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ABSTRACT

The Developer’s Art: An examination of public art in master planned communities

New residential development combined with urban consolidation policy is critical to providing the housing necessary for Sydney’s growing population. One of the most challenging assignments for developers is the art of creating a meaningful sense of place in new communities built from the ground up, particularly on the urban fringe. While the creation of unique places is the primary marketing strategy for master planned communities, the end results have often been criticised as generic in character and lacking in substance. Public art has provided developers and local authorities with a unique opportunity to fashion new communities with a distinctive sense of place. It can do this through not only enhancing the aesthetic quality of the built environment but also by encouraging creativity in the design process and providing a better connection between people and place. Increasingly, public art is being planned for and required by local authorities as a part of new residential development. This thesis examines the recent use of public art in master planned communities in Sydney and explores the factors driving its implementation. The central question is the extent to which public art can facilitate the creation of better communities. A combination of a detailed inventory analysis of 16 master planned communities, in depth interviews with artists, public art coordinators (1 private consultant and 1 local government) and a Landcom representative and 50 resident surveys in The Ponds new residential master planned estate were undertaken. The results revealed that a majority of residents in The Ponds felt the artworks should not be removed but overall awareness and understanding of public art installed prior to the community forming was low amongst residents. The implications of the findings are that resident perception of attachment to place and identity with place (as key dimensions of sense of community) through public art could be increased if the artwork was installed with their participation after they had moved in. Further, given local authorities are expected to accept the maintenance costs and responsibilities of these artworks, it stands to reason that the public art actually engages the local community.
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CHAPTER One

Introduction
Research Agenda
Research Context
Research Statement
Study Structure
RESEARCH AGENDA

This thesis is about planning for communities or ‘people places’. In particular, it is concerned with the implementation of public art within master planned community estates and whether such residential developments are actually creating a sense of ‘place attachment’ and ‘place identity’ within new communities – the developer’s art.

Although public art has been readily adopted internationally, interstate and now within Sydney as a part of new development, there has been little research into whether public art within master planned communities, particularly within the Australian experience, actually encourages or fosters a strong sense of place and community experienced by the residents of these types of developments. This can be attributed to both the perceived difficulty of measuring the impacts of the arts generally and also due to limited opportunity for private developers to implement public art on a large scale across an entire new suburb.

Given the emergence of developments with more conspicuous public art, in particular in western Sydney, there now exists ample opportunity to investigate the communities that have been established and the residents that live in them to explore whether public art, when applied to master planned estates, are actually an effective medium of creating a sense of place identity and attachment to place for residents.

This thesis therefore examines both the literary and professional planning discourse regarding the application of public art in new master planned residential developments and also explores the actual sense of place identity and attachment to place experienced by the residents living with public art in this type of development.

In light of the agenda of this thesis outlined above, the main objectives of this thesis are to:

1. Provide an introduction and understanding of public art, master planned estates and the ideas of place identity and attachment to place as indicators of community.
2. Explore the relationship between master planned communities and public art.

3. Identify the extent to which public art is being implemented in master planned communities across Sydney.

4. Determine how public art installed in master planned communities is received by residents of such developments and by extension to what extent resident sense of place attachment and identity with community is reflected through public art.

RESEARCH CONTEXT

Introduction

The changing social, environmental and economic environment has given rise to a new style of suburbia. The suburbs of the past have often been synonymous with a sense of isolation, or “geography of nowhere” (Kunstler, 1993), and a lack of adequate infrastructure and services. As a result, there has been a need to retrofit existing communities to meet the social, environmental, economic and cultural needs of people through the rise of community cultural development and participatory arts. Based on the ideals of urban consolidation and principles of new urbanism, there has been a shift towards creating new forms of suburbs planned in an integrated and sustainable fashion that are more conducive to meeting the social, environmental, economic and cultural needs of people. The context relevant to this thesis involves the challenge associated with developing typically Greenfield sites on the urban fringe of Sydney into new higher density suburbs with a closer connection between people and place through the potential of public art.

Urban developers play an active role in establishing a sense of community or place within new residential developments. The creation of places that relate well to people, or at least are perceived to relate well by the people buying into and living in new master planned estates, plays a key role in the overall success of the development. An understanding of how this sense of place or community is achieved is of great importance to planning practitioners and urban developers alike.
Development Drivers

Over the last 20 years, the desire to better utilise land and its resources has seen the emergence of urban consolidation and smart growth to prevent urban sprawl in an ad hoc manner (Searle 2004, 42). Bunker et.al (2005) explains that urban consolidation is the densification of residential areas and argues that it improves housing choice in terms of dwelling type, tenure and location. This form of new residential development is critical in providing the housing necessary for Sydney’s growing population and a major part of the economy.

In this regard, there has been pressure to increase dwelling densities in a traditionally suburban setting particularly on the western fringe of Sydney. The NSW Department of Planning’s Sydney Metropolitan Strategy envisages a total of 30-40% of all of Sydney’s housing needs being provided in the North West and South West Growth Sectors on the urban fringe of Sydney (DOP 2006).

The Developer’s Art

One of the most challenging assignments for developers is the art of creating a meaningful sense of place in new communities built from the ground up, particularly on the urban fringe. As Webster (2004, 73) elaborates, “for edge development, the most challenging assignment for developers is creating a sense of ‘community’ or ‘place’ which, in its basest sense means the community having ready access to the range of social and physical infrastructure one would normally associate with an established community”.

Many developers have been implementing the principles of urban consolidation and new urbanism through the development of master planned estates to achieve both greater development yields as well as to create greater vision and marketability. A master plan is a planning mechanism controlling an entire project site, underpinned by a particular vision for the completed development (Gwyther 2005).
With the pressures of urban consolidation (and need for development yields to ensure the feasibility of an estate) reducing the size of typical residential lots, developers are seeking to offer other facilities to ensure the amenity of an area is not lost (DOL and DFT 2006) particularly in the case of western Sydney.

This higher density form of living through master planned estates has created a unique opportunity for developers to implement New Urbanist principles that provides a mechanism by which place attachment and place identity could be created. New urbanism seeks to increase densities to reduce sprawl and promote efficient infrastructure provision, enhance the quality and comfort of the public realm, promote walkable neighbourhoods and integrate land uses to promote public transport and correspondingly reduce car use (CNU 1996). It is within this master planning paradigm that public art is being implemented as well.

The adoption of ‘new urbanist’ ideals in master planned communities has also created opportunities for the application of public art. Like the human focused principles of new urbanism, public art can also provide a sense of pride, community interest, increase happiness and well-being in residents and increase social capital by celebrating cultural diversity while bridging cultural differences within local communities.

Increasingly public art is playing a significant role in adding the intrinsic value necessary in establishing a sense of place and community in new residential Greenfield and brownfield sites in the Sydney Metropolitan Region. It can do this through not only enhancing the aesthetic quality of the built environment but also by encouraging creativity in the design process and providing a better connection between people and place.

While the creation of unique places is a primary marketing strategy for master planned communities, the end result has often been criticised as generic in character and lacking in substance. The names of themed new residential developments such as ‘The Ponds’, ‘Forest Glades’ and ‘Stanhope Gardens’ evoke idyllic images in the minds of the consumer but may not
necessarily be more than an image. However, public art is increasingly being utilised to physically and interpretively realise these images and connections between the built form, physical environment and people in order to create unique places on the ground. Nonetheless, it remains to be seen whether the use of public art has managed to create a real sense of place and community and increase the level of cultural identity in new residential communities.

**Creating ‘People Places’**

The key strategies to put the main principles and aims of public art into practice are critical in determining the effectiveness of public art in creating actual community identities and a sense of place.

Therefore, public art is being planned for and required by both local authorities and developers as a part of new residential development. This has been reflected by the spate of Public Art Strategies drafted and implemented by both Councils and developers across NSW, the requirement for public art in new Development Control Plans, Section 94 Contributions Plans and Developer Agreements for site specific master planned developments and the recent inclusion of public art as a key component of Landcom’s 2008 development guidelines for the creation of better communities known as ‘the Landcom Guidelines’.

A key indicator of a presence of community within a suburb is the degree to which people feel a sense of place attachment and cultural identity. The concept of the social and community benefits of the arts through participatory models has been largely advocated by supporters of the arts, such as the Australia Council of the Arts.

Whilst the qualitative benefits of public art are often immeasurable on the quantitative scale, little work has been done to evaluate the impact of public art, while the cost of implementing significant pieces of public art can often be quite substantial, with ‘Float’ in ‘The Ponds’ (a master planned community in the Blacktown LGA) for instance estimated to cost $542,000 dollars to construct (BCC, 2009). Are these artworks superfluous decorations or ornaments, or
is a meaningful sense of cultural identity and place attachment being created commensurate with the amount of financial investment? Overall, the level of understanding and relevance of public art to people in master planned communities will be used as an indicator to determine the presence of place attachment and cultural identity or at least a sense of it in the case studies investigated by this thesis.

The central question explores the extent to which public art actually creates better communities. In particular, it is concerned with the implementation of public art in master planned residential estates within New South Wales with a primary focus on western Sydney. It explores the challenges associated with developing a community and establishing a sense of place attachment and identity for residents from the outset of the development.

To determine the prevalence of public art in these developments an audit of 16 Master Planned Communities across Sydney was undertaken. Then in order to ascertain the extent to which a sense of place is being achieved through public art in master planned communities, an in depth case study of ‘The Ponds’ master planned community within the Blacktown Local Government Area in western Sydney, which has a strong focus on public art, has been investigated in detail to determine the presence of place identity and attachment through public art. Survey areas include residents that have moved in both prior to, and after, the artworks being installed.

This thesis therefore considers current residents’ early views of place and public art (primarily installed upfront) in their community. It is contended by this thesis that the success of public art should be measured by the degree to which it is accepted by the community. It is noted that this thesis is primarily an exploratory study due to a lack of established master planned communities containing public art and hence a sense of ‘place’ or ‘community’ and by extension, the perception and interpretation of public art, inevitably grows over time. However, the question is how this acceptance or ownership is achieved when there is no community in place.
RESEARCH STATEMENT

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the extent to which public art in new residential master planned communities create better communities. It explores the factors affecting these master planned estates such as new urbanism, place branding, the concepts of place attachment and community cultural development and discusses the effectiveness of public art in creating meaningful cultural identities within master planned estates. In an attempt to better understand the factors relating to the level of place attachment and cultural identity through public art, a number of indicators are identified as an appropriate method to measure the extent to which place attachment and cultural identity are achieved in these estates.

Whilst public art within master planned estates seeks to promote and create communities, it is questionable as to whether or not these estates strengthen the sense of place attachment and cultural identity experienced by residents. Moreover, public art can come at a significant cost, yet there has been little research in regards to its effectiveness in creating better communities and stronger cultural identities.

This thesis will therefore attempt to answer the following research questions:

- To what extent is public art being implemented in new residential master planned estates in Sydney?
- Does public art contribute to residents’ sense of place attachment and cultural identity within new master planned estates on Sydney’s urban fringe?
- Public art for which public, if no community is involved? Are current implementation practices for public art an effective means to create a sense of place in new residential master planned estates?
- Are higher levels of place attachment and cultural identity experienced in master planned estates with a strong focus on public art as opposed to master planned communities with less of a focus on public art?
RELEVANCE TO PLANNING
Planning is a broad field. The improvement of the public domain, shaping the urban form (for example, addressing the creep of suburbia), and creating socially, economically and environmentally sustainable communities through a combination of design, policy, implementation and regulation all fall within the domain of ‘(town) planning’. The relevance of public art to planning is immense. Firstly, themes of creating places for people of more human essence are common to both art, being a creative production of meaning for people, and the driving aim of planning, being the creation of community. The formation of community is a driving aim of both master planned communities and participatory public art, or ‘community art’ in the context of community cultural development in established areas where residents are highly involved in the design and/or making of the art. Secondly, improving the quality of the public domain, which ultimately comes down to how well it relates to its users, is applicable to both planners or urban designers, and artists with the rise of public art.

SCOPE OF THESIS AND LIMITATIONS
Further to the research agenda and context outlined above, it is necessary to set definitional boundaries to limit the scope of this thesis as the notions of public, art, public art and master planned communities are wide reaching and probably the subject of theses in themselves. ‘Public art’ shall be limited to legal, object based, permanent pieces (that include design embellishments created by architects or integrated into landscape design without artist input as these may be easily interpreted as the work of artists especially in the absence of any signage) installed in master planned communities in places accessible to the public, which may include shopping centres, community facilities, parks and roads.
STRUCTURE

This introductory chapter of this thesis provides detail in regard to the research agenda, context, and objectives. This preliminary component to the thesis provides direction to the overall study, establishing the structure and content of the research paper. The diagram below details the logical structure of this thesis.

**Chapter 1: Introduction**

Chapter 1 has been used to introduce the research agenda and context, outline the research objectives and give an overview of the thesis structure.

The purpose of **Chapter 2** is to provide a detailed discussion of literature and theoretical concepts behind the different concepts of this thesis. In particular this chapter explains the relationship between master planned estates and public art, communities, the ideas of place attachment and cultural identity and how it can be used to measure presence of community in an area.

