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Abstract

Like many other countries around the world, Australia and Great Britain are struggling with the renewal of public housing estates. Public housing neighbourhoods have often been associated with poor social connections and physical problems resulting in concentrations of deprivation and social exclusion.

Past efforts to effectively regenerate these using a ‘top down’ approach have met with varying degrees of success and recent literature has called for a more ‘place based’ approach in planning policies resulting in greater levels of public participation. This can be evidenced in changing planning philosophies and, more importantly, the allocation of funding for community involvement in large scale projects. This being said, how are these being achieved?

This thesis aims to answer this question by focusing on two case studies of public housing regeneration: the Bonnyrigg renewal project in Sydney and Castle Vale in Birmingham, England. The case studies are examined according to their strategic operation and initiatives for community interaction within the master planning process. Through this analysis, a greater understanding of the difficulties and advantages associated with community focused urban regeneration is advanced.
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Policy Glossary

New Deal for Communities (UK): A central government led programme which aims to relieve deprivation in England’s 39 most deprived estates. Launched in 1998 by the Blair government, the program has a funding budget of £2 billion over 10 years and aims to bridge the gap between these estates and the rest of England by work on community development and service provision. The program is currently run by the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit at the DCLG.

Stronger Families Stronger Communities (AUS): a $240 million program which contains 9 initiatives to develop early intervention and prevention policies within local communities. These aim at community capacity building and family support. It is run over a period of 4 years and combines community intervention with family assistance.

Living Communities (AUS): the Living Communities Project is a NSW Housing initiative to combine community development with urban regeneration. The pathfinder project currently in operation is Bonnyrigg which is run by a PPP with the collaboration of Newleaf Communities, Fairfield Council and NSW Housing.

Housing Act 1988 (UK): was given royal assent in November 15 1988 and contained major changes to the private rented sector and radical transformations on the role of public housing within England. One of the provisions of the act allowed the government to set up Housing Action Trusts which would mediate urban regeneration in deprived estates. Castle Vale became the subject of one of these Trusts.

Right-to-Buy (UK): Conveyance scheme introduced in 1980 by the Thatcher Government which gave public housing tenants the ability to purchase their homes at below market price. The price depended on the state of the dwelling and number of years of occupation. The Right-to-Buy was partly responsible for a decrease in the number of public sector owned dwellings across England.

Neighbourhood Improvement Programmes (NIP) (AUS): Launched in 1994, it marked NSW Housing’s first attempts to combat social exclusion in public housing estates. During its lifetime the NIP identified 20 estates for improvement which have been met with a mixture of success and failures.
1. INTRODUCTION
This thesis considers public participation in urban regeneration, in particular for public housing projects. It aims to examine the processes involved in community focused urban regeneration. The project will look at the community participation in urban regeneration projects in particular with relation to public housing estates and how differing processes involved work together to create a pragmatic solution.

Since the 1990’s, community engagement has become an important aspect of planning policy. Partnerships which include the community are becoming more common and are actively encouraged by scholars and practitioners alike (Ball, 2004). In the case of England, the need for community involvement in large scale regeneration programs has become a vital part of government funding applications. This has been largely led by policies such as *The New Deal for Communities* (2002) and changing attitudes to support community empowerment with the need to create ‘local solutions for local problems’ (Gilchrist, 2003: 17).

In Australia, recent reforms in public policy have aimed to encourage public engagement, partnerships and social cohesion in community development and physical regeneration (Adams & Hess, 2001). The new direction has been symbolised by the inclusion of community minded approaches like the *Stronger Families and Communities Strategy* (2004) and changing government attitudes. For example, John Howard in the *1998 World Economic Forum* was noted saying that “we believe that social capital and the building of networks of trust and understanding in national and local communities are vital if those communities are to respond constructively to the challenges of change” (Adams & Hess, 2001: 15).

This has come from past criticisms relating to the complex interactions within policy which has neglected to include the community (Peel, 1993). More recent changes in urban development have combined both the issues of poverty with urban development to form a more holistic approach to renewal. This has been coupled with the increased role of the private sector resulting in the positive re-enforcement of public private partnerships (Stubbs, 2007; Ball, 2004). New social initiatives such as *Living Communities* aim to reduce poverty and social exclusion whilst improving on the physical environment with the collaboration of the community.

This chapter sets up the background, methodology and overall structure of the thesis. It aims to introduce the topic and give a brief analysis of public participation within the context of urban regeneration.
1.1 Context

Although public participation has been widely accepted as a positive influence on strategy by academics and planners, practitioners continually find roadblocks in the implementation of these policies. Some, such as Maginn (2007) argue that it is a result of the need for participation rather than the desire; often practitioners will establish partnerships without an extensive knowledge of the processes, hierarchies and conditions which exist within the community. This often leads to failure and has resulted in a certain degree of caution among institutionalised partnerships to engage with such processes despite growing encouragement.

Another reason is the potential costs associated with participation whether it is financial or political. These costs can especially be prevalent in large scale developments and regeneration programs. This exhibition of caution towards public participation can lead to inadequate participatory processes further creating a ‘breeding ground’ for conflict between partners and local communities (Rist, 2000 in Denzin, N & Lincoln, Y (eds)).

More often than not, increased tension between working partners and the community can lead to a prolonged development phase and ultimately an unsustainable regeneration scheme.

This thesis will examine the extent of community engagement by undertaking a comparative study of two community focused public housing regeneration programs by examining the processes of urban development and community education. By doing so, it is hoped that guidelines for successful full participation will emerge.

The case studies chosen are located in two very different areas geographically but both are a product of government social initiatives which attempt to reduce concentrations of deprivation with special consideration for community input. In Australia the case study focuses on the Bonnyrigg Living Communities project established by NSW Housing and currently run by Newleaf Communities. It is considered to be a pathfinder project under the Living Communities program and includes a public private partnership which works in collaboration with the community.

In England, the Castle Vale (Birmingham, UK) urban regeneration scheme is examined. Widely considered as an example of good practice for community empowerment and sustainable regeneration, the Castle Vale project began under the 1988 Housing Act which established independent organisations (also known as Housing Action Trusts) to help alleviate poverty and social exclusion in England’s most deprived estates. Although the physical transformation of the estate has now been completed, the project was successful in forming strong collaborative relationships with the community. Its successor organisation, the Castle Vale Neighbourhood Partnership Board is one of the few fully run community led associations in England.
1.2 Aims

The purpose of the thesis is to consider how full participation can be achieved especially in large scale regeneration programs where tensions, time constraints and politics are common factors.

