environment, 2005) in preparing activity centre structure plans and in assessing the design and built form of new development in activity centres.

- *Safer Design Guidelines for Victoria* (Crime Prevention Victoria and Department of Sustainability and Environment, 2005) in assessing the design and built form of new development.

- *Urban Design Charter for Victoria* (Department of Planning and Community Development 2009).

(DPCD 2013)

**References and sources of information:**


Appendix 9 - Model ILAP arrangement for a large PDL site

The following model would suit the plan and design preparation for a large PDL site where the likely future population would require a number of State funded and built facilities and there is a likelihood that the future population would support commercial activity including a central community gathering place. The Defence Site Maribyrnong may be one such PDL and the diagram below is modelled for its needs. This is only an example as there are a lot of variables to be considered before a clear institutional arrangement can be prepared for each PDL.

The first step in any planning and design process would be the scoping of the site and its locality for its existing and future needs- often referred to as capacity modelling. Part of this process can be the involvement of the community in a workshop that investigates the opportunities and constraints which without providing specific values on those aspects of the area begins to tease out the likely issues that the PDL development presents. This is sometimes achieved as a visualisation process as already employed for the Defence Site Maribyrnong. Scoping would also involve consultation with infrastructure planning agencies on current state-wide or localised policy and the flexibility or alternatives that are offered. For example, while the community may wish to have a new public primary school established in the suburb of Maribyrnong, the alternatives may be an off-site location or the expansion of existing schools with transport arrangements for access.

A scoping plan needs to be shared with the local community for its feedback so that the arrangement of establishing a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) would proceed in parallel with the scoping activity. Three months would seem an adequate time to do this. The CAC’s first role amongst the development of administrative arrangements (election of chairman, code of conduct, level of openness to the public etc) would be to receive a draft of the scoping report that would set down the land use and design issues and from these the structure of the working groups. Once this is agreed; on this model, the CAC would assume its place as an active working group contributor to the Integrated Local Planning for the PDL.

The Figure below shows a fairly elementary structure at two levels, one being the Planning & Development Committee (P&DC) comprising the project manager plus chairs of the working parties, and State or local interests such as the local lower State
house member and ward councillor; the other being a number of working parties. The P&DC’s role would be to receive working group proposals and seek the comments of the other working groups and others outside the groups on these reports. Its other role would be to conduct its own investigations for synthesizing all working group proposals into a plan for the PDL site. The overall financing of the project would be the role of the Executive Committee.

**Figure A10** ILAP model for a major PDL plan, design and development process

In this model many people will be involved in the planning of a large PDL such as the Defence Site Maribyrnong, and some would say that this is too complex. However, the risk of failure through limited consideration will be a major cost burden on the future.
community due to the poor planning of community services and urban design. Thus careful inclusive initial planning is very desirable. Not all working groups need to exist over the whole life of the project and it is likely that once their basic work is finished they would be terminated or absorbed into another working group. For example, the Remediation working group will be very important at the beginning of the project in the strategic planning phase but, on the other hand, the Recreation Working Group is likely to be more active at the end of the project when more place making activities take place. There is also scope to engage other interests if not specifically handled by a working group (right hand bottom corner).

The above arrangement would be simplified for smaller projects. For example, a 10 ha PDL site may, on scoping, need very little investigation for most aspects of development with the exception of two matters- remediation and transport. In such a case, the project manager would be a nominee of the Council (probably an existing project manager) and no working groups would be required, any specialised information being obtained through internal staff resources or consultants.

The major issue is the problem of State government bodies making forward commitments to providing infrastructure within the proposed phasing of a major PDL project. Such problems would be resolved, if possible, through the project Executive Committee. However, this is sometimes an issue which may require a decision at State cabinet level, often at budget time, and it would be up to the City and Places Victoria through the executive committee to make representations to the responsible minist