**Chapter 3** outlines the research design process, methods of selection and data selection. It also justifies the rationale behind the case study and interviewee selection and the ethical and political considerations.

In **Chapter 4**, the results of the public art audit of master planned communities in Sydney and resident surveys of both case studies are outlined and analysed.

During **Chapter 5**, the results of both the case studies and the interviews are discussed in relation to the research objectives.

**Chapter 6** summarises the thesis and findings, makes recommendations, outlines limitations of the thesis and identifies opportunities for further research.

*Figure 1.1: Thesis Structure (Source: Author)*
CHAPTER
Two

Introduction
What is public art?
Place Attachment & Identity
Master Planning Community
The New Urbanism
Chapter summary
Introduction

The purpose of this critical literature review is to provide the theoretical framework and concepts underpinning this thesis.

Firstly it will be necessary to explain what public art is and understand the notions of public and art. After considering the varying types and roles of public art, then the notion of master planning communities will be explored along with the concepts of creating a sense of attachment to place and by extension cultural identity within master planned communities. Finally the synergy between public art and master planned communities will be identified, which will be further explored as a part of a Sydney wide audit and in depth case study analysis where resident interview surveys on themes of overall place satisfaction and awareness of public art will be undertaken to inform the study.

What is public art?

Guppy (as cited in Landcom 2008) explains that “art is an expression of the creative spirit, of our endless capacity to see the world with wit and imagination, to be innovative with materials and technologies, and to provide an engaging commentary on the times and places in which we live”. A dictionary definition of art includes:

“the quality, production, expression, or realm, according to aesthetic principles, of what is beautiful, appealing, or of more than ordinary significance; Human effort to imitate, supplement, alter, or counteract the work of nature” (Dictionary.com 2009).

“An easy differentiation of art and everyday life is no longer viable when advertising derives its vocabulary from art, when consumer desirables are designed like sculpture, when sculpture resembles freezing cabinets, and vacuum cleaners are exhibited in art galleries. The boundaries are dissolved in an all encompassing visual culture, in which the level of sophistication is often higher in advertising than in art, as is the level of financial support. Appearance, however, can be deceptive, and the fusion of categories does not mean a democratisation of art’s meta consciousness, a spreading of its aura into the streets” (Miles, 2004, 441). This ambiguous nature makes art difficult to define and distinguish for people, particularly when the art is placed in the public realm outside the context of a gallery. Similarly, the term ‘public’, is broadly defined as “of, pertaining to, or affecting a population
or a community as a whole; maintained at the public expense and under public control; universal; a particular group of people with a common interest, aim, etc” (Dictionary.com 2009).

The notion of “public” art is open to interpretation. “Public art is not simply art placed outside. Many would argue that traditional gallery spaces are public in their openness to interested viewers, while, conversely, others would insist that the privatisation of public space has meant that art placed in public space is not necessarily for all. Thus, public art is art which has as its goal a desire to engage with its audiences and to create spaces—whether material, virtual or imagined—within which people can identify themselves, perhaps by creating a renewed reflection on community, on the uses of public spaces or on our behaviour within them” (Sharp et al., 2005). This blurring of the public and private domains is dynamic and there is an ongoing need to re-examine this (Crane 2001).

Therefore, public art is more than simply sculpture in the open air as once contended (Selwood 1995). It has shifted over time to include “creative work that is part of the public experience of built and natural environments. It can include sculpture, environmental art, the integration of art and architectural design, and more temporary or ephemeral works such as installations, lighting works, new media and outdoor performance” (Landcom 2008: 6). This broad scope of public art has provided many opportunities for its implementation but has also posed an issue in terms of understanding its impact.

Whilst art can simply be considered as the creative work of people generally, typically public art is defined by arts advocates through the involvement of a professional artist. “Public artworks may involve the community in various stages of consultation however a community art project is when non-artist members of the community actively participate in the making of the work” (Artsource 2009). However, “ideally, a trained artist and/or community arts worker facilitates community arts projects” (Artsource 2009).

However, according to Belfiore and Bennett (2006: 17), “the question ‘Is it a work of art? – asked in anger or indignation or mere puzzlement – can now receive only the answer ‘Yes, if
you think it is; no, if not’. Young (1997, 57 as cited in Belfiore and Bennett 2006: 18) similarly points out that, “the acceptance of something as an artwork by an artworld does not force everyone to accept the thing as a work of art”. Therefore, the work of non-artists may also be equally considered ‘art’.

Both art and the public involved can take many different forms in public art in master planned communities. Today, “the general public is now recognised as increasingly diverse and composed of special interest groups whose commitment to self-determination frequently overshadows their sense of participation in the broader fabric of society” (Senie and Webster 1992: xv).

“Definitions of the public sphere in the literature of public art advocacy, as in most briefs for commission, tended to be defined as a physical, geographical space - a work’s integration with its site consisted of making visual references to it, or perhaps incorporating some kind of local history. Seldom was there a sense that a public sphere was historically a space of multiple meanings and voices” (Miles, 2004, 190).

**Place Attachment and Place Identity**

In essence people make a place into a community. The level of place attachment and cultural identity one feels in their local community are key indicators of a sense of community. This is because the more one feels (and other like them feel) attached to the place in which they live and identify with it, the greater the opportunity for a sense of community to develop. Therefore it is crucial that the places being created by master planned communities meet the social, environmental, economic and cultural needs of people. For the purpose of this thesis, the intrinsic connection between people and place through public art will be explored. In this regard, it is important that public art in master planned communities is readily identified with and appreciated, if not understood or interpreted in some way that is meaningful, by the residents of a community.

Pretty et al. (2003) in assessing the sense of place one feels looked at dimensions of place attachment, sense of community and place dependence as indicators of place identity
Bourdieu (1968 as cited in Merli 2002: 116) argues that “the arts exist only for those who are able to decipher them: the recapturing of the work’s objective meaning ... is completely adequate and immediately effected in the case—and only in the case—where the culture that the originator puts into the work is identical with the culture or, more accurately, the artistic competence which the beholder brings to the deciphering of the work. ... Whenever these specific conditions are not fulfilled, misunderstanding is inevitable: the illusion of immediate comprehension leads to an illusory comprehension based on a mistaken code”.

“As the work of art only exists for those who can decipher it, the satisfactions attached to this perception ... are only accessible to those who are disposed to appropriate them because they attribute a value to them, it being understood that they can do this only if they have the means to appropriate them. Consequently, the need to appropriate ... cultural goods ... can appear only in those who can satisfy it, and can be satisfied as soon as it appears. It follows on the one hand that, unlike ‘primary’ needs, the “cultural” need as a cultivated need increases in proportion as it is satisfied, because each new appropriation tends to strengthen the mastery of the instruments of appropriation and ... consequently, the satisfactions attached to a new appropriation; on the other hand, it also follows that the awareness of deprivation decreases in proportion as the deprivation increases” (Bourdieu, 1968; 1993, p. 227 as cited in Merli 2002: 116).

In achieving a sense of place attachment and identity with place (as key dimensions of a sense of community) one can turn to the five dimensions of social cohesion (belonging; inclusion; participation; recognition; legitimacy) identified by Jenson (1998). Matarasso (1997) adds “it is in the act of creativity that empowerment lies, and through sharing creativity that understanding [is] promoted”.

The degree to which one feels an attachment to place and identity with place through public art can be measured by levels of belonging, inclusion, participation, recognition and legitimacy.
The dimension of belonging refers to shared values, attitudes and sense of identity between members of a community (Marshall 2006) and as such, the degree to which public art evokes this sense of belonging can be a significant contributor to its acceptance by the community. Inclusion, which refers to a capacity to be a part of the labour force (Marshall 2006), coincides with the notion that local artists should be engaged for public artworks as a means of increasing economic activity (Landcom 2008). The level of participation, or community involvement, in the design and making of public art can directly impact on the level of attachment one feels to the place in which they live.

In this regard, Landcom have adopted the following Public Art principles (Landcom Guidelines, 2008):

“1. Art that contributes to cultural identity and creates a distinctive sense of place.
2. Creative projects that help to build stronger, more connected communities.
3. Art that can be enjoyed, and experienced by people of different ages and cultural backgrounds.
4. Art that responds to themes of people and place – both past and present.
5. Art that relates well to the built and natural environment.
6. Art that exemplifies artistic excellence and integrity.
7. Art that responds to the challenge of climate change through sustainable design and fabrication.
8. Art that is appropriate and safe in public contexts and is easily maintained.”

“The degree to which the arts contribute to our social, economic and environmental well-being will have more to do with whether or not the production and/or display of art engage people emotionally and intellectually. A valued arts experience is a very subjective thing. People do not value arts experiences that leave them emotionally or intellectually unmoved, no matter how vigorously we [arts advocates] present reasons why it should. In addition to the capacity of an art work to engage its audiences, the way we go about managing arts resources and facilitating public engagement in the creative arts, is of fundamental importance in generating social, educational or economic benefits. This presents a challenge for any arts practitioner or arts organisation wanting public support for their work, to have a
fairly good idea of who they are wanting to engage, why this is important and how they will apply their resources to respond to these needs” (Williams 2001: 1).

“To date it has proved extremely difficult to get arts funding bodies to place community art in a broader paradigm — community culture. This is not surprising considering the difficulties in defining the term ‘culture’, or the implications for government arts bodies in broadening their fine arts policy paradigm to encompass art in community culture” (Williams 1997: 1).

“Collaborative artistic practice at community level is a potent forum for communication of ideas and values. In the quest for seeking new ways forward the arts can draw on the intuitive, the non-rational, the mythical and the symbolic, and can be a powerful tool for cutting through existing patterns of thought and behaviors” (Williams 1997: 2).

Of course establishing an appropriate level of community involvement is crucial as types of participation can vary from non participation, to degrees of tokenism to degrees of citizen power. The strategy suggested by Matarasso (1996) in evaluating the social impacts of the arts ultimately comes down to the implementation of the highest possible degree of community involvement, leading to community empowerment and ultimately independent and autonomous activity.

“The value of community art is in its expression of community culture, as part of the culture of wider society. In this arena community art becomes a part of the process of community cultural development ... these activities are an essential addition to, and antidote for, the passive relationship with homogenous popular culture emanating from the commercial media. It is an essential and powerful way in which people build and rebuild community, release creative energy and transform minds, organisations, institutions and society” (Williams 1997: 2).

“The degree to which the arts contribute to our social, economic and environmental well-being will have more to do with whether or not the production and/or display of art engages people emotionally and intellectually. A valued arts experience is a very subjective
thing. People do not value arts experiences that leave them emotionally or intellectually unmoved, no matter how vigorously we present reasons why it should” (Williams 2001:1). “How we estimate the value of the arts in the 21st century will include its capacity to generate social capital. We will be familiar with how social capital describes the processes between people that establish the networks, norms, social trust and facilitates co-ordination and co-operation for mutual benefit” (Williams 2001: 5).

Art has long been involved in the shaping of the urban form. Since the classical renaissance periods through to the city beautiful movement, architecture and the public domain were commonly “enriched and complemented by the addition of painted and sculpted decoration” (Senie and Webster 1992: xiii). However, with the onset of modernism pervading architecture and the urban form, the opportunity for public art as decoration was somewhat limited (Senie and Webster 1992). As a result, the role of public art has undergone significant transformation and has taken on an array of different forms and functions. Today, within the context of master planned communities, the notions of both ‘public’ and ‘art’ have been redefined.

Public art and master planned communities share a dynamic synergy “in which each contextualises and interrogates the other and where artists can contribute to a new urbanism of connectedness” (Miles 1997: 188). But how is this occurring?

Community engagement is the key to this successful interaction of art and place and people (Matarasso 1997). Matarasso (1997) noted that it is in the act of creativity that empowerment lies, and through sharing creativity that understanding is promoted.

How best to communicate and establish dialogue with this complex public remains the single greatest challenge facing public art today” (Senie and Webster 1992: xv). In his address to the National Local Government Community Development Conference, ‘Just & Vibrant Communities’, Hawkes (2003) underscores the importance of understanding and promoting the creative processes of culture, or the “social production of meaning”, such as public art, in developing social capital and community capacity building. Further culture,
Hawke (2003) contends, as the mechanism that drives the way we behave, should be promoted as a key consideration in the planning and urban development process.

“Not least, because it is through cultural action:
- that we make sense of our existence and the environment we inhabit;
- that we find common expressions of our values and needs, and
- that we meet the challenges presented by our continuing stewardship of the planet” (Hawke, 2003, 3).

In order to fully embrace the importance of culture, Hawke argues that the “three pillars” of sustainability need reworking to clarify each purpose outside the dominant economic viewpoint and the addition of the fourth pillar of culture. Similarly, Bridge (2006) puts forward the notion of cultural capital drawing on the work of Bourdieu as an asset that requires greater value attached to it.