More specifically, the objectives of the research will be to:

- To research information associated with public participation and identify any areas for further research;
- To examine public participation and involvement as an integral part of urban regeneration projects with particular focus on the case studies;
- To examine the operationalisation of the public participation programs and how they are integrated into the all aspects of urban regeneration with particular focus on urban development and education and job training.

By taking a comparative approach to the case studies of Castle Vale (Birmingham, UK) and Bonnyrigg (Sydney, Australia) it is hoped that the research will ultimately demonstrate the importance of onsite planning and the use of ‘bottom up’ approaches to developing strategy. A further understanding of community focused urban regeneration programs in public housing will also result.

1.3 Methodology

There are two main components to this thesis. The first includes secondary data analysis in the form of an extensive literature review. The review will include the examination of theories associated with urban regeneration and public participation, the second includes primary data analysis in the form of site visits (Castle Vale & Bonnyrigg) and interviews.

1.3.1 Literature Review – Secondary Data Analysis

The first component of the thesis includes a literature review of sources relating to community participation, urban regeneration and collaborative planning especially in the context of public housing. Information is obtained from a variety of resources including textbooks, journal publications, newspaper articles, government policy documents and publications, organisational publications, books and internet websites. A detailed explanation of this can be found in Appendix A of this thesis.

1.3.2 Site Selection

For the purpose of this comparative study, two case studies have been chosen. One is located in the city of Birmingham in the United Kingdom and the second is located in Sydney, Australia. There are several reasons why I have chosen these two specific case studies. This is listed following this:
Castle Vale

Castle Vale is regarded as an example of good practice internationally and has won a number of good practice awards such as Housing Deliver of the Year (CVCHA 2008) and the best Land Renewal Scheme Award (2003). The regeneration efforts began as part of the government initiative – led by the Housing Action Trust (HAT) and has served to successfully include the community during and after its regeneration process. Presently, many members of the community are recognised as experts in the field of community development and provide support on this topic. Castle Vale is an extremely good example to study in respect to full public participation as its success has been central to defining some of the planning policies both in Birmingham and England. It also has made remarkable improvements physically and socially within a regeneration context and has become once again, a desirable place to live.

Bonnyrigg

Bonnyrigg is considered to be the firstly fully integrated public private partnership of its kind within NSW and the first project under the Living Communities Program. It is run by a consortium of four companies now known collectively as Newleaf Communities and has a fully funded social and service provision component which will run for 30 years from the inception of the program in 2004. The Bonnyrigg case is especially interesting because it is an experimental program which accumulates all the ideas of participation released in the last decade into one solid entity. It has taken the lessons learnt from Castle Vale and incorporated them to form a better and more informed engagement model.

1.3.3 Site Visits – Primary Data Analysis

One site visit to Castle Vale and Bonnyrigg respectively has been undertaken as part of the research. The site visits will act as an observational analysis for the current development as part of the subject estate and surrounding. Observational analysis or participant observation is particularly useful as it allows the researcher to identify different aspects of the estate and regeneration program and how residents respond to these techniques without the need for forced interaction ie. deliberate contact. In this case, the research is able to observe individuals in a relaxed and natural environmental without the possibility of biased results (Bryman, 2004). In addition, even though information can be gathered through the examination of aerial photographs and maps, site visits allow a greater appreciation of the estate’s operation within their social and physical environment. In particular, a better understanding of community interactions and the ‘look and feel’ of the estate can be better defined through personal experience.
1.3.4 Interviews – Primary Data Analysis

The second component to primary data analysis includes the interview of one key professional member of each case study. The main focus of the interviews is to gather information in relation to the operationalisation of the urban regeneration programs in relation to the literature review and also to gauge professional opinions on public participation. Interviews are particularly useful as they are able to gather meanings behind secondary factual data. As the research deals with participation and social interaction, indepth interviews with professionals are especially important as they give an added dimension to the written information obtained. These interviews allow the researchers to pursue in-depth information around specific topics which could bring about a different side to the research (Bryman, 2004; Campio et. al, 1994). Further details of this can be found in Appendix A of this thesis.

1.4 Limitations

There are several limitations in this thesis. Firstly the literature review presented in Chapter 2 is by no means exhaustive. Although every effort has been made to conduct an in-depth review of the literature relating to public participation, urban regeneration, public housing and collaboration there is still a large volume of information available. Due to space and word limit constraints, Chapter 2 will provide a broad analysis and description of the current and most popular theories in relation to this field.

Secondly, the focus on two case studies negates the fact that there are other case studies which may contain different models and may produce different results. Further information relating to different international case studies can be found in a variety of texts including Crocker, 2002; Arthurson, 2001; Hall, 2007 and Rawlings et. al, 2008.

Lastly, the qualitative nature in which the interviews have been conducted is prone to subjectivity. Qualitative interviews were chosen so that further probing opportunities that may be presented in order to gather information specific to the topic of interest. However, a trade off of such a technique is a bias towards certain theories or philosophies whether they are in support of or object to public participation (Bryman, 2004). I have chosen to do this as it provides a helpful outlook into how community engagement programs are approached by certain professionals. This subjective nature should be noted to the reader.
1.5 Structure

This section outlines the structure of the thesis.

Chapter 1 (this chapter) is used as an introductory tool and aims to familiarise the reader with the thesis. Contained in Chapter 1 is the aim, objectives and methodology, it also provides the structure and key ideas presented in the research.

Chapter 2 examines the theoretical context of public participation. It examines the concepts behind urban regeneration, public participation, collaborative planning and seeks to determine the direction of public housing policy in both the UK and Australia.

Chapter 3 explores the two case studies; and provides context of these two case studies in their relation to their cities and also the operationalisation aspects of the urban regeneration programs with particular focus on urban development and training and education.

Two areas of the program have been specifically chosen. Firstly development is considered to be the most immediate and obvious change associated with urban regeneration. It would therefore be beneficial to compare how these differ between case studies. Secondly, training and education was selected because it is believed that these factors contribute to the long term sustainability of each regeneration program and acts as a way to break the deprived out of the cycle of poverty.

Chapter 4 is essentially a comparative study of the responses gained from both interviewees. These are examined according to their opinions towards several aspects of their respective regeneration programs such as the importance of funding, the need for active participation, methods of participation and the opinions on community empowerment. This particular chapter will focus more on the interviewee’s personal experiences rather than empirical research; this has been deliberately done so to gage the relationship of public participation programs and the practitioner.