**Master planning community**

The utopic quest for community through master planned estates is not a recent phenomenon, with the master planned community (MPC) just “the latest manifestation of utopian place making deriving from the Garden City movement of the late 19th century. The MPC is underpinned by utopian expectations that the form of development can produce a better way of life, with particular notions of social status, civility and communalism the social objectives” (Gwyther, 2005). Similarly, the notion of public art used to enhance public space is not a new one, although it has recently returned in vogue in the planning and urban development sphere (Hamilton, 2001). However, the players involved in the production and consumption of MPCs and the associated use of public art in these estates, are driven by the pervading neo-liberal, economic values prevalent today (Edwards, 2002), which potentially subvert, but do not necessarily hinder, the social agenda of creating a sense of community (Gwyther, 2005). This has resulted in “the contemporary practice of ‘branding’ new residential areas” (Guppy 2006: 1), through the use of elevated standards of amenities and external appearances evoking a sense of exclusivity.
The construct of a master planned community entails a top down approach in which the developer’s vision is detailed from the outset and implemented as a completed product for the consumer (Giddings and Hopwood 2006). In order to produce a product for the consumer that is palatable it is necessary to understand who it is being planned for.

There has been a considerable critical commentary on the undesirability of master planned estates should they increase in number due to perceived exclusionary and unequal socio-spatial outcomes being created by such development (Atkinson and Flint 2004; Kenna 2007). Penrose (1993 as cited in Kenna 2007) pointed out that while place attachment and place identity might have beneficial outcomes, over emphasis on these dimensions could also lead to negative outcomes such as social exclusion and socio-spatial disparity.

Troy (2000) is critical of this exclusive sense of community engendered as an end result of master planned communities, as it is to the detriment of overall social cohesion and the build up of bridging social capital. Ultimately, in this quest for security, the loss of bridging social capital results in less understanding and trust, which are critical ingredients to a sense of security. Blandy and Lister (2005) in looking at the social and cultural impact of gated communities within existing residential areas in the UK also report this adverse impact on social capital.

Walters (2007) recognises that community means different things to different people and as such, developing a sense of community from the ground up a highly contextualised, local affair. As Hall and Porterfield explain these concentrated microcosms, or communities, “thrive because they have a reason for being. This reason for being is not something that has been erroneously contrived but rather is a response to some external force or desire from the people who live there... the character and identity for which they are well known have developed as a direct response to their citizens’ needs for order and sense of place” (Hall and Porterfield, 2001, 5).

Given the benefits of community capacity building, clearly has an important role in the recognition of the value of culture and the facilitation of active participation in the arts, which provides the mechanisms for community empowerment and development of cultural identity and social capital.
Further, as illustrated by Putnam (2001) in the American context, the effects of urban sprawl, technological and generational change have conspired to erode social cohesiveness and community involvement. New master planned estates on the urban fringe therefore face the challenge of providing a community, or at least a strong sense of it, in a higher density form of living in a traditionally low density setting on the urban fringe (Webster, 2004).

A crucial component to the creation of a sense of community is based on the notion of social capital. Putnam, a leading sociologist states “social capital refers to connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them” (Putnam, 2001, 19). Crane states “a viable community is not necessarily an inclusive one which values diversity, but one where people "actively gossip about each other", know one another and spend their time on front steps watching passers by” (2001, 13).

Mills and Brown (2004) in exploring the idea of art and wellbeing take the concept of social capital one step further when they describe bonding and bridging capital, which distinguishes those connections between individuals within a highly cohesive community and those broader connections between the groups themselves.

**The new urbanism**

Modern master planning in the Australian context has become the “tool of property led urban regeneration” (Giddings and Hopwood 2006: 344). A master plan is a planning mechanism controlling an entire project site, underpinned by a particular vision for the completed development (Gwyther 2005) and a “large scale, private sector driven, integrated housing development” (Minnery and Bajracharya, 1999, 33). This vision entails the process of “value adding” referred to by Gwyther (2005) in terms of capital expenditure on physical and social infrastructure that distinguishes the master planned community from the regular suburb.

In spite of the potential social disparities in Western Sydney caused by the rapid expansion of the urban form in the 1960s (Guppy 2006), the philosophy of the new urbanist movement
has also created opportunities to remedy these potential social disparities brought about by urban consolidation whilst also encouraging a higher density residential environment. Like the principles of urban consolidation, the new urbanism movement, commonly attributed to Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater – Zyberk, encourages higher density living and at the same time promotes close-knit communities and sustainable development (Brown and Cropper 2002).

Grant explains, “New Urbanism calls for an urban/urbane environment with an animated and attractive public realm. It advocates connected and pedestrian-friendly streets that encourage natural surveillance (eyes on the street) and a variety of transportation options as alternatives to the car. New Urbanist designs incorporate a mix of uses, housing, and people and reflect a desire to embrace and accommodate age, income, and ethnic diversity. They provide attractive civic amenities and high design standards in a compact form. Many New Urbanist projects adopt traditional design approaches, but in cities like Vancouver (British Columbia), they have used modernist architecture (Grant 2007: 485).” Grant further adds that “New urbanism in many ways facilitates suburban development by making growth more attractive” (Grant 2006: 6), which Ford (in Crane 2001) criticises as a preoccupation with appearances and a lack of substance.

Conclusion

This critical literature review has provided a discourse over a range of issues contained within the general topic area of the role of public art and how it interacts with master planned communities in creating a sense of community with a view to identifying common themes or raising questions unanswered. The rise of new urbanism has seen an opportunity for the increasing use of public art as urban developers and planning practitioners attempt to create communities from the ground up that have a closer connection with place. The melding of the private and public domains is a theme that undoubtedly shaped the evolution of master planned communities and the role of public art. A tension has been revealed between master planned communities which emphasises the presentation and
marketing of a product on one hand and the creation of a sense of community on the other. The use of public art in this context necessarily entails an appreciation of this.

The issue of cultural identity in the role of public art in new residential developments has highlighted that whilst public art can play an important role in creating a sense of place prior to the establishment of the community, it is important to involve the community through public participation to ensure public art is relevant to the cultural identity of the community. The next chapter shall provide a detailed methodology and research strategy to address the central question of this thesis: to what extent does public art create better communities?
CHAPTER Three
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Ethical and political considerations
“The art of evaluation lies in ensuring that the measurable does not drive out the immeasurable”

The Audit Commission as cited in Matarasso (1996).

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I outline the methodology utilised for this thesis. Given the lack of empirical data on public art in master planned communities in Sydney as demonstrated in the previous chapter, it was considered necessary to conduct a broad scale audit of public art in master planned communities throughout Sydney to provide an empirical basis to the study focus. In order to build on this theoretical and empirical framework and provide information upon which the outcomes and recommendations of this thesis are to be based, two case studies were selected for comparative analysis specifically focusing on the formation of place attachment and cultural identity in new master planned estates through public art.

This thesis adopts traditional qualitative and quantitative research methods based primarily on extensive literature reviews from text sources including books, journals, reports and policies, a public art inventory analysis of 16 Master Planned Communities and a comparative analysis of two adjoining master planned communities within the same LGA, one with a more evident focus on public art and the other with a lesser focus, being The Ponds and Stanhope Gardens, respectively. Information for the comparative analysis was collected through a combination of self-administered questionnaires and interview surveys with residents, in-depth formal interviews with a Landcom Development Manager, Landcom’s Public Art Coordinator, and Artists Susan Milne and Greg Stonehouse, and informal discussions with relevant Council staff and attendees of the Arts and Ecologies Forum I attended held at the Australia Council of the Arts on 30 September 2009. It should be noted that I also drew from an interview conducted last year for previous assignment purposes with Blacktown Council’s Cultural Planning Coordinator and personal experience dealing with the approval of public art.

Figure 3.1 provides a step by step summary of the research approach taken by this thesis.
RESEARCH STAGES

- **Research Design**
  - Compile initial literature review
  - Conduct Audit/Select Case Studies
  - Design questionnaire/interview
  - Complete Literature Review
  - Gain Ethics Approval

- **Trial and Refine**
  - Revise questionnaires & interviews
  - Test surveys/contact participants
  - Conduct surveys/interviews

- **Analysis and Interpretation**
  - Quantitative/Qualitative
  - Analysis by suburb
  - Comparison of results and discussion

- **Recommendations**
  - Report findings
  - Develop recommendations

**Figure 3.1 (Source: Author)**

**AUDIT SELECTION PROCESS**

Master planned estates were selected following a desktop review of the Metropolitan Development Program land supply regions and the website of the NSW State Government’s Urban Development Corporation Landcom, and its various joint venture partners such as Mirvac, Stockland and Delfin Lend Lease, given it is Landcom and their joint partners that are involved in the majority of ‘Greenfield’ and ‘Brownfield’ master planned residential development across Sydney (Dowling & McGuirk 2009). Given the lack of any database identifying the presence, not even so much as the location, of works of public art within MPCs, the audited sites had to be systematically surveyed. Initially, after studying the latest Street
Directory information and available marketing material and plans, I drove through each street and each entry point to the estate and identified open space areas, footpath/cycleway networks and items of interest such as local heritage, and then walked through the identified sites. It was within these areas of the public domain that I had deduced from the literature review and personal observations were most likely to contain items of public art either integrated within landscape design, building facades, infrastructure, such as roads, path paving, street furniture, playgrounds and lighting or stand alone sculptures.

CASE STUDY SELECTION PROCESS

A significant proportion of master planned estates are developed on Greenfield sites (Gwyther, 2005), hence it was considered appropriate to focus the in depth case study and resident interview surveys on such a site. More specifically this research looks at public art within master planned communities from the perspective of the state of New South Wales, and in particular on the western fringe of Sydney.

Following the results of the desktop review and audit of 16 master planned communities in Sydney, a case study was chosen for in-depth analysis for the purpose of this thesis and the central question being the extent to which public art creates better communities. Accordingly, it is considered that to gain a good indication of the impact of public art as implemented in master planned communities in Sydney, it is appropriate to focus on the adjoining master planned community of The Ponds within the Local Government Area of Blacktown. Given that this is an examination of public art, it is important to note that the case study actually overlaps onto adjoining areas of Stanhope Gardens and Kellyville Ridge, by virtue of the location of public artworks as entry statements. Here one can observe the impact of public art on residents within the same LGA and similar contexts that have moved in before and after the installation of the artworks respectively. The rationale behind the case study selection is further explained in Chapter 5.
RESIDENT SURVEY

Quantitative research relies on measurements and amounts to produce numerical measurements of indicators to describe the traits of the sample group and to explain and support hypotheses (Babbie 2007). In specific reference to this thesis, the purpose of conducting the survey of residents within the two different release areas was to gather insights with respect to whether public art in master planned communities actually create a sense of place attachment and cultural identity.

The primary method of data collection used for analysis in this thesis involved conducting an interview survey, via a questionnaire, of residents living within the two case study areas. Microsoft Excel was used to collate the data for further analysis using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Respondents for the survey were selected based on proximity to the major entry artworks in The Ponds in an attempt to ensure respondents were aware of public art in the area given it was resident understanding of art that I am seeking to examine. A map showing the survey sample areas with location of artworks and response rates is contained in Chapter 5. A total of 50 completed surveys were targeted.

It was considered that 50 surveys while not truly representative, would allow a fair indication of resident opinion. If time had allowed, follow up door knocking of those not present at the time would have likely increased the response rate as the majority of “non-responses” indicated in the above response rate were not refusals but simply no-one answering the door. The response rates obtained are revealed in Chapter 5. A reliable response rate is generally above 50% but as Babbie (2007) notes, interview surveys generally enjoy higher completion and response rates than other types of surveys.

Further, although time did not allow, it is noted that questionnaires can limit the scope and breadth of information obtained and ideally should be followed up with some form of qualitative research such as focus group or interview to confirm the survey data (Babbie 2007).
However, in addition to the open ended questions included in the questionnaire, I did manage to converse informally with a couple of residents to gain a better anecdotal understanding.

**QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN**

The premise behind this thesis is that public art is being implemented in master planned communities to create better communities through the creation of place identity and a closer connection or attachment between people and the place in which they live. Therefore, the resident survey attempts to identify which public artworks are the most well known and identified with and how, and which ones are the most liked and disliked and why.

Residents are asked their age, gender, form of housing tenure, occupation, how long they have been living in the area, which area they came from, main reasons for choosing to live in the area and to rate on a scale from 1 to 5 their overall level of satisfaction of living in the area and to what extent public art attracted them to live in the area. Awareness will be tested by asking whether they know of any public artwork in their local area, when they found out about the artwork and how, and if they can correctly nominate its location. Resident understanding will be tested by asking residents ‘what does the artwork mean to you?’, ‘what do you think the artist was trying to represent?’, and to rate overall how well they think public art in their local area relates to their community on a scale from 1 to 5.

**Figure 3.2: Rationale of issues raised in questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background information</td>
<td>To identify the representativeness of the sample selected. Background information such as why they chose to move to these areas to determine if it was for a desirable lifestyle or due to economic and land shortage pressures. Further information such as how long they have lived here was used to determine if sense of community was related to length of time that they have lived in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Public Art</td>
<td>To ascertain what respondents considered to be public art, whether they knew of any and understand what it means to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place attachment</td>
<td>To determine if respondents felt that a sense of attachment to place as an indicator of sense of community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Involvement

To gain an insight into the extent of community involvement respondents thought there should be for public art as an indicator of place attachment and identity.

The design and content of the questionnaire was developed to address the issues raised in the Literature Review within Chapter 2 and to obtain new information/data to address the Research Objectives outlined within Chapter 1. Figure 3.2 provides a summary of the issues addressed within the questionnaire and rationale for their selection. Results are discussed in Chapter 5. A copy of the complete questionnaire and Project Information Statement is included within Appendix A.

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

In order to ascertain a greater understanding of the topic, in-depth interviews were conducted with 3 professionals involved with ‘The Ponds’ development specifically being a Landcom Development Manager (who requested to remain unidentified by name), Landcom’s Public Art Coordinator, Marla Guppy, and Artists Susan Milne and Greg Stonehouse. It is also noted that I have previously interviewed Blacktown Council’s Cultural Planning Co-ordinator for previous assignment purposes on the topic of the role of public art in master planned communities.

Figure 3.3: Rationale of issues raised in interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining public art</td>
<td>To understand the nature of public art and how it is interpreted/received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of public art</td>
<td>To ascertain why public art is being applied in master planned communities and in what ways it creates a sense of place attachment and cultural identity in master planned communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Implementing public art      | To establish how public art is implemented in master planned communities and whether these methods are effective/conducive to the creation of better communities.  
To uncover any difficulties/challenges in the implementation process particularly between the different professionals involved and local stakeholders including residents and local Councils. 
To identify possible gaps/things that could be done better. |
| Evaluating the impacts of public art | To determine whether public art achieves its objectives in master planned communities.                                    |
ETHICAL AND POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Babbie (2001) eludes that all social research projects are likely to be influenced by political considerations and need to consider any ethical implications. Given the above, it is necessary to understand the Political and Ethical implications that this research may have had. So as to ensure that such considerations were taken into account, the following measures were incorporated into the research methodology to address and protect these concerns:

- A formal Project Information Statement outlining the details of the project and relevant contact details was provided to each respondent.
- No details were recorded regarding the respondent’s names and addresses.
- Approval from the Human Research Ethics Advisory Panel (Approval No. 95052) was obtained 17 August 2009.

Further to the research methodology discussed above, the following chapters will present the results of the various aspects of the research undertaken, with Chapter 4 presenting the inventory analysis of 16 master planned communities across Sydney and Chapter 5 presenting the case study of The Ponds along with professional interviews and resident survey results.
CHAPTER Four
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Conclusion
Introduction

The previous two chapters provided through a critical literature review the definitional and theoretical framework underpinning this thesis, and then an outline of the research methodologies driving this thesis. In this chapter I provide an overview of the growing emergence of public art in Sydney’s Master Planned Communities (MPCs) through a detailed audit of a number of various developments throughout Sydney to determine the prevalence and types of public art in these developments. The driving factors behind the implementation of public art are also outlined to form the basis of further discussion in Chapter 6.

The purpose of the audit is to provide a broader empirical background to inform the study given the lack of literature specifically relating to the presence of public art in MPCs. In so doing, this chapter in turn provides the necessary context for the following chapter, and indeed informs the selection of the in-depth case study analysis of The Ponds. The main question unifying this discussion remains: to what extent does public art facilitate the creation of better communities?

SYDNEY AUDIT OF PUBLIC ART IN MASTER PLANNED COMMUNITIES

An audit of public art in 16 MPCs across Sydney was conducted on 1-2 August 2009, 5-6 September 2009 and 20 September 2009 of the following sites:

- Ayre – Spring Farm, Elderslie – Camden Acres/The Ridges, Bridgewater, Glenmore Park, Harrington Park, Macarthur Gardens and Park Central; and

A copy of the audit for Newbury, The Ponds and Ropes Crossing can be found at Appendix B.

Results

As discussed further below (see figure 4.7), public art was taken to include architectural design embellishments. The audit of 16 MPCs, which yielded a total of 75 identified pieces
of public art, was limited in scope due to time constraints and as such, it is by no means an exhaustive list of either MPCs in Sydney or examples of public art contained therein. However, it is considered that the number of MPCs surveyed provide a representative overview of this phenomenon within a variety of contexts to enable some robust conclusions to be drawn as to some of the factors driving the implementation of public art in MPCs and the resultant typologies and forms of public art being implemented. Figure 4.1 below highlights the master planned communities that contain public art and those that do not.

![Figure 4.1: Map of Master Planned Communities studied highlighting MPCs with and without public art (Source: Map from Metropolitan Development Program (DOP), 2009; adapted by author).](image-url)
Chapter 4: The State of Art in Sydney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Public Art Policy</th>
<th>MPC with public art</th>
<th>MPC without public art</th>
<th>No. of artworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Ponds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanhope Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ropes Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hills Shire</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The New Rouse Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith City Council</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Glenmore Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holroyd City Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lakewood – Pemulwey</td>
<td>Camden Acres – Elderslie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Ridges – Elderslie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ayre – Spring Farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harrington Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Council</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Park Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macarthur Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbelltown Council</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randwick Council</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prince Henry – Little Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sydney</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockdale Council</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Wolli Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.2: Master planned communities with public art.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Public Art Policy</th>
<th>MPC with public art</th>
<th>No. of artworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Ponds</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stanhope Gardens</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ropes Crossing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hills Shire</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The New Rouse Hill</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith City Council</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Glenmore Park</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holroyd City Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lakewood – Pemulwey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randwick Council</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prince Henry – Little Bay</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sydney</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockdale Council</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Wolli Creek</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.3: Number of artworks in each master planned community.**

As shown in Figure 4.1, from the 16 MPCs studied, the majority of MPCs containing public art were located in the North-West region of Sydney, with Newbury, The Ponds and Ropes Crossing being located in the Blacktown LGA and The New Rouse Hill being located in The Hills Shire. Brownfields developments Victoria Park and Prince Henry – Little Bay also contained a number of artworks. Of the 8 MPCs selected in the South Western region of Sydney, none contained any public art. Figure 4.2 above shows the master planned communities that do contain public art and those that do not sorted by LGA location and indicating whether a public art policy is in place.
The Master Planned Communities surveyed ranged in area, density, market value, LGA, stage of development amongst other distinguishing features, which enabled an identification of commonalities between the Master Planned Communities that may indicate underlying factors or contexts conducive to the implementation of public art. This apparent difference in the concentration of public art could be put down to the stage of development and when it was initiated, the size of development (and hence available budget), the developer(s) involved, and any policy in place (and the degree to which it is mandated) within a particular LGA.

Areas such as Victoria Park, Wolli Creek, Prince Henry and The New Rouse Hill contained higher densities and greater market values than MPCs in The Ponds, Stanhope Gardens, Ropes Crossing and Lakewood. Based on the number of artworks found, there would seem to be some correlation with the size of the development (for example Rouse Hill is a regional centre with a shopping centre) and the number of artworks found (as shown in figure 4.3).

The adoption of a public art policy by the Local Council seems to have some influence over whether the master planned community had any public art installed. It should be also noted that of the 9 MPCs containing public art, 6 have been developed by Landcom or in joint venture with Landcom (The Ponds, Stanhope Gardens, The New Rouse Hill, Prince Henry, Victoria Park and Wolli Creek). Only Glenmore Park is relatively established having been completed during the 1990s, with all other developments currently underway either in the first phases of completion (in terms of houses on the ground) as with The New Rouse Hill or towards the latter stages of completion as with Stanhope Gardens. While Blacktown Council does contain 3 master planned communities with art, it should be noted that the public art policy in place and associated maintenance budget (which is not yet in place) did not envisage public artworks of the scale and number as that found in The Ponds.

[Council does not] “have a specific budget for this. But what has happened in the public art inter directorate working group, ... we have managed to educate all the sections of Council about public art, how to go about it, and I’ve also managed to get other sections who are doing public art to talk to us and use the best practise” (Blacktown Council representative pers. Comm.. 2008).

“I think that what’s happening, and this is often true of master planned estates, we’re doing art with bigger budgets and a bigger scope than is happening elsewhere in Blacktown, and I think that council
has been put in a position of looking at how they are going to maintain a project bigger than what they could possibly do even in the city centre sometimes ... I also think that it’s that thing about policy that it’s not quite rolled out enough for development and the funding has not quite developed enough yet for Council to feel comfortable about it.” (Guppy pers. Comm. 2009).

**FACTORS INFLUENCING THE STATE OF ART IN SYDNEY**

Based on the above audit of public art in Sydney’s master planned communities, it is clear that certain types of public art have typically been implemented. Other factors such as policy in place, the rise of social sustainability, branding of estates and the international scene have also influenced the rise of public art in Sydney’s master planned communities. Generally, these factors are somewhat interrelated.

**Typologies of Public Art**

*Art Integrated in Design*

Art integrated in the design of landscape, environmental features, infrastructure such as roads, footpaths and stormwater systems, and furniture such as public seating was a common typology where form met function. The higher the degree of integration, the greater the opportunity for the implementation of public art. Figure 4.4 demonstrates two examples of the variety of forms found in Sydney’s master planned communities.

![Figure 4.4: Art integrated into landscape design in Rouse Hill (left) and park seating in The Ponds (right) (Source: Author 2009).](image-url)
Public Art as Entry Feature

The majority of the MPCs contained the traditional entry features associated with estate branding consisting of a low type retaining wall with landscaping and estate or neighbourhood title in prominent lettering, with the exception of The Ponds. However, the audit has revealed that the use of public art as a landmark and entry feature is commonplace throughout the majority of the estates observed as shown in Figure 4.5.

Figure 4.5: Art used as entry statement in The Ponds, Ropes Crossing & Stanhope Gardens (Source: Author 2009).

Small-scale intimate art

The other main form of public art encountered was that of the small scale intimate nature often found in local parks and pathways, as shown in Figure 4.6. Ropes Crossing has effectively utilised onsite materials such as old timber rail sleepers to create a subtle link to its industrial past through ‘Markers’ by Milne and Stonehouse shown below.

Figure 4.6: Examples of small-scale intimate art (Source: Author 2009).
Design embellishment or art?

Public art was taken to include the design embellishments created by architects and designers shown in figure 4.7 above. These were included on the basis that in the absence of any identifying signage these could be interpreted as a form of public art.

The rise of social sustainability

The increasing acceptance of responsibility on the part of developers for implementing socially sustainable outcomes and a sense of community in new master planned estates has seen a corresponding rise in the use of public art in master planned communities in Sydney. The NSW State Government’s land release developer Landcom has taken an important role
in adopting best practice approaches in achieving social sustainability and acting as an industry leader for others to follow. It is by no coincidence that of the Master Planned Communities observed the majority were being developed either solely or in joint venture by Landcom. With the recent inclusion of public art guidelines within Landcom’s own guidelines for development, it is clear that Landcom has taken on public art as an integral part of their approach in creating better communities that people can relate to and enjoy. Similarly, Delfin Lend Lease and Stockland are also the other key developers involved in the implementation of public art within master planned communities that have showed a commitment to social sustainability as a marketable commodity in their residential estates.

**Key Developers in the Art Scene**

The majority of Master Planned Communities in Sydney, especially those of a large scale, are being developed by the NSW State Government Land Developer, Landcom. Of the 8 MPCs containing public artwork of some form, Landcom is involved in the development of five estates. It is noted that while Landcom would have commenced planning for these estates prior to their adoption of public art guidelines as a part of the Landcom Guidelines, 2008, there was still sufficient scope to allow the implementation of public art. As revealed by Landcom’s Public Art Coordinator Marla Guppy:

“I’ve been on the project for about three years. It was early enough in the process - the master plan had been completed – but … [good quality] landscape architects will come in expecting that public art will be part of the scenario so they will be looking at that early [master planning] stage what the best opportunities might be for public art” (Guppy pers. Comm. 2009).

Public Art Principles (Landcom Guidelines, 2008):

“*Landcom supports and seeks to develop:*
1. Art that contributes to cultural identity and creates a distinctive sense of place.
2. Creative projects that help to build stronger, more connected communities.
3. Art that can be enjoyed, and experienced by people of different ages and cultural backgrounds.
4. Art that responds to themes of people and place – both past and present.
5. Art that relates well to the built and natural environment.
6. Art that exemplifies artistic excellence and integrity.
7. Art that responds to the challenge of climate change through sustainable design and fabrication.
8. Art that is appropriate and safe in public contexts and is easily maintained.”
Shown above are the 8 driving principles behind the implementation of public art in the Landcom Guidelines. It is evident that the degree to which the public art relates to the community is a key factor in achieving the main principles. However, there is no mention of how this will be assessed or considered. These principles will be considered in terms of the dimensions of place attachment and place identity in assessing to what extent public art creates better communities.

**The role of Local Government**

Policy support from the local government level is another factor that has influenced the rise of Developer initiated public art in Master Planned Communities. In some instances public art has been mandated by the local authority as a part of either Section 94 Contribution Plans or Developer Agreements and thus reflected in Development Consents, Development Control Plans or Public Art Policies. Councils such as City of Sydney, Marrickville and Parramatta have formulated policy and implemented funding mechanisms such as Section 94 or strategic asset management to implement public art (Guppy pers. Comm. 2009). However, this has not been the case in Blacktown Council, which contains a significant proportion of current and future master planned communities, where the public art has been very much developer led in master planned communities through Landcom and Delfin Lend Lease.