The Conclusion aims to summarise the information contained in Chapters 1 – 4. It seeks to bring together all the information provided and ultimately list observations to consider when developing a community engagement strategy. It is hoped that this chapter may enlighten and provide additional knowledge on how to effectively integrate full participation and community development in public housing regeneration. Figure 1.5.1 below is a graphical representation of the thesis structure.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW
2. Literature Review

This chapter will look at the theories relating to urban regeneration and public participation. It will begin by examining the concept of neighbourhood decline, and continue by looking at guidelines behind urban regeneration and public participation. Finally, the chapter will briefly chart Australian and British policy towards greater community engagement in public housing.

This chapter aims to give the reader background knowledge on the theories which will be discussed in the later sections of the thesis. It will provide a broad understanding of various philosophies associated with the research.

2.1 Neighbourhood Decline

One of the key reasons behind the need for urban regeneration, in particular in public housing estates, is due to neighbourhood decline. Evidence from a wide variety of sources has indicated that the main causes of neighbourhood change are usually socio-economic. These include elements such as loss of employment or increased poverty (see Maggin, 2007; Randolph & Judd, 2000; Lupton, 2003; Arthurson & Jacobs, 2004). Changes such as these often have a profound effect on other factors within the area resulting in a shift in the housing market, social relations and the physical environment (Lipsky, 1980). Figure 2.1.1 on the following page indicates the cycle of neighbourhood decline which is often associated with public housing estates. Megbolgube et. al (1996) suggest that one of the first steps towards decline is often a result of poorly planned or sub-par housing which then leads to a variety of other factors, these unfortunately, are most commonly evident in public housing estates.

Both Bonnyrigg and Castle Vale were planned using the Radburn Design which advocated ‘back to front’ houses that faced communal open space areas and the use of cul-de-sacs. The design which had been a model for many public housing estates at the time aimed at providing access for car usage and recreation (see Figure 2.1.2). Unfortunately, the design has been linked to fostering anti-social behaviour and ghettoism mainly due to the absence of casual surveillance as a result of the back to front designs (Birch, 1980).
Figure 2.1.1: Neighbourhood Decline Cycle most common in public housing estates (Houghton & Power, 2007: 137)

Figure 2.1.2: Typical Radburn Design (Aurbach, 2006)
The next step is often the departure of more well-to-do tenants due to housing deterioration and as a result, a reduction in the tenant waiting list for the area. As dwellings begin to lose their attractability, letting difficulty increases and the estate becomes a breeding ground for ‘second choice’ residents; those who are forced to take up these dwellings due to circumstance. In most cases, they become accepted by more vulnerable households (Agulnik & Hills, 2002).

Research (see Milligan, 2009; Wu, 2007) suggests that there are three categories of vulnerable households, those with social problems, thus resulting in a higher demand for social services and public infrastructure, ‘problem’ households, consequences in a lack of social order leading to crime and anti social behaviour and low income families resulting in a decline in private sector houses and decreased economic activity. This is particularly common in public housing estates in Australia where there is a relatively low housing stock over the state resulting in the housing of families considered the most in need (Milligan, 2009).

The need to accommodate the household rather than a desire to live in the certain area causes a rejection of the surrounding social environment from the tenants leading to poor physical environmental factors such as vacant homes, vandalism, a reduced social organisation such as smaller social circles, mistrust and a perceived sense of powerlessness. These factors once again contribute to a departure of households which contributes to the cycle once again (Agulnik & Hills, 2002).

It is argued that this neighbourhood decline can only be broken with the help of public intervention and restructuring. Urban regeneration therefore becomes one of the many tools to revitalise estates and contribute positively to the surrounding environment. Past attempts at urban regeneration have focused mainly on a ‘one size fits all’ approach in which policies and plans are simply implemented upon the area without consideration for community aspirations. These, have often resulted in what many have called ‘failures’ in urban regeneration and the introduction of external factors such as loss of character and disillusionment. This has served to push disadvantaged households out of these newly regenerated areas and into others increasing concentrations of deprivation (Houghton & Power, 2007; Robert & Sykes, 2000).

Policy approaches and programs have now been directed towards community development as a key component in regeneration programs. These have been a result of increased encouragement from literature and working experiences supporting resident involvement. Many believe that partnerships between differing sectors become prominent in the long term sustainability of these projects.
2.2 Urban Regeneration and Collaborative Planning

Drawing on literature from Roberts & Sykes (2000) and Healey (1997) an understanding of urban regeneration and collaborative planning is firstly explained and then collaborated.

Urban regeneration (sometimes known as urban renewal) has been a concept discussed within planning circles for the last few decades. Stemming from the need to identify and resolve urban problems, urban regeneration has undergone dramatic changes to shape cities, towns and neighbourhoods (Roberts and Sykes, 2000). The concept of urban regeneration can be difficult to define as it branches from the desire to change physical, social, economical, and environmental processes operating within an area. In particular, urban regeneration is dictated by political and social trends which may change the very nature of the regeneration process. The theory also increases in complexity when political elements begin the dictated nature of the activity (Bianchini & Parkinson, 1994).

Roberts & Sykes (2000) defines urban regeneration as:

“comprehensive and integrated vision and action which leads to the resolution of urban problems and which seeks to bring about a lasting improvement in the economic, physical, social and environmental of an area that has been subject to change” (Roberts & Sykes, 2000: 17). This definition draws upon Lichfield (1992) and Hausner (1993)’s regeneration principles relating to place making and public housing.

Lichfield (1992) in her book Urban Regeneration for the 1990’s emphasises the need to understand the reasons behind social decline in housing estates whilst Hausner (1993) notes that some of the main weaknesses of most regeneration schemes are inherent in the short sighted nature of projects where schemes become “short term, fragmented, ad hoc and project based without an overall strategic framework for city-wide development” (Roberts & Sykes, 2000: 17). Both these theories recommend the need to better understand environmental processes existing in an area and of course, the importance of strategic development.

Both also call for a co-ordinated and long term approach to urban regeneration projects which can complement and improve the various processes active within the city. The emphasis of the definition is on the complex and ever changing nature of the city; a unique landscape which incorporates a variety of different systems. Power & Houghton (2007) furthers this definition by comparing a city to a jigsaw; a puzzle made from different pieces which both operate independently and jointly to make a whole, an organism which is a product of social and environmental trends. This is similar to Healey’s (1997) definition of collaborative planning which will be discussed later in this section.
In essence, successful urban regeneration projects seek to examine the big picture and set out to understand how each piece interconnects with one another. The function of urban regeneration is to improve processes and environments so that the pieces of the puzzle fit better together.