In the case of the majority of Master Planned Communities being developed by Landcom particularly on the western fringe of Sydney Local Government policy support has provided the necessary encouragement for developers to implement public art because ultimately Local Government will be expected to maintain these works. However, it is largely the self imposed objectives and aims of Developers that have driven public art implementation. Moreover, differing levels of capacity between Local Government budgets and skill sets compared with large scale land developers economies of scale has seen a potential limitation on the type and form of public art being implemented in master planned communities.
The evolution of branding Master Planned Estates

The branding of Master Planned Estates has seen an ever increasing reliance on visual presentation and creation of a sense of place in order to provide a product to meet the needs of the consumer. Public Art has been adopted as a method to fulfil both these aims, but it remains to be seen whether public art is being readily interpreted or accepted by residents.

The International context

Before delving into the state of art in Sydney’s master planned communities, although it is not the intent of this thesis to analyse public art in master planned communities internationally and across Australia, it is considered necessary to briefly look at some examples from a broader context.

In the US and the UK, there has been a history of public art being implemented as a part of new development generally mandated under ‘percent for art’ schemes. But the implementation of public art in master planned communities has been specifically driven by a desire to create a sense of place or a unique community identity to encourage consumers to buy into an estate.

The marketing for ‘Craig Ranch’, a 2000 acre master planned community in Collin County Texas states “throughout the property, Texas-inspired art and sculpture dot the landscape, from dramatic cascading waterfalls to the various western bronze statues encountered along the pathways and greenbelts. A sense of place, a purpose for everything, Craig Ranch is a community for all time” (Craig International 2009) [http://craigranchtexas.com/].

Similar to The Ponds in western Sydney, in ‘Briar Chapel’, Columbia the developer Newland Communities has also adorned the landscape with sculpture to add interest to the environment and create a point of difference for the estate compared to others as shown in the advertising banner below in Figure 4.8.
Conclusion

This chapter has provided an overview of the Sydney scene of public art in master planned communities and provided an insight into some of the explanatory factors behind this phenomenon. The following chapter will now look into resident perceptions of public art in The Ponds, in order to provide the basis for discussion and findings in Chapter 6.
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Chapter 5: Case Study of art on the fringe

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the in-depth case study analysis of The Ponds was to provide a close-up view of the emerging use of public art in master planned communities on the urban fringe of Sydney and attempt to gain an insight from the currently forming community itself as to the extent to which public art resonated with them. The results from this chapter along with previous chapters will allow an in-depth discussion of public art in master planned communities in Sydney in the following chapter.

Rationale

The rationale behind the case study selection is that in The Ponds one can observe the impact of public art on residents (within the same LGA and fairly close proximity and similar contexts) that have moved in before and after the installation of the artworks respectively. Whilst it would have been possible to conduct the research within different Council areas, it was considered appropriate to observe case studies within the same LGA and proximity to ensure transparency and consistency of planning controls and their application. Further, study of these sites within the Blacktown LGA context is warranted due to the significant proportion of future master planned Greenfield release areas to be developed within the North West Growth Centre, which is predominantly in the Blacktown LGA. Finally, the location was selected due to the amount of local knowledge the author has of the area. Overall, it is considered that the focus on public art in The Ponds and adjoining suburbs Kellyville Ridge and Stanhope Gardens has allowed a suitably detailed picture of the impact of public art on a currently forming community to be drawn, which could be used to draw some generalisations at least to future adjoining master planned Greenfield areas.

The primary case study, being The Ponds, is a master planned community located in the Blacktown LGA with a large focus on the provision of public art that has been installed prior to the residents moving in. “One hundred and thirty homes are now occupied and when complete, the 390 hectare master-planned community which is being developed by Landcom and Australand will comprise over 3,000 homes” (Landcom 2009). Marketing material has emphasised the provision of public art as an additional element distinguishing the place from other new communities. It is noted that the residents of The Ponds are more likely to have a greater awareness and understanding of public art than residents of
Kellyville Ridge and Stanhope Gardens despite not being there as long, due to the fact that Landcom has made public art a significant part of their marketing for the estate.

The secondary case studies, being the adjoining suburbs of Kellyville Ridge and Stanhope Gardens, represent residential subdivisions with a lesser focus on public art but with its pieces primarily provided after the residents have moved in. They also enjoy relatively equal proximity to the major entry artworks recently installed as a part of ‘The Ponds’ estate.

Figure 5.1: Map showing survey areas, public art locations & response rates (Source: Author; adapted Map from Mapit.com.au 2009)

Given that the entire ‘Ponds’ estate is still far from completion, it was considered appropriate to focus the resident survey on the first precinct (Survey Area 1 along The Ponds Boulevard) to be developed as it was likely that residents had lived there longer and become better established compared to other precincts in the ‘Ponds’ Estate (see Figure 5.1 Map of case study survey areas, public art locations and response rates). Survey areas 2 and
3 located on the boundary of The Ponds estate were subsequently selected due to their relative proximity to major entry artworks ‘Waterlines’ and ‘Float’, respectively. Figure 5.2 shows the visual presence of these 2 artworks at night.

![Figure 5.2: ‘Waterlines’ (left) and ‘Float’ (right) at night (Source: Author 2009).](image)

**INTERVIEW SURVEY RESULTS**

The main hypotheses being tested through the resident survey are: (1) that understanding and awareness of public art will decrease as resident involvement decreases; (2) increased understanding and awareness of public art increases satisfaction with living environment and the notion that “this is the right place for me”. Thus as resident understanding and awareness of public art in their local area diminishes so does their perception of identity and attachment with place.

50 completed survey results were obtained with a response rate of 39%. Response rates for survey areas 1 (The Ponds), 2 (Kellyville Ridge) and 3 (Stanhope Gardens) were 25 out of 56, 14 out of 40 and 11 out of 27 respectively. As noted previously in Chapter 3, while the
overall number and response rate is not truly representative, it is considered that the results allow some indicative findings to be made. Moreover, while quantitative survey data may provide a somewhat limited result and ideally these quantitative results should be supported and further tested by follow up focus groups or more in depth interviews with residents, it is considered, in light of time and word limit constraints, that these results do provide a suitable level of insight of resident perceptions. Overall demographics of those surveyed are summarised in Figure 5.3, while Figure 5.4 shows a breakdown by survey area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>Housing Tenure</th>
<th>No. of years at current location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/50</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30/50</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17/25</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellyville Ridge (Survey Area 2)</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age Bracket</td>
<td>Housing Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANHOPE GARDENS (SURVEY AREA 3)</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age Bracket</td>
<td>Housing Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.3: Overall demographics, housing tenure and number of years in current location (Source: Author 2009).**

**The Ponds (Survey Area 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>Housing Tenure</th>
<th>No. of years at current location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kellyville Ridge (Survey Area 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>Housing Tenure</th>
<th>No. of years at current location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stanhope Gardens (Survey Area 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>Housing Tenure</th>
<th>No. of years at current location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.4: Breakdown of Figure 5.3 by survey area (Source: Author 2009).**

As shown above (figures 5.3 and 5.4), overall in The Ponds and the immediately adjoining study areas, a total of 20 out of 50 males and 30 out of 50 females were surveyed. The vast majority of respondents are currently paying a mortgage (76%) and around half of the residents are 30-39 (48%) and have been living there for less than a year (50%), respectively.
The first hypothesis provided that residents of The Ponds were more likely to be aware of public art in the area despite not living there as long as residents of adjoining suburbs, due to the fact that residents of The Ponds were more likely to be exposed to marketing material at the time of purchase. The response categories for the dependent variable ‘aware of public art’ (Question 13: Do you know of any public art in your local area?) was recoded so that ‘don’t know’ responses and ‘no’ responses were combined in order to produce a meaningful result and because on reflection having a ‘don’t know’ response category was superfluous for question 13. Similarly, ‘Number of years living here’ was recoded from four categories to two in order to produce a viable chi-square with adequate expected cell.
counts. The results in figure 5.5 indicate that ‘whether residents know of any public art in their local area’ is dependent on which suburb they are from. Despite residents from The Ponds being more likely to have received marketing material about public art at the time of purchase of their property, 52% of residents did not know of any public art compared with 21.4% of residents in Kellyville Ridge and 36.4% of residents in Stanhope Gardens. However, given the number of media articles (e.g. ‘Float artwork at The Ponds’, Landcom Media release, 30/5/08; ‘Brolly art reigns supreme’, The Northern News, 3/6/08; ‘The unveiling of float’, Landcom media release, 9/7/08) it is considered that most the general public had equal access to this information. Figures 5.6 and 5.7 confirm that the length of time a resident had lived in the area was indeed predicted by which suburb they came from, with 80% of The Ponds residents living there for a year compared to 92.9% and 63.6% of resident from Kellyville Ridge and Stanhope Gardens respectively, living there for over a year. The chi-square of 20.104 with 2 degrees of freedom and statistical significance of 0.000 confirms that this result is very unlikely to have occurred by chance.

**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>20.104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>22.669</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>3.198</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.50.

**Figure 5.7: Chi-square test for cross tabulation at figure 5.6.**

**Awareness of public art (recoded) * No. of years living here Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of years living here</th>
<th>&lt;1 year</th>
<th>&gt;1 year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of public art (recoded)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within No. of years living here</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within No. of years living here</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within No. of years living here</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.8: Crosstabulation of resident awareness of public art with number of years living there.**
Figure 5.8 indicates a very slight relationship between awareness of public art and length of time living in the area as over twice as many people (over all survey areas) that had lived there for over a year were aware of public art, yet only a slight majority (52%) of people that had lived in the area for less than a year were not aware of public art. This was confirmed by the chi-square (figure 5.9) of 3.000 with 1 degree of freedom, as its statistical significance was just outside the minimum 0.05 confidence level. This does indicate that media and marketing exposure of public art may have played some role in this level of awareness so soon after moving in. It is noted that the survey deliberately did not make any specific reference to actual artworks in the local area but referred generally to ‘public art’ in order to gain an understanding of what residents perceive to be public art and not lead them items of public art if they did not believe it was art.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>3.036</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td></td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher’s Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>2.940</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.00.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Figure 5.9: Chi-square for figure 5.8 cross tabulation.**

The second hypothesis stated that increased understanding and awareness of public art increases satisfaction with living environment and the notion that “this is the right place for me”. Thus as resident understanding and awareness of public art in their local area diminishes so does their perception of identity and attachment with place.

A total of 52% of respondents did not have a favourite artwork, indicating that the artworks in the area did not resonate with just over half of residents. Further to this, in answer to the question ‘do you think any public artworks should be removed from the local area, while only 3 people answered ‘yes’, 40% or 20/50 were not sure, indicating that perhaps they did not have a sufficient awareness or understanding of the artworks in their local area to
nominate either way. Of the minority that did have a favourite artwork 14/50 or 28% nominated ‘float’ and 5/50 or 10% nominated ‘digital litter’, with 2/50 nominating ‘cows’ and 1 person each nominating Aboriginal Artwork. In terms of resident perceived understanding of public art in their local area, it is noted that 92% of respondents did not know what the artist was trying to represent in ‘float’ and 72% were unable to say why they liked ‘float’. Coded responses of the 4 residents who stated what they perceived to be the artist’s message included: “global warming” (2); “anti-drought” (1); and “solar renewable energy” (1). Coded responses of the 28% that liked ‘float’ included: looks nice (1); new and unusual (4); suits area and decorative vibe (1); encourages young artists (1); classy (1); sense of direction and landmark (3); presence at night (3).

Likewise, 92% of respondents were unable to say why they liked ‘digital litter’, and all but one respondent out of 50 did not could nominate what they thought the artist was trying to represent in ‘digital litter’ (the one respondent stated “climate change”).

“I use Zeros and Ones in many of my artworks... to represent the ‘leftovers’ of a message that was not received by the phone it was sent to. Just where do these beams of information go?” (Tatton, 2009).

The single resident response as to their understanding of the artist’s message was: “climate change”.

“With the awareness of climate change, the element of water has been transformed from an anticipated resource to a precious spring. As a colony of sculptures in the roundabout, their inverted form changes them from sunshade and rain shelter to light receptor and water collector” (Milne & Stonehouse, 2009).

Figure 5.10: ‘Digital Litter’ (left) and ‘Float’ (right) with artist’s interpretation of their artworks.
The above results indicate that the vast majority of residents surveyed were unable to gain an aesthetic or intrinsic appreciation of the artworks nor any meaning from the artwork. However, it is noted that perhaps a follow up focus groups or in depth interviews with willing participants may provide a greater insight into their understanding and awareness of public art.

**Figure 5.11: Pearson Correlation analysis of 2 dependent variables to 6 predictor variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Perceived Visual Quality Of Public Art</th>
<th>Perceived Success Of Public Art Relating to the Community</th>
<th>Rating the amount of art residents believe there should be</th>
<th>Rating the extent of Community Involvement residents believe there should be</th>
<th>Degree of certainty as to whether moved in due to public art</th>
<th>Degree of certainty as to whether public art makes this a better place to live</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success Of Art relating to the Community Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.636*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.587**</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.280*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Amount Of Art should be Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.587**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>-.363**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In order to test whether resident perception of sense of attachment and identity to place was dependent on an understanding or awareness of public art in the local area, perceived success of public art relating to the community and perceived amount of public art a resident thought there should be on an ordinal scale from 1 (lower) to 5 (higher) were tested against each other and 4 additional variables including ‘perceived quality of public art’, ‘extent of community involvement one believed there should be for public art’, ‘degree of certainty as to whether public art makes this a better place to live’, and ‘degree of certainty as to whether moved in due to public art’. The results indicate strong positive relationships between ‘perceived visual quality’ and ‘perceived success of public art relating to community’ (r = 0.636); visual quality and ‘perceived amount of art residents thought there should be’ (r = 0.384); and success and amount (r = 0.587). This means that the greater the perceived extent of success of public art relating to the community the higher
the perceived visual quality and amount of public art residents thought there should be. All results were statistically significant at greater than the 0.01 level. Similarly, the greater the degree of certainty as to whether public art makes this ‘a better place to live’ (noting that 1 = greater certainty and 3 = lesser certainty), the greater the amount ($r = -0.363$) and success ($r = -0.28$) of public art people perceived (1 = lesser to 5 = greater). Interestingly, there were very weak correlations between perceived amount of community involvement residents thought there should be for public art and perceived success and amount of public art. This suggests that residents do not want to have greater community involvement in the public art going in.

**Conclusion**

The survey results suggest that the degree to which public art relates to the community is an important predictor of the amount of public art people believe should be going in and of the perceived visual quality of public art. These findings are discussed in the following discussion chapter in relation to the findings of the Sydney wide audit, professional interviews, literature review and the initial research questions and objectives.
INTRODUCTION

This chapter will bring together the findings from the literature, Sydney wide audit of public art in master planned communities and interview surveys of residents in The Ponds to establish the extent to which public art creates better communities. The results from in depth interviews with professionals in the field will unify the discussion. This discussion will lead to the development of recommendations and conclusions with regard to the implementation of public art in master planned communities in the following chapter.

INDEPTH INTERVIEWS

In summary, the main themes I uncovered from the interviews with Marla Guppy and Artists Susan Milne and Greg Stonehouse:

- Public art is very diverse and can be found in a variety of contexts/settings.
- It is important to define art in terms of the artist's involvement;
- Drivers behind public art in a master planned community while obviously tying into the marketing of the estate not too dissimilar to those of Local Government i.e. defines local character/image of place; adds interest/excitement; picks up on local cultural themes; offers employment to artists;
- The artist's place at the design table is relatively limited i.e. sites/locations heavily influenced by urban/landscape design/engineering; this limited role can lead to design issues with the artworks, although Guppy suggests that these constraints or challenges are “what artists are good at – thinking creatively”;
- An advocate e.g. Public Art Co-ordinator is important for implementing public art;
- Increasing exposure to art/education of practitioners/community is important in public art achieving success;
- It is not greatly understood how public art achieves its aims/ what makes successful public art. However, it is important to note that public art achieves greatest success when well integrated with planning and design i.e. it forms a part of the success of a new community/ cannot be asked to take on whole responsibility.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>FINDING/THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining public art</td>
<td>To understand the nature of public art and how it is interpreted/received.</td>
<td>Public art is diverse and found in a variety of contexts. This diversity affects the nature of its reception or interpretation. The involvement of an artist is stressed. However, it is not greatly understood how public art in master planned communities is understood or received by residents. “art that is found in a public or community context ... can be very broad ... However, it seems to be fairly important to define public art in terms of the artist’s involvement. I think that there has been a feeling, and it’s true, that there is a creative overlap between say urban design or landscape elements and public art [and] often they look very similar. But unless an artist is involved I don’t think it is appropriate to call it public art and I think that ... with some developers that is quite an important distinction to make” (Guppy pers. comm. 2009). “The nature of “public” is a highly contested and mutable term ... public art is a very broad concept” (Stonehouse pers. comm. 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of public art</td>
<td>To ascertain why public art is being applied in master planned communities and in what ways it creates a sense of place attachment and cultural identity in master planned communities.</td>
<td>Public art in master planned communities plays an important role in defining the character of a community and is driven by agendas not dissimilar to local Councils seeking to create, in a suburban context, interest and excitement, address local cultural themes and offer employment for artists. “Landcom is committed to providing a sense of place and identity in new communities... we would go to Canada and see these special places and want to bring something like that back here in the communities we are creating” (Landcom representative pers. comm. 2009). “I think that community enjoyment is a really big thing ... [Public art] has a big role in defining the character of the community and I think that is one of the reasons why developers are so interested in it. It does tie in with that whole sense of marketing the community as a community, a completed community, rather than just a place and I find that good public art finds itself in imagery that is about describing and defining that community ... it is a similar agenda [of Councils] to make environments more interesting and exciting, to pick up on local cultural themes, to offer employment for artists” (Guppy pers. comm. 2009). “Public art can sometimes fall behind all the supposed values it is meant to bring and value of the art itself can be lost” (Stonehouse pers. comm. 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing</td>
<td>To establish how public art is</td>
<td>Public art in The Ponds master planned community is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public art</td>
<td>implemented in master planned communities and whether these methods are effective/conducive to the creation of better communities. To uncover any difficulties/challenges in the implementation process particularly between the different professionals involved and local stakeholders including residents and local Councils. To identify possible gaps/things that could be done better.</td>
<td>initially implemented through a public art coordinator who acts as a conduit between the developer and the artist to ensure suitable artworks in primarily pre-determined locations set by the urban design process. This can lead to a top down approach with a greater focus on aesthetics for major artworks rather than a meaningful engagement of residents. “It is easier to provide these things upfront and that’s what people want” (Landcom representative pers. comm. 2009). “I’m finding these days that landscape architects will come in expecting that public art will be part of the scenario so they will be looking at that early stage what the best opportunities might be for public art and sometimes there is a real synergy with that” (Guppy pers. comm. 2009). “It can be challenging if you are coming in at the end and everything has already been designed because you may have wanted to do something different, but the decision has already been made for you” (Milne pers. comm. 2009). “I don’t want art to be trite or twee or look as though it has just come off the shelf... but I think I do want people to be able to enjoy it, so with float I think residents are able to enjoy float I mean to the extent that if the lights go out Landcom gets complaints immediately” (Guppy pers. comm. 2009). “people will often now say public art because they’ve seen good examples of it... isn’t this interesting - they’ve been exposed to that and now they’re wanting it in their own environments” (Guppy pers. comm. 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the impacts of public art</td>
<td>To determine whether public art achieves its objectives in master planned communities.</td>
<td>Public art forms part of the public domain and hence a key component of its success is the degree to which residents relate with it. There is no current evaluation method apart from anecdotal evidence and media reports, and little community involvement in master planned public art. “I like people to enjoy art. So when I develop art in communities I try to engage artists and do projects that I think communities will enjoy... and that’s me - not everybody does that. I don’t think that a suburban environment that’s a people’s home is necessarily the most appropriate place for highly confrontational art” (Guppy pers. comm. 2009). “It is important not to spell things out for people completely because you may deprive the opportunity for the artwork to make that impression over time or limit the growth one may have with the artwork”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.1: Interview issues, rationales and findings.

DISCUSSION

The results found that public art in The Ponds was not readily identifiable as ‘public art’ by the residents of The Ponds. This entails that even if public art provided some intrinsic benefits to residents, the residents would be unaware that this was the result of public art. Hence this lack of awareness of what public art is could result in a lesser appreciation for the arts and its benefits and as such, lesser importance placed on its presence.

The capturing of a sense of community - how it forms, how long it takes, to what degree it forms - is a notion very much aspired to but not fully understood. The case study provided an understanding of community formation, being the extent to which one identifies with place, within the early phases of The Ponds master planned community. This can be used as a benchmark to assess the growth of survey areas at a later point in time, and compared with subsequent future stages of the development at a similar point in time to the subject stage. The Ponds case study also has significance because the lessons learnt from it can to some extent be applied to the numerous as yet undeveloped future Landcom master planned communities within the North West Growth Sector given the shared LGA context.

Overall results found that few people drew great meaning from the major artworks and mostly identified with them as abstract sculptures serving as landmarks. Of the people that did identify a message from the major entry artworks, the majority were from ‘The Ponds’. This can be attributed to the emphasis Landcom has placed on promoting public art as a part of its marketing strategy. This may also be reflective of the formation of a different type of community with its set of own values distinct from the adjoining Community Title master planned estate that is Stanhope Gardens.

Kenna (2007) in her empirical study of Glenmore Park found “the profit-driven nature of place marketing has seen the distinct and exclusive identity of Glenmore Park concretised in the minds of the residents, to the extent that the ‘Self/Other’ mentality exists in Glenmore
Park” making the residents conscious of their “distinctiveness from the surrounding western Sydney region” (Kenna 2007:312).

The use of public art in The Ponds has sought to differentiate the estate from surrounding earlier estates in the locale. In this instance, the imagery of ‘float’ and ‘waterlines’ attempts to highlight the progressive nature of the estate in terms of sustainability initiatives and growing awareness of climate change and the need for more efficient and sensitive use of resources such as water. The intention is that residents will identify with these artworks and grow an attachment to them and thus a sense of ownership and belonging to the community. However, in these early stages it remains to be seen whether this is the case, as the majority of residents surveyed did not identify with the major artworks installed to date.

It is noted that the resident survey deliberately referred to artworks generally, because the intent was to establish what exactly residents identified as ‘public art’. This is important because one of the principles behind the implementation of public art is to support the work of artists. If it is unclear what the work of artists is, then overall community support for public art may be undermined. While none of the artworks installed in The Ponds displayed any title or artist information about the artworks, it is noted that this information was found in the media including on the community website, Landcom marketing material online and in their Sales and Marketing Centre and local newspaper articles. However, the reach of these mediums may not be that extensive judging by the survey results although as previously noted, this may indeed change over time.

The most obvious purpose of public art in master planned communities is that of place identifier. Combined with the way the locations and contexts for public art are heavily predetermined by the overarching urban and landscape design concept applying to a planned community, public art plays a key role in identifying or branding the place, while providing an update on the ubiquitous “entry feature” common in master planned communities. Place attachment and identity are important factors in the formation of a sense of community as it is clear one needs to be drawn to and actually be present in a place in order to form part of a community and feel a sense of belonging, trust and security.
It is important to ensure however, that this place marketing does not undermine the aims of creating sustainable socially diverse communities that people can relate to (Kenna 2007), as there is a fine line between place attachment and identity turning into social exclusion.

This study has found that public art in master planned communities is generally installed prior to the residents having moved in and with minimal involvement with the residents apart from the minimal public participation requirements of the Development Assessment process for major public artwork. The key differences between public art in master planned communities and public art in an established community are: the stage at which the public art has been implemented relative to resident length of time living in the area; the scale/budget of the artwork – grand versus small; and the body/person(s) implementing it, for example, developer versus local authority.

By virtue of its broad nature and possibilities, increasingly public art is playing a significant role in adding the intrinsic value necessary in establishing a sense of place in new residential development on Sydney’s fringes (Guppy, 2006). In fact, developers have realised the marketability of creating new unique places to live in, which can be seen through their willingness to provide defining landmark statements through public art in their new exclusive residential estates. However, it is questionable whether these statements, which have been tailored to attract a desired target market and by extension the most profitable return, offer a meaningful contribution to the social wellbeing of the eventual community of these new residential estates (Guppy, 2006).

In fact, the results of the resident survey show that there is a minimal connection between the residents and the public artworks in place, although it is noted that this is still at an early phase of the community formation. Therefore, a follow up study would need to be done after the residents have had sufficient time to form a sense of community and attachment to place and identity with place. Alternatively, public art could be installed after the residents have moved in to enable greater community input to ensure that the creative outputs of artists in the public domain is representative and meaningful to the residents that live there.
From a social perspective, instilling a sense of place into a community through public art is important because it can provide a sense of pride, community interest, increased happiness and well-being in residents, and increase social capital by celebrating cultural diversity while bridging cultural differences between residents (Mills and Brown, 2004). Of course, these benefits are often immeasurable on a quantitative scale, however are still vital to the social health of a community. This has been reflected through the notion of the quadruple bottom line reflecting the importance of cultural considerations in the planning and development process (Hawke, 2003).

It is clear however, that community involvement and engagement is the key to successful planning and the degree to which public art successfully represents the community and offers a meaningful contribution to social wellbeing. Definitive landmark statements provided by developer funded public art in new residential areas, while welcome and serving a physical landmark purpose, do not address the community to the same extent as public art in existing communities in established areas.

The opportunity for community involvement and participation does not exist to the same degree in the entry statements of new residential developments as it does for the character defining public art with direct community involvement. Matarasso (1997) describes the importance of active public participation and community engagement in achieving the greatest social value out of public art to a community, and perhaps this should be more closely considered in the implementation of public art in new residential developments.