Roberts & Sykes (2000) identifies several key principles of urban regeneration. More importantly, the authors create a list of items which regeneration should achieve. These propose that urban regeneration should:

- “be based upon a detailed analysis of the condition of an urban area;
- Be aimed at the simultaneous adaptation of the physical fabric, social structures, economic base and environmental condition of an urban area;
- Attempt to achieve this task of simultaneous adaption thorough the generation and implementation of a comprehensive and integrated strategy that deals with the resolution of problems in a balanced, ordered and positive manner;
- Ensure that a strategy and the resulting programs of implementation are developed in accord with the aims of sustainable development;
- Set clear operational objectives which should, wherever possible, be quantified;
- Make the best possible use of natural, economic, human and other resources including land and existing features of the built environment;
- Seek to ensure consensus through the fullest possible participation and co-operation of all stakeholders with a legitimate interest in the regeneration of an urban area; this may be achieved through partnership and other modes of working;
- Recognise the importance of measuring the progress of strategy towards the achievement of specified objectives and monitoring the changing and influence of the internal and external forces which act upon urban areas;
- Accept the likelihood that initial programs of implementation will need to be revised in line with such changes as they occur;
- Recognise the reality that the various elements of a strategy are likely to make progress at different speeds; this may require the redirection of resources or the provision of additional resources in order to maintain a broad balance between the aims encompassed in a scheme of urban regeneration and to allow for the achievement of all the strategic objectives.”

(Sykes & Roberts, 2000: 19)
These principles emphasise the need for a co-ordinated, area-wide strategic approach to urban regeneration schemes and also the recognition that each place is unique in its own nature. This is echoed by Power & Houghton (2007: 2) who state that “there is no single solution that can be applied everywhere – one size does not fit all”. Above all, the principles highlight the need for effective stakeholder communication to create these multifaceted solutions; drawing on the ideologies of collaborative planning.

Healey (1997) highlights the importance of the new institutional theory and collaborative planning as it is central position in the establishment of successful regeneration programs. Within the theories, Healey explains that methods of conflict mediation and consensus building can lead to a wider understanding of different ideologies as well as a reflection on the individual or organisation’s own values; these build up social capital can later be reused when dealing with similar conflicts.

Social capital are “the rules, norms, obligations, reciprocity and trust embedded in social relations, social structures and society’s institutional arrangements which enable members to achieve their individual and community objectives” (World Bank, 2000). It is important because it allows members of the community (particularly in the case of urban regeneration) to express their opinions and desired outcomes which can then be included into the strategy.

Social capital is achieved through active participation and strengthened of community ties. Some argue that the best way to do this is to allow external forces to establish self-help groups in order to aid the community (Sabel, 1994). Others state that external agents should not create groups but instead support those that are already in existence.

However, this particular option becomes a point of contention when the mere announcement of donor or NGO support may lead to the creation of new groups; the attraction of funding for programs often drives a group of residents or activists with the same objectives to form organisations to bid for this funding in order to achieve those objectives. In this way, the external forces create these organisations in an indirect manner.

Hobbs (2000) notes that difference between support and creation (animated mobilisation) may be that support programs reach the well informed and connected whereas mobilisation may be capable of reaching the marginalised and vulnerable.

The diagram on the following page shows the steps involved in strengthening social capital in most urban regeneration projects. It illustrates the steps that organisations might take in order to better strengthen and create social capital within policy planning projects. Figure 2 will now be explained with special consideration to urban regeneration.
Animation refers to the assisting of local people to stimulate their awareness of their own resources and infrastructure. In particular, animation helps the community to examine and explain what types of changes are desired.

Structuring relates to the development of internal cohesion and solidarity among the community to form community organisations or groups while facilitation is the assistance of certain members of the community to undertake specific tasks these may include education in technical or managerial aspects of the estate/program, the ability to translate ideals or opinions into feasible strategies and gaining resources.

Intermediary refers to the organisation’s role as a mediator and communicator between the community and external services; this aims to establish contact with other communities and organisations as well as educating residents on how to deal with them.

Linking aims to provide the community with communication with other estates or areas which are facing similar problems so that an active dialogue can be established and finally withdrawal refers to the exit strategies or establishing ways for the community to take over responsibilities previously set out by the organisation.

Figure 2.2.1: Dimensions to strengthening social capital (Oakley et al., 1999).
In particular, theories relating to collaboration are especially relevant to building social capital and creating forums for better communication. Some of these theories are derived from theologies which mark the foundation of collaborative planning this is particularly the case for New Intuitionalism. New Institutionalism draws upon Marxist theory which acknowledges the presence of social superpowers or social constructs; those which influence our opinions, interactions, relationships and learning. In this theory, individuals are influenced by two factors: social life - ingrained influences such as decisions on stereotypes and evaluation on individuals and social constructs - forces which dictate our behaviour such as laws and economic development (Healey, 1997).

It is Healey’s (1997) belief that local problems are caused not only by individuals interacting with one another for their own interests but by society and values as well. Unlike Marxist theory, new Institutionalism focuses on the way that forces move within and are ingrained within our social life.

In this case, the theory believes that individuals actively seek to create and change these social constructs by making choices. The choice to maintain, alter or transform structures allows us to either accept or reject these into our “social embeddeness” (Healey, 1997: 57). It is through these choices that we create our own identities and relationships; interactions with other individuals create a shared understanding and mutual trust creating “webs” of intellectual and social capital. These, according to Healey (1997) can also be called upon at a later date.

Collaborative planning therefore looks at the way that these webs of information and relationships interact. It sets the premise that each person is connected to another through choices and the environment, these points of intersection are known as nodes which become places where network systems may interact and lean from one another. Healey (1997) believes that one cause of local environmental conflicts is that people confront each other from very different relational positions without a history of past encounters. In this way, they may not fully understand or comprehend other positions and there is no social capital or bond to fall back on.

Returning to Roberts & Sykes (2000) definition of urban regeneration, we see that the act of renewal is to create an overarching solution to local problems. In accordance to definition the stated opinion of this thesis is that that urban regeneration is the perfect forum to promote and nurture networks so that they may co-exist in a locality which in turn enables conflict resolution.
Stemming from this thought, community focused urban regeneration is therefore vital in the promotion of community cohesiveness. The effort of urban regeneration not only revitalises the physical environment but it has the potential to create social and intellectual capital within the suburb or housing estate. It brings together individuals with different takes and interests which may be operating in different networks within the community and promotes communication.

2.3 Public Participation

In the previous section, the importance of open communication in urban regeneration projects was discussed. These, are seen later within the case studies as a way to promote understanding and foster community cohesiveness.

The following builds on this by introducing theories behind Public participation. Public participation not only builds on social capital but allows open communication between the community and the regeneration organisation.

Participation can be different according to various situations; this is due to the contextual nature of the topic which will vary according to circumstances (Sandoff, 2000). It involves an interaction process between communities, private organisations and public agencies thus giving opinion to matters which affect them (Munro-Clark, 1992).

Creighton (2005) notes that participation must be an integral part of the development process otherwise it is a complete waste of time. Participation programs must therefore effectively provide opportunities for participants to become a useful influence in the decision-making process. To this end, there is no such thing as a one-size-fits-all participation program.

Through this process leadership and communication is built and allows for a full representation of many different aspects of the community (Sandoff, 2000). Public participation also proposes to encourage information exchange, conflict resolution and provide a supplementation to planning and design. It reduces the feeling of anonymity and communicates to the individual an increased degree of concern on the part of the administration.

Deshler & Sock (1985) in their paper Community Development Participation: A concept review of the international literature identifies two levels of participation within the community involvement sphere. These are:

- Pseudo participation which includes domestication - the act of simply informing, therapy and manipulation and Assistencialism – the act of placation and consultation and
- **Genuine participation** including co-operation – the act of partnership and delegation of power and citizen control which is similar to empowerment.

The above two categories represent the amount of power communities and individuals receive in project; a scheme where the decisions are controlled by the administrator is considered pseudo participation whilst a project where the community acts as the deciding body is within the genuine participation category (Sandoff, 2000).

Public participation emerged originally as a result of the popular participation programs run the United Nations. These programs required the creation of opportunities for the local people to voice, be involved in and share decisions in the development process (Sandoff, 2000). In the United States, public participation was mostly influenced by the grass roots movement linked to American civil rights actions (Sandoff, 2000). This, particular movement was further legitimised by government funded programs involving social reform known as the ‘War on Poverty’.

Although this period of time saw many protest marches and dissention throughout the continent, the wide variety of topics covered and the frequency of these protests meant that not all of the proposed reforms were undertaken (Sandoff, 2000). Even so, the civil rights movements in America had a more far reaching influence in the form of theory and international reform.

The Alinsky Model of community organisation which focused on a more confrontational approach to community action was created as a result of problems witnessed by Saul Alinksy. Alinksy who is considered to be one of the fathers of modern American community organisation pioneered the organisation of protests and radical movement within the northern states of America particularly in Chicago. He believed in the mobilisation of the poor and neglected to form organisations with a collective cause, his methods were sometimes considered to be too radical by many of the liberalists at the time (Sandoff, 2000).

Another and perhaps more important influence in relation to this thesis report is the international ‘follow-on’ affects that these movements had on public participation and planning, particularly in England and Australia.

Fuelled by the centralist nature of the post-war government and increased support for Marxist theory, both Australia and England experienced a period of dissidence and critique towards the capitalist methods of urban planning (Gleeson & Low, 2000; Hamnett & Freestone, 2000).
In Australia, the 1960’s saw rise to an increased concern for urban poverty and aboriginal civil and land rights. The 1975 Poverty Report released to the Commonwealth government by Prof. Ronald Henderson firmly presented evidence of poverty within Australian cities particularly those of Aboriginal Australians which were previously undetected (Gleeson & Low, 2000).

The result was an increase in public interest in planning decisions whilst the rise of media and popularity of organised protests and calls for greater transparency and participation in government plans meant that the local councils had greater and more direct contact with social and urban problems (Morison, 2000). Critiques of the planning system at the time began to emerge, although highly geared towards Marxist theory these, according to Morison (2000), provided to be instrumental in the renewed concern for social justice and development within the Australian political sphere.

Perhaps the most famous of these critiques was Sandercock’s (1975) scathing assessment and exploration into urban planning practices. Society, according to Sandercock (1975) was ingrained in capitalist nature and planning was an instrument which not only promoted but aids this process. Sandercock’s book influenced a number of different critiques especially on the role of the professional role of the planner during the 1970’s.

Although there was existing criticism on overcrowding and slum clearance in inner city areas within England, this did not gain momentum until the 1960’s. The release of Townsend and Abel-Smith’s (1975) famous book The Poor and the Poorest brought to light the extent of poverty within cities despite periods of economic growth, providing a catalyst for similar studies such as the abovementioned 1975 Poverty Report.

The 1960’s marked a period of extraordinary social growth within England and a series of recommendations and reports resulted. Some, like the Seebohm Report (1968) which recommended the combining of previously separate welfare, health, childcare and social service systems proved to increase government efficiency and was firmly supported by the medical community within England (Scott, 1969).

The late 60’s also marked the inclusion of public participation in The Town and Country Planning Act of 1968. The provisions within the act required local councils to advertise development applications and allow for objections from the public. Although this type of public participation was minimal at best, it provided a catalyst to calls for greater community involvement (Deakin & Wright, 1990).
As a reaction to the 1968 Town and Country Planning Act, the Skeffington Report (1969) was published. The Report aimed to introduce local and state governments to the importance of citizenship participation in urban planning, and provided information which promoted the “act of sharing in the formulation of policies and proposals” (Skeffington Report, 1969:1). These methods included holding public meetings, the creation of exhibitions and the inclusion of the media.

During this time, the government began a series of urban experiments partly due to increased pressure from academics and the public and partly as a way to better understand the social and environment problems which had come to light. Programs such as Community Development Projects (CDPs) attempted to understand the reasons behind deprivation in inner city estates began to emerge.

The outcome was a greater diversification of urban planning schemes within both England and Australia which involved a higher quality of physical, social and environment problem management. The importance of planning and social justice was highlighted by an array of academics and professionals resulting in a greater concentration on public participation.

Community organisation was becoming a major topic during this time, one form of organisation was the already discussed Alinsky model whilst an alternative model took a less confrontational approach and this was known as the consensus organisation approach. Similar to Healey (1997)’s recommendations, the consensus organisation approach attempted to establish partnership between the public and private sectors by providing a platform for members to use their skills for the good of the community (Sandoff, 2000).

The particular concept focuses on a relationship building approach which begins with the identification of local commercial and cultural institutions and the ability of these firms to provide financial support and responsibility to the organisational process as well as an examination of local government and private services. This particular assessment helps identify groups which could potentially lead the project and provide useful information to administrators (Sandoff, 2000).

The other characteristic of public participation and particularly community building approaches is its focus on people’s efforts. According to Sandoff (2000), residential driven initiatives such as urban regeneration programs with a high degree of public participation have a “greater chance of success because residents are more aware of the realities of their own environment than outside professionals. “They have a sense of what will work and what will not work” (Sandoff, 2000: 7).
This particular point is extremely important because it highlights one of key elements of successful regeneration programs. Particularly in the case of Castle Vale, we will examine how the establishment of a community based panel and the involvement of the housing estate affected the regeneration project. The point above will be emphasised throughout this thesis.