As it stands, developers gain all the benefits of the increased marketability of their entry statements under the guise of public art but are not providing the possible social or even intrinsic value of public art developed through active community participation. However, this is compounded by local government that is yet to appropriately provide the funding or fully embrace the value of public art through an understanding of the importance of culture. Therefore, it is clear that if it can be demonstrated that public art in master planned communities do engage the community and provide a meaningful attachment to and identity with place, or alternatively true intrinsic value that endears the artwork to the community, then local government must actively support and maintain such endeavours.
On the other hand, the very nature of the ‘public’ domain entails responsibility equally on the part of artists as designers for works in the public domain. If the artwork does not engage the community, then there is a responsibility to ensure that the public domain does appropriately meet the needs of the community as it is how the artwork is received that is the ultimate test of the success of public art.

**Conclusion**

Ultimately the creation of better communities stems from the extent to which residents feel a sense of ownership and attachment to the place in which they live. Public Art can play a significant role in the formation of cultural identity that corresponds with, and actually belongs to, the people making up the community. In this sense, the way public art is implemented can make a considerable difference to the extent of which public art reflects the people that make up a community and by extension creates meaningful cultural identities.

The level of participation involved in the implementation of public art is considered to be a key factor in how successfully people identify with the place in which they live. Interestingly enough, one need only draw from the examples of participatory arts in the community cultural development programs of the neglected established suburbs adjoining many of these master planned communities to find a possible answer to the role public art plays in creating community. Given the early stage of community found in The Ponds thus far, it remains to be seen whether the public art installed so far does resonate and represent a meaningful cultural identity and sense of place attachment to the people living there. However, given the importance of this interaction between people and public art in making sense of their local community, this study has shown that it is something which does need to be assessed. The following chapter will now provide a list of recommendations to be implemented as a result of this study.
This chapter will address the ways the research questions and objectives have been met and provide suitable recommendations for the implementation of public art in master planned communities in Sydney. The study concludes with suggestions for future research based on the findings of this thesis.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

This study has examined the implementation of public art in Sydney’s master planned communities. A mixed research strategy was employed involving qualitative interview, quantitative survey, observation and inventory analysis, and the review of critical literature relevant to this study.

This study has uncovered the recent use of public art in Sydney’s master planned communities. With the adoption of Public Art Guidelines in the Landcom Guidelines 2008, the implementation of public art in master planned communities is set to continue. Therefore it is important to understand this phenomenon in order to ensure it contributes to the creation of better communities.

Public art can create an increased sense of attachment and identity to place. In order to do so it must be relevant to the community in which it is placed. Providing public art prior to the formation of any community can make this a challenge.

In order to ascertain an understanding of the topic I audited 16 master planned communities across Sydney to reveal the extent of public art and the types of public art being implemented. Then I interviewed a Public Art Coordinator, a Landcom Development Manager and 2 Artists. I also relied on an interview with Blacktown Council’s Public Art Coordinator conducted for previous assignment purposes. Following this, I undertook face to face surveys with residents of The Ponds master planned community in the Blacktown LGA to establish the extent to which a currently forming community engaged with public art installed without their involvement. The outcome of this research is to provide a set of recommendations for the implementation of public art in Sydney’s master planned communities.
RESEARCH OUTCOMES

1. To what extent is public art being implemented in new residential master planned estates in Sydney?

Public art is increasingly being provided in new residential master planned estates in Sydney as a result both local government policy being implemented and the recent introduction of public art guidelines in Landcom’s Guidelines 2008. New release areas for future development are increasingly providing for public art as a part of Section 94 Plans, Developer Agreements and Development Control Plans. An audit of 16 master planned communities across Sydney revealed a total of 75 pieces of public art.

2. Does public art contribute to residents’ sense of place attachment and cultural identity within new master planned estates on Sydney’s urban fringe?

Public art may provide a sense of place attachment and cultural identity however this is difficult to achieve without a community being present.

3. Public art for which public, if no community is involved? Are current implementation practices for public art an effective means to create a sense of place in new residential master planned estates?

From the research undertaken it is considered that current approaches are not the most effective means of creating a sense of place in new residential master planned estates and it is imperative to implement higher levels of community involvement in order to create a meaningful sense of place through public art in such developments.

4. Are higher levels of place attachment and place identity experienced in master planned estates with a strong focus on public art as opposed to master planned communities with less of a focus on public art?
The research has revealed that residents did not resonate very strongly with public art in their local area and as such, it is concluded that the value add of public art in terms of creating a higher sense of place attachment and identity is not great. However, it is noted that this study has provided an indication of levels of place attachment and place identity experienced by residents in these communities at a very early phase of community formation and higher levels of place attachment or identity through public art may very well result over time. This study may be used as a benchmark for the examination of the same community at a later point in time to see if levels of attachment and identity had increased.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of findings of this research, the following is recommended for the future implementation of public art:

1. There is an inherent tension within the notion of public art as art for art’s sake and art which serves some instrumental purpose such as community engagement or community cultural identity. However, it is important to consider the context and ‘public’ (the actual community living with the artwork) first and foremost in spite of whether art is used for some instrumental purpose or art is simply used for its own intrinsic qualities as a creative expression of meaning.

2. Education and dialogue is critical in the successful implementation of public art. The artists interviewed revealed that there is a lack of tertiary education for this field of public art and hence may be a lack of respect from design professionals and planning practitioners when it comes to integrating art in the public domain.

3. A bottom up approach as opposed to a top down approach is called for when implementing public art. Public art should be implemented after the residents have moved in to ensure a meaningful engagement with the community. This is due to the fact that unless the public art is overly confronting (and hence a detractor to the public domain and image of a local area), it is not a major factor in residents making a decision to move to an area.
4. Public art should be subject to a post evaluation procedure (similar to other aspects of the built form upon completion) involving the public art coordinator and/or artist engaged to ensure the desired outcomes of the artwork have been achieved.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

During the course of this study, it has been revealed that there is a limited breadth of empirical knowledge in the area of public art and its impacts. There exists an ongoing scope to investigate this field as the people and places driving and influencing the creation of public art and new communities are dynamic and constantly changing.

Understanding and appreciating art for its own intrinsic value, and being able to measure this value, is important. Developing suitable evaluation procedures for public art is an area that has received little attention but is critical in a public context where there is an expectation and accountability to ensure suitable outcomes.

CONCLUSION

This study has revealed the recent growing emergence of public art in master planned communities in the Sydney context. Public art is being used as a way of identifying the character of new residential development by drawing on themes of heritage, sustainability and the natural environment. It is a progression of the place branding and identity relied on by developers to market an estate and give residents a sense of place to own for themselves. However, whether these messages are coming across to the residents of such communities is questionable. It would seem that without an active involvement in the making and design of public art, the art may be lost on the local community.
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Appendix A: Public Art Audit
Appendix B: Questionnaire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Artwork</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Float', 2007-2008</td>
<td>Susan Milne and Greg</td>
<td>The main southern entry</td>
<td>Sculptures consisting of 10 x 10-12m high vertical galvanised steel “upside down</td>
<td>DA approval granted in 2007, with a Section 96 Modification Application later lodged to amend a</td>
<td>“With the awareness of climate change, the element of water has been transformed from an anticipated resource to a precious spring. As a colony of sculptures in the roundabout, their inverted form changes them from sunshade and rain shelter to light receptor and water collector” (Milne &amp; Stonehouse, 2009).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                    | Stonehouse, Artists     | point to Stages 1 & 2 of  | umbrella” structures with perforated steel meshing and multicoloured LED lighting and   | condition of consent requiring the removal of the artwork in the event an adequate source of     | ARTIST PLANNER Marla Guppy & Associates  
|                    | based in Terrey Hills,  | 'The Ponds' residential    | associated landscaping.                                                               | funding was not identified after the initial 5 year Landcom maintenance period commencing from | PROJECT MANAGER Incoll  
|                    | NSW                     | estate within the roundabout |                                                                                       | date of completion. Blacktown Council subsequently resolved to commence consideration for a      | STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS Connell Wagner  
|                    |                         | intersection of Conrad Rd.  |                                                                                       | had been dedicated to Council as public road) granted 2008. Value of $500,000.                | FABRICATORS Fleetwood Engineering  
|                    |                         | and Stanhope Pwy., The      |                                                                                       |                                                                                                  | ELECTRICAL Repcal Australia                |
|                    |                         | Ponds |                                                                                       |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                   |
| 'Waterlines', 2007 | Susan Milne and Greg     | The main eastern entry      | Sculptures consisting of 21 x 2m high vertical & slanted galvanised laser cut perforated | DA approval granted in 2007, with a Section 96 Modification Application later lodged to amend a    | “A rhythm of perforated panels sways as it meanders through the landscape. This installation grew from collaboration with the Landscape Architecture team” (Milne & Stonehouse, 2009). |
|                    | Stonehouse, Artists     | point to Stage 1 of 'The    | steel panels set in a low retaining wall with blue LED uplights and associated landscaping | condition of consent requiring the removal of the artwork in the event an adequate source of     | ARTIST PLANNER Marla Guppy & Associates  
|                    | as above.               | Ponds’ residential estate  |                                                                                       | funding was not identified after the initial 5 year Landcom maintenance period commencing from  | PROJECT MANAGER Incoll  
|                    |                         | within the verge at the    |                                                                                       | date of completion. Blacktown Council subsequently resolved to commence consideration for a      | STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS Connell Wagner  
|                    |                         | NW and SW corners of the   |                                                                                       | funding source in the 09/10 Management Plan. Subsequent separate DA for boundary adjustment    | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT Context  
|                    |                         | intersection of Riverbank  |                                                                                       | lodged to ensure the artwork was placed within a widened verge of the road reserve dedicated to Council to ensure maintenance was not a private property burden. Value of $210,000. | FABRICATORS Fleetwood Engineering Jetcut  
<p>|                    |                         | Drive and Fyfe Road, The    |                                                                                       |                                                                                                  | Australia                                |
|                    |                         | Ponds. |                                                                                       |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                   | ELECTRICAL Repcal Australia                |
| <strong>Water Marker</strong>, 2007-2008, Commissioned by Landcom (Image: Miletic, 2009) | Susan Milne and Greg Stonehouse, Artists as above. | The main eastern entry point to Stage 1 of ‘The Ponds’ residential estate within the verge at the SW corner of the intersection of Riverbank Drive and Fyfe Road, The Ponds. | Stand alone sculpture associated with “Waterlines” consisting of a single 6m high vertical galvanised laser cut perforated steel panel and lightweight steel and Perspex lightbox with multicoloured LED lights. | DA approval granted in 2007, with a Section 96 Modification Application later lodged to amend a condition of consent requiring the removal of the artwork in the event an adequate source of funding was not identified after the initial 5 year Landcom maintenance period commencing from date of completion. Blacktown Council subsequently resolved to commence consideration for a funding source in the 09/10 Management Plan. Subsequent separate DA for boundary adjustment lodged to ensure the artwork was placed within a widened verge of the road reserve dedicated to Council to ensure maintenance was not a private property burden. Value of $90,000. | The vertical scale of the structure provides a balanced contrast to the lower scale meandering waterlines structures, which could not continue due to conflicts with underground service provisions. |
| <strong>Digital Litter</strong>, 2008-2009, Winner of 2008 University of Western Sydney Landcom Acquisitive Sculptural Award, Commissioned by Landcom | Marcus Tatton, born 1963, 1989 Bachelor of Fine Art (Furniture Design), University of Tasmania Artist - Sculpture &amp; Friezes based at 1422 Huon Road, Neika, Tasmania <a href="http://www.marcustatton.com/contents.htm">http://www.marcustatton.com/contents.htm</a> | Public Reserve (known as “The Parklands”) within Stage 1 of ‘The Ponds’ residential estate immediately south of the playground off Pebble Crescent, The Ponds. | Sculptures consisting of 10 x 0.2-2m high rust patina corten steel “0” and “1” digits set at varying heights in concrete and steel footings buried in mulched landscaped areas. | DA-08-1748, lodged 14/7/08, approval granted 31/10/08, est. value $20,000; CC-09-399 lodged 13/3/09, issued 8/4/09. Approval delayed due to maintenance concerns regarding mowing of turf underneath the sculptures. Proposal subsequently amended to provide a low ground cover instead. Value of $100,000. | “The work references the detritus of binary characters lost in cyberspace” (Landcom Guidelines, 2008) - “I use Zeros and Ones in many of my artworks... to represent the ‘leftovers’ of a message that was not received by the phone it was sent to. Just where do these beams of information go?” (Tatton, 2009). It also serves “as a reminder of the impact waste can have on our environment” (Landcom media release, 2009). “Digital Litter captured our attention as it resonates with the environmentally conscious nature of The Ponds” (Steve Driscoll, Director of Sustainability and Policy, Landcom media release, 2009). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artwork</th>
<th>Commissioned by</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Owl Seat', 2006</td>
<td>Landcom</td>
<td>Integrated galvanised steel seat sculpture wrapped around an established pre-existing native tree.</td>
<td>Installed during the construction process as an ancillary part of the DA approval DA-06-2440 (lodged 30/8/06, approved 12/2/07) and associated CC-07-509 (lodged 28/3/07, issued 17/7/07), final inspection 1/6/09 for the overall embellishment of the public reserve in 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Leaf Seat', 2006</td>
<td>Landcom</td>
<td>Integrated galvanised steel seat sculpture wrapped around an established pre-existing native tree.</td>
<td>Installed during the construction process as an ancillary part of the DA approval for the overall embellishment of the public reserve in 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Bird Flight', 2006</td>
<td>Justin Sayarath</td>
<td>Laser cut rust patina steel bird fixed to low boundary retaining wall with associated patterned terracotta tiles.</td>
<td>Installed during the construction process as an ancillary part of the DA approval for the overall embellishment of the public reserve in 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Art.is.an Option, Wrought-iron & ornamental metal work designers & manufacturers based at 225 Chifley Road, Dargan NSW 2786 Ph: 02 6355 2891 Fax: 02 6355 2891

'Eastern Neighbourhood Park' Public Reserve 828 within Stage 2 of 'The Ponds' residential estate at Lot 892, DP 1119045, corner of Warbler Street and Stanhope Pwy.

Installed during the construction process as an ancillary part of the DA approval for the overall embellishment of the public reserve in 2006.

"Depicts the local barking owl" (Landcom Guidelines, 2008).

*Image: Miletic, 2009*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem by Vicky Thornton, local Blacktown resident.</th>
<th>Public Reserve (known as “The Parklands”) within Stage 1 of ‘The Ponds’ residential estate (Stage 5a(1) of the parklands) immediately north of the playground and adjacent to The Ponds Sales &amp; Display Centre off Riverbank Drive, The Ponds.</th>
<th>Poem by Vicky Thornton engraved into concrete retaining wall</th>
<th>DA-04-4671 – “The Parklands” overall landscape embellishment – (lodged 23/12/04, approved 11/4/07); CC-07-868 (lodged 17/5/07, issued 15/8/07) for stages 5a(1) &amp; 5b, est. value $3910000; CC-07-2641 (lodged 21/12/07, approved 17/9/08) for stage 5c(2), est. value $1803377; CC-08-2276 for pedestrian bridges in 5c(2); CC-09-300 (lodged 27/2/09, issued 22/9/09) for stages 5a(3), 5c(3) &amp; 5b(2).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ishi Buki Chris Bennetts 1 Chiltern Road, Ingleside NSW 2101 Ph. / Fax. (02) 9979 3666 Email: <a href="mailto:info@ishibuki.com">info@ishibuki.com</a></td>
<td>“Braemont Park” Public Reserve 816 within Stage 1 of ‘The Ponds’ residential estate at Lot 1044, DP 1109171 &amp; Lot 5017, DP 1106203, Portal Street, Kellyville Ridge.</td>
<td>Sandstone engraving of Kookaburra</td>
<td>DA-07-937 (lodged 23/4/07, approved 3/9/07); CC-07-2523 (lodged 7/12/07, issued 29/1/08). Total cost of park $226,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>Public Reserve within Stage 1 of ‘The Ponds’ residential estate at Portal Street, Kellyville Ridge.</td>
<td>Sandstone engraving of bird</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Commissioned by</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image](62x419 to 202x523)</td>
<td>Title Unknown, 2007-2008, commissioned by Australand/Landcom (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image](62x271 to 200x374)</td>
<td>Title Unknown, 2007-2008, commissioned by Australand/Landcom (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image](62x122 to 201x226)</td>
<td>'Creekline' – Aboriginal Artefacts Display, 2007, commissioned by Landcom &amp; Australand (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>Dharug Artists</td>
<td>Within The Ponds Sales and Marketing Centre (site of future commercial use) at Lot 1071, DP 1119679, off Riverbank Drive, The Ponds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Artwork</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Physical Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural design embellishment</td>
<td>Within verge area fronting local primary school &amp; ABC child care centre at Lot 9002, DP 1065521, corner of Greenwich Street and Perfection Avenue, Stanhope Gardens.</td>
<td>Series of vertical coloured hardwood and metal poles of varying heights with associated landscaping.</td>
<td>DA-03-3415 lodged 15/8/03, approved 22/6/04; Crown works – no CC; est. total value $750,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural design embellishment by Suters</td>
<td>Within verge/land part of the Council owned Stanhope Gardens Leisure Centre/ Library at Lot 5, 1111764, the corner of Sentry Drive and Stanhope Parkway, Stanhope Gardens.</td>
<td>Series of vertical natural hardwood poles of varying heights with associated landscaping.</td>
<td>DA-00-1833 for Leisure Centre lodged 5/4/00, deferred commencement approval 2/11/00, est. value $14000000; DA-07-3402 for library by Suters Architects on behalf of Council lodged 19/12/07, approved 9/5/08, est. value $5300000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Tobin – Darug Community</td>
<td>Attached to the external wall of the Council owned Stanhope Gardens Leisure Centre Community Facility at the corner of Sentry Drive and Stanhope Parkway, Stanhope Gardens.</td>
<td>Painted and engraved piece of timber with associated plaque identifying artist, title, year.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Poles*, date & commission DET (Image: Miletic, 2009)

*Poles*, date & commissioned by Council (Image: Miletic, 2009)

*Darug Clan*, 2009, commissioned by Blacktown City Council (Image: Miletic, 2009)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lettering, date &amp; commission Council (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>Architectural design embellishment by Suters</td>
<td>Attached to the external wall of the Council owned Stanhope Gardens Leisure Centre Community Facility at the corner of Sentry Drive and Stanhope Parkway, Stanhope Gardens.</td>
<td>Laser cut black powder coated steel lettering set against galvanised corrugated iron wall sheeting.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel cut-out &amp; Lettering, date &amp; commission Council (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>Architectural design embellishment by Suters</td>
<td>Attached to the external wall of the Council owned Stanhope Gardens Leisure Centre Community Facility at the corner of Sentry Drive and Stanhope Parkway, Stanhope Gardens.</td>
<td>Laser cut black powder coated steel lettering set against engraved concrete panel wall.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Artwork</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Physical Description</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Markers’, 2006-2008, commissioned by Delfin Lend Lease (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>Milne and Stonehouse, as above.</td>
<td>Public reserve / bushland near corner of Susannah Drive and Forrester Road, Ropes Crossing.</td>
<td>3-4m high vertical reused former onsite timber rail sleepers with attached laser cut rust patina steel image.</td>
<td>“The markers have responded to the local natural environment as well as the prior history of the area as a munitions site. They function as orientation signs, reinforcing a cohesive language within the landscape” (Milne and Stonehouse, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Markers’, 2006-2008, commissioned by Delfin Lend Lease (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>Milne and Stonehouse, as above.</td>
<td>Public reserve / open square at Central Place, Ropes Crossing.</td>
<td>3-4m high vertical reused former onsite timber rail sleeper with attached coloured laser cut steel lettering “Overshoes must be worn within the red line area”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milne and Stonehouse, as above.</td>
<td>Public reserve / open square at Central Place, Ropes Crossing.</td>
<td>3-4m high vertical reused former onsite timber rail sleeper with attached coloured laser cut steel assorted numbering and lettering “Press isolating steam valves”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown title &amp; date, commissioned by Delfin Lend Lease (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>Architectural design embellishment</td>
<td>Public space between Ropes Crossing Sales and Marketing Centre (future Community Centre) and Coles/retail centre off Central Place, Ropes Crossing.</td>
<td>3-4m high rectangular slanted green metal poles fixed to hard paved surface with associated landscaped islands and curved seating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Artist</td>
<td>'Woodlands’ Entry Feature, Unknown date, commissioned by Delfin Lend Lease (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>Boundary of Public Reserve at corner of Beston Street and Bradley Avenue, Ropes Crossing.</td>
<td>Laser cut rust patina steel lettering “Woodlands” set on natural stone low retaining wall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milne and Stonehouse, as above.</td>
<td>‘Markers’, 2006-2008, commissioned by Delfin Lend Lease (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>Public Reserve at corner of Beston Street and Bradley Avenue, Ropes Crossing.</td>
<td>3-4m high vertical reused former onsite timber rail sleepers with attached laser cut rust patina steel image.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Markers', 2006-2008, commissioned by Delfin Lend Lease (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>Milne and Stonehouse, as above.</td>
<td>Drainage Reserve at corner off Bluebell Crescent, Ropes Crossing.</td>
<td>3-4m high vertical reused former onsite timber rail sleepers with attached laser cut rust patina steel image.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Markers', 2006-2008, commissioned by Delfin Lend Lease (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>Milne and Stonehouse, as above.</td>
<td>Drainage Reserve off Ropes Crossing Boulevard, Ropes Crossing.</td>
<td>3-4m high vertical reused former onsite timber rail sleepers with attached laser cut rust patina steel image.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Markers', 2006-2008, commissioned by Delfin Lend Lease (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td>Milne and Stonehouse, as above.</td>
<td>Public Reserve 'Aurora Park' at corner of Susannah Drive and Drummond Avenue, Ropes Crossing.</td>
<td>3-4m high vertical reused former onsite timber rail sleepers with attached laser cut rust patina steel image and associated landscape embellishment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>'Markers', 2006-2008, commissioned by Delfin Lend Lease (Image: Miletic, 2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Unknown Artist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Milne and Stonehouse, as above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Milne and Stonehouse, as above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Public Reserve ‘Aurora Park’ at corner of Ferdinand Avenue and Woolls Crescent, Ropes Crossing.
- 3-4m high vertical reused former onsite timber rail sleepers with attached laser cut rust patina steel image and associated landscape embellishment.
- Laser cut rust patina steel lettering “Woodlands” set on natural stone low retaining wall.
- Public reserve off Ropes Crossing Boulevard, Ropes Crossing.
- *Southern Entry Feature* to Ropes Crossing Estate located within Penrith LGA.
Your participation would be greatly appreciated in this questionnaire for a thesis project on Public Art in Master Planned Communities by Eltin Miletic for the Bachelor of Town Planning degree at the UNSW. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask Eltin Miletic at z3158217@student.unsw.edu.au or Dr Robert Freestone, the research supervisor on 93854836, or r.freestone@unsw.edu.au. Please circle your answer or write where space is provided.

1. Gender: Male Female
4. Occupation:__________________

5. Please circle which applies:
   I rent my house  I pay a mortgage on my house  I own my house (i.e. no mortgage)  Other________
6. Which suburb do you live in?__________________
7. Do you feel like this is the right place for you to live? Yes No Don’t know
8. How long have you been living here (Number of years or months)?_________________________
9. Which suburb did you come from before living here?________________________________________
10. Was there any public art that you knew of in the suburb you used to live in? Yes No Don’t know
11. What are the major reasons that you chose to live here?
   Primary reason:________________________________________________________________________
   Secondary reason (if any):_______________________________________________________________
12. Please rate the following items for your current satisfaction of living here:
   Location/Convenience:          Lesser satisfaction 1 2 3 4 5 Greater satisfaction
   Social Network (friends/family): Lesser satisfaction 1 2 3 4 5 Greater satisfaction
   There are lots of things I like to do here: Lesser satisfaction 1 2 3 4 5 Greater satisfaction
   Security/Safety:                Lesser satisfaction 1 2 3 4 5 Greater satisfaction
   Quality of living environment (e.g. visual /health): Lesser satisfaction 1 2 3 4 5 Greater satisfaction
   Overall satisfaction of living in this area: Lesser satisfaction 1 2 3 4 5 Greater satisfaction
13. Do you know of any public art in your local area? (for example sculptures or murals or monuments or any other types of art, but not including illegal types of art like graffiti) Yes No Don’t know

Please skip questions 14 – 20 and proceed to question 21 if you did not answer yes to the above (question 9).
14. If yes, when did you find out about the public art in your local area (before or after you started living here)?
   Before  After  Don’t know
15. And, how did you find out about the public art in your local area?
   Someone told me      I saw it      I used it      Other? (please specify)__________ Don’t know
16. What are your favourite artworks in your local area?
________________________________________________________________________________________________

17. Please write down why you like these artworks (Does it hold any special meaning/represent anything to you and/or do you think it really suits the area or any other reasons?)
________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________

18. What do you think the artist was trying to represent in these artworks?
________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________

19. Is there any public art that you think should be removed from your local area?  Yes  No  Don’t know

20. If yes, which ones and why?
________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________

21. Please rate the overall visual quality of public art in your local area:
   (Lesser Quality)  1  2  3  4  5  (Greater Quality)

22. Please rate how successfully you think public art in your local area relates to the local community? (For example do you think the public art does not fit in very well with the people that live here(1) or relates to the community very well (5) or somewhere between?)
   (Lesser Success)  1  2  3  4  5  (Greater Success)

23. Would you have moved here if there was not any public area in the area?  Yes  No  Don’t know

24. Do you think public art makes this area a better place to live?  Yes  No  Don’t know

25. Please rate the amount of public art you think there should be in this area?
   (Lesser amount)  1  2  3  4  5  (Greater amount)

26. Please rate how much community involvement you think there should be for public art in your local area (for example should the local community be more involved with the design/or making of the artwork (5) or do you think it is better to leave it to the artists (1) or somewhere between?)
   (Lesser involvement)  1  2  3  4  5  (Greater involvement)

27. Any other comments you would like to make about public art in this area? (Do you see any problems / or have any concerns e.g. location/ safety issues/ cost / would you like to participate in future artworks in your local area/ see more information about artworks in your local area?)
________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time and participation.