Adding onto Healey (1997)'s theories discussed the previous section, public participation provides a combination of a top down and bottom up approach which creates partnerships and builds social and human capital. This is often exemplified by the use of community groups to partake in certain project tasks such as youth groups to undertake survey studies. Another advantageous result of the public participation process is the ability for professionals to undertake an inventory of community asserts early on in the project and thus devise ways to take advantage of them. This could prove to be particularly useful in reducing operational costs (Sandoff, 2000).

A review of the literature presented regarding the theories and practices of public participation was summarised by Sandoff (2000) in his book *Community Participation in Design and Planning*. He notes that so of these theories include:

- The main role of the professional to encourage debate and promote awareness within the community. His/her work does not become unchangeable but rather the opposite; the solution or project scheme comes from a dialogue between the professionals and the participants with the professional providing expert and technical opinions and the participants providing ideas and experiences
- Designs and projects should be transparent so that those who are affected by the scheme may understand it easily
- Public participation meetings are useful ways to encourage people to openly express opinions and suggestions. These help to strengthen not only the end result of the project but help strengthen the user group through learning
- As projects may require technical solutions, there is a high possibility that professionals from many other fields will be involved. This fosters multi-disciplinary interaction and thus bonds and relationships
- Final decisions within projects are not necessarily final and can change and differ according to new information or community opinion. Theoretical solutions to problems may not always work and thus practical efforts and experience may be required
Points one (1) and five (5) in the summary on the previous page represent another important factor in this thesis by highlighting the ever changing nature of urban regeneration projects particularly when involving public participation. This is one of the dominating characteristics in both of the case studies examined.

The thought that perhaps not all theoretical and proposed decisions may be entirely beneficial and work efficiently in reality is highlighted by Power & Houghton (2007) in their book *Jigsaw Cities*. *Jigsaw Cities* illustrates this point by examining the progress and growth of British cities and how solutions which seem perfect in theory may lead to disastrous consequences in reality. Thus the information above emphasises the need for public participation in urban regeneration however, there is no specification of who should participate. The correct answer is everyone but in reality this is not the case. Studies show that education, socioeconomic status, economic power, residential stability and sex are among the main factors in dictating whether an individual participates in the planning process.

Miller (1988) in his study of participants and non-participants finds that:

“The [typical] participant is a married, middle-aged, well-educated man who is active in voluntary organisations. His income is higher than average; he owns his own home and car; he has resided in the area a long time and is active in local politics” (Miller, 1988 taken from Munro-Clark, 1992: 14).

Miller (1988) found that most participants understandably were those who had direct economic interest in land use matters however representatives of large scale corporations rarely participated as they are able to exert influence through other means.

Although this may be true in most planning cases, urban regeneration in public housing estates such as those discussed later may be the exception as they typically focus on low income, socially deprived areas. However, in most cases of public participation, we find an over-representation of the group stated in Miller’s findings. This of course, can cause different results in the eventual project decision making process and in some cases of urban regeneration omit the groups which require the most support.

Sandoff (2000) strongly advocates the inclusion of youth groups within the regeneration process as it creates a sense of belonging, decreased alienation, empowerment, promotes skill development, increased volunteering, reduce vandalism and increase collaboration in future schemes.
Participation can potentially enhance their roles within society leading to a reduction in youth related problems. Although public participation is advantageous in many ways including the increased knowledge of local problems from local people, the increased sense of influence exhibited by the end user group, a resulting design which promotes transparency through learning and the ability for professionals to gather up-to-date information it also has a number of disadvantages (Sandoff, 2000: Munro-Clark, 1992).

Aside from the possibility of over-representation from certain groups within the community, public participation is both time and resource consuming resulting in delays in project timelines. Critiques of public participation undertaken during the late 1960s as a reaction to its inability to cause social reform found that:

- Public participation was not progressive and it hindered the project process
- Activists acted on their own personal interest more than the community’s
- Enforced the status quo in allowing people to co-operate with authorities and disregard specific groups. (Munro-Clark, 1992)

Although many of these problems may still occur today, public participation is still vital for the transparency and eventual success of urban regeneration projects. Community involvement and public participation has become one of the main elements in the decision making process both within Australia and England.

Public participation creates a forum where social, intellectual and human capital can be developed to bring together professionals, organisations and the community creating a better outcome for urban regeneration schemes. It proves to be, as will be discussed later, one of the main reasons behind success renewal projects.

### 2.4 Towards Community Focused Urban Regeneration in public housing

As the previous two sections have highlighted, the growing recognition of community in urban regeneration projects has become an increasingly important issue in recent years. The case studies which will be discussed in Chapter 3 will examine how community participation has operated within the regeneration process of these public housing estates and how these have or could potentially result in more sustainable regeneration efforts. As previously stated, there is an increasing recognition from policy makers, private developers and registered landlords that the community are a body of multi function entities which hold a great deal of expertise and knowledge (Maginn, 2007).
Both in Australia and the UK, there has been a shift away from direct provision of public housing to favouring rent assistance or a reliance on private market solutions. This has been exhibited by the introduction of the Right-to-Buy scheme in the United Kingdom allowing tenants to purchase their government owned houses at a discounted price according to various conditions and the decline of commonwealth funding in Australia for the provision of public housing leading housing authorities to favour market trends rather than intervention from the public sector (Miligan, 2009; CHP, n.d).

In both countries, the realisation that public housing contained concentrations of deprivation, chronic unemployment and polarisation has become increasingly evident. Policy over time has evolved from regeneration from a purely development orientation to one which includes community development.

The realisation that public participation is needed in large scale regeneration of public housing has been supported by governments, practitioners and the community. There has been a shift in recent years towards a greater involvement in the community the government policies have highlighted the need to not only improve the built environment but also on the importance of services, employment and crime reduction.

The New Deal for Communities program established by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) in UK exemplifies this change. The £2 billion program looks at changing the social disadvantage in communities by utilising area based initiatives with the need for local communities to ‘step up’ and take control. This decentralised approach takes on a greater flexibility in policy creation and looks creating solutions which fit the processes and context of the locality (Lawless, 2004).

In NSW, there has been a history of community involvement particularly in public housing. The very first of these programs began with the introduction of the Neighbourhood Improvement Programs (NIP) which began the process of both social improvement and development. This program has evolved overtime to become the current Living Communities project a public private partnership focused on community renewal and urban development (Judd & Randolph, 2000; Judd et. al, 2005).

2.5 Summary

This chapter has examined the theoretical components which have led to a greater need for public participation in urban regeneration and especially public housing estates. The traditional methods of ‘top down’ planning have now been replaced by more pragmatic approaches which cover a range of different socio-economic issues (Maginn, 2007).
The face of urban regeneration has changed; it not only focuses on the physical aspects of the environment (although development still plays a large role), instead it now includes a social component. Community participation and engagement is now seen as a vital aspect to the long term sustainability of urban regeneration and has been argued as a new frontier to planning (see Carley & Kirk, 1998).
3. CASE STUDIES
This chapter will look at the context and master plans of the two case studies; Castle Vale (Birmingham, UK) and Bonnyrigg (Sydney, Australia).

The master plans for both estates are complex and involve a variety of different elements including crime prevention, physical regeneration, health improvements, education and training and economic stimulus. A detailed description of all these components cannot be listed in this thesis due to word constraints.

This chapter focuses on two specific aspects of the projects rather than give a brief description of all of the components. This has been done because I believe an in-depth examination of two elements would give a better understanding to the project than brief descriptions. The two aspects that this research will be centred on are the physical regeneration and education and training programs, for the following reasons:

1). Physical regeneration is often the most obvious part of the urban renewal process and perhaps the most key concern for residents, due to this; it is often the most community participation intensive.
2). Research has found that education and training initiatives provide an important way to communicate and form stronger relationships with marginalised groups which do not wish to participate in the traditional brainstorming or consultation group sessions (Stubbs & Storer, 1996). This would effectively reduce the opportunities for under-representation.

3.1 Case Study 1 – Castle Vale, Birmingham (United Kingdom)

Castle Vale is located in the city of Birmingham. Birmingham is one of the major cities within the UK, located approximately 100 miles north west of London and it is considered to be the second most populous city within England (see Figure 3.1.1).

Figure 3.1.1: Map of Birmingham in relation to England (UKBorders, 2009 adapted Xian, 2009)
Birmingham has a population of 1,006,500 with a majority of inhabitants being between 20 – 24 years of age. There are 40 wards currently within Birmingham each with approximately 24,400 people (see Figure 1). A ward is an elected district within a city which is represented by a Councillor, they are a British unit of local administrative and electoral geography. Castle Vale is located in the ward of Tyburn (see Figure 2) (Birmingham city Council, 2009).

Birmingham has had a long history of public housing beginning in the early 18th century and continuing into the present day. The Council currently holds the second largest stock of council housing in the United Kingdom (71,000 dwellings) with the city of Glasgow owning the most (Birmingham City Council, 2009). Its current policy seeks to privatise or give a larger proportion of these houses to Housing Associations in order to maintain their upkeep and as a result of this, the amount of public housing have been reduced to a great extent over time (Power & Houghton, 2007).

3.1.1 Castle Vale, Birmingham

Castle Vale is a housing estate located within the city of Birmingham, UK. It is approximately 5 miles north-east of Birmingham City Centre and is bounded by several major transport routes including the M6, A38 and the east midlands railway (see Figure 3.1.2).

Figure 3.1.2: Map of Castle Vale in relation to Birmingham (UKBorders, 2009; Google Maps, 2009 adapted by Xian, 2009)
Castle Vale has had a long and often turbulent history. The original land was purchased by Birmingham City Council in 1962 under an initiative to provide additional housing on the outskirts of the city. The aim was to provide cheap affordable houses for the 50,000 residents waiting to be housed as a result of slum clearance policies in the 1950s, unfit housing and increased immigration. This coincided with the council’s long history of public housing development immediately preceding the post World War II period (Power & Houghton, 2007).

Early plans for development were met with controversy and many argued for it to remain undeveloped. For one, the site which had previously been the Castle Bromwich Airfield was part of Birmingham’s green belt and any development would be in clear breach of this policy, the second most important argument was that the absence of services available in the area would potentially result in the exclusion of residents from the inner city. As a result, the site was left untouched for a number of years (Bateson, 2005).

The corresponding years saw the Council focus heavily on the reducing the housing waiting list and projected overspill of people (60,000) as a result of the 1940’s housing conference held in the city (Bateson, 2005). The Council needed to devise efficient methods of increased housing provision and due to this the decision to create a master plan for Castle Vale along with other outlying estates was supported.

Castle Vale’s master plan was part based the Radburn layout, which surrounded the estate with transport routes and created superblocks of housing, retail, café and community services. 3000 houses were grouped in small cul-de-sacs and living and sleeping areas faced onto parklands while service rooms were located near roads. This meant that many of the houses built as a result did not front the street (Gatti, 1989). As well as the houses 2000 concrete high rises were proposed along with two shopping centres, five schools, two churches, a swimming pool and other community facilities. The main feature of the estate was the construction of 34 tower blocks which dominated the Birmingham skyline (see Figure 3.2.2) (CVCHA, 2008). Castle Vale was built as the largest tower block estates of its kind in Birmingham with 30% of the estate built for private sale. This meant that there was a large proportion of mixed tenure in the estate (Mornemont, 2005).
The tower blocks were considered to be revolutionary architecture for its time, the inclusion of private bathrooms and hot running water made this type of accommodation extremely attractive as this was not a previously a norm in previous Council owned dwellings. A total of 20,000 residents were decanted from inner city back-to-back housing to the estate, at no point were residents and potential tenants’ opinions considered or asked whether they would have preferred alternative forms of housing (Roy, 1995 from Mornement, 2005).

Evidence of cost saving initiatives during the construction of 34 tower blocks could clearly be seen. Many of the walls began to crack and large portions of the high rise buildings fell off. The experimental and often low quality construction of the blocks meant that apartments were poorly ventilated, always damp and reacted poorly to insulation.

The close living proximity of neighbours caused deterioration in the standard of living as well as in the area (see Figure 3.2.3). Most of the tenants who had strong social and environmental connections with their previous residences, felt the sudden change and subsequent loss of social networks which made readjustment extremely difficult. The increased costs associated with electricity and gas heating which were previously not considered also placed a greater financial burden on tenants and isolated from services in the inner city meant increased travel costs (Mornement, 2005).

As the high rise buildings became the focal point of discontent and the continued relocation of new residents eroded community cohesion, turnover rates increased dramatically. In particular the centre 8 towers which were a row of 8 tower blocks (see in Figure 3) and Farnborough Road which housed 14 smaller tower blocks were the main areas of interest for crime and drug trafficking. In
1992 the Health Needs Assessment revealed that the average life expectancy in Castle Vale was 68.3 years when compared to the national average of 76 and crime rates were above the average of both the city and national numbers (Mornement, 2005).

In 1983 Beryl Bainbridge and a BBC crew set out across England to document the work lives of the English people in various towns and cities. Castle Vale was one of the featured estates. Afterwards, in her book *Forever England: North and South* written on the series, Bainbridge noted that “the unemployed of the 1930s at least had a structure of home and chapel to support them; nothing then could have matched the degradation of being out of work and an inhabitant of Castle Vale.” (Bainbridge, 1987).

The absent of vital services on the estate such as banks and health care and the decline of British manufacturing during the 1980’s saw the relocation of several larger businesses such as Dunlop tyres from the surrounding area. The dissolute atmosphere and notorious nature of ‘The Vale’ meant that businesses were reluctant to operate in the estate. This accumulated to job losses and reduced job opportunities which furthered to deteriorate the estate (BirminghamUK.com, n.d). Birmingham City Council did not have the financial capabilities to continually maintain the different aspects of the estate as tower block fixtures had consumed a large proportion of their budget and thus Castle Vale remained unpleasant and unattractive.

During the late 1980s and towards the mid 1990s a number of social experiments were introduced throughout England in an attempt to reduce poverty and bridge the deprivation gap within cities. Housing Action Trusts (HATs) were a part of these experiments, they involved the designation of specific non departmental bodies to lead projects in areas identified as locations with high multiple deprivation. These experiments meant that large amounts of Council housing stock were transferred out of council control and place solely in the responsibility of the HAT board (Balchin & Rhoden, 2002). The residents, along with Council decided that this would provide the perfect opportunity to revitalise Castle Vale without the need to utilise further funds from Birmingham.

However, the initial conception of the urban regeneration program was a difficult one. Castle Vale had become a notorious estate both within Birmingham and nationally, media coverage of crime, violence and homelessness had highlighted the state of decay experienced by the estate (CVCHA, n.d).

Local resident and former chair of Housing in Birmingham Council, Stan Austin realised the need for drastic action. Along with other members of the community and Derek Waddington, the director of housing they lobbied the Council to encourage a Housing Association model within the estate to
kick-start regeneration. Initially, the Labour led Council were reluctant as opposing political powers meant that the estate would be controlled by the Conservative government in power at the time but as lobbying persisted, a feasibility study was established and a tenant ballot which resulted in 92% being in favour of the set up of a Housing Action Trust (HAT) in 1992. This meant that the formation of a HAT became the best option for revitalisation (Mornement, 2005).

The seeds of community involvement were subsequently planted; the need to consult the tenants of the estate to begin urban regeneration was a precursor to the intensive public participation program which would run parallel to the physical and social regeneration taking place within Castle Vale.

Public participation and community involvement has been ingrained into every aspect of the Castle Vale urban regeneration programs. Since its completion in 2005 and the subsequent departure of the Castle Vale Housing Association Trust, the community run Castle Vale Neighbourhood Partnership Board has continued to provide services and education to members of the estate (CVCHA, n.d).

Castle Vale became one of the six locations designated for HAT renewal. The trust was set up in 1993 with 13 members, three of which were resident representatives and one permanent resident as CEO. A 12 year program was created with all of the Council owned houses being transferred to the HAT. These dwellings would be given back to the Council upon the completion of the 12 year scheme.

One of the main differences between the Trust and the Council was the initiative to take an onsite holistic approach to regeneration. Tess Randles, former public relations officer for the HAT at Castle Vale summarised their public participation approach by saying “we believe in involving people. We ask them constantly how they want to see the estate develop. We encourage them to join committees. And when our job is finished, we hope the people who live here will decide how Castle Vale should be run.” (Mornement, 2005 p. 109). The Council tended to keep an arm’s length approach to the maintenance of the estate, the HAT opted for a more place based approach which set out a number of priorities for the program based on community input.

The next two sections will examine the housing and development and education and training portions of the master plan. It will aim to highlight some of the community consultation efforts used by the HAT during the 12 year regeneration scheme. Alluding to some of the reasons why Castle Vale has become such a success.
3.1.2 Housing and Development

The Castle Vale estate has undergone a tremendous amount of development and renovation since 1993. This has both benefited the residents on the estate and the environmental and financial viability of Birmingham city. The first major role undertaken by the HAT was to create an inventory of all the developments, this was to better understand what action needed to be undertaken in accordance to the state and value of all the buildings in the estate. Hunt Thompson Associates was engaged to undertake this role (Mornement, 2005).

Hunt Thompson chose to commence this task with a consultation process, allowing the residents to provide input on the different types of dwellings, buildings and centres available on the estate. They also gathered information on their usage and any improvements which were needed.

The resulting document found that the estate did not cater for the needs of the residents and lacked the personality which would enable residents to see the estate as a place rather than a space (Mornement, 2005). The document therefore found that the initial Radburn design did not cater for the needs of the residents which in turn resulted in a decline in the neighbourhood. The new regeneration scheme aimed to create a better estate by creating dwellings, buildings and services which were tailored to the needs of the residents. This would provide to be more effective than the ‘one size fits all’ approach undertaken in the 1960’s.

The master plan was created to combat these elements; the development of the master plan involved the participation of all stakeholders. The participation program included brainstorming and workshop sessions to create an overall result which all stakeholders were satisfied with.

The main element of the project was the use of a holistic approach in transforming the estate. In this case, factors such as crime reduction, health, and employment and education were examined along with the physical regeneration of the area (SPP, 2004).

The main components of the development and housing context involved:

**Housing**

- The refurbishment of housing;
- The demolition of 17 tower blocks and 24 four storey maisonettes (later changed to 32 tower blocks, 27 maisonettes and 114 bungalows);
- The construction of 350 low rise housing units and 60 sheltered accommodation to replace the Centre 8 blocks;
- The construction of 44 two, three and four bedroom dwellings to replace Concorde tower (previously the highest tower block on the estate);
The construction of 11 eco-homes using sustainable and environmentally friendly materials;

The construction of 14 Tudor style dwellings as a result of the self-build program (a program which provided education and job training for local residents this will be further explained in the later section); and

The construction of 237 dwellings on Farnborough Rd comprising of two bedroom units and bungalows. These distinctive colourful dwellings were originally intended for rent but some have been sold privately due to high demand. These dwellings have become one of the distinctive characteristics of the area.

Essentially, the housing included the demolition of the majority of tower blocks for low density residential dwellings. These included the now famous colourful 2 unit and bungalow dwellings on Farnborough Rd (see Figure 5) and the construction of a number of low density flats and detached houses.

Development

The main development areas within the master plan included:

- The £35 million redevelopment of the main shopping centre which was previously a focus for criminal activity. The introduction of the supermarket giant Sainsbury’s attracted a wider demographic to the area rather than the lower market Iceland which was previously the main supermarket component within the centre;

- The redevelopment of Reed Square, Castle Vale’s other shopping district which had previously housed poor quality retail outlets. Reed Square has since been transformed into a commercial centre with office space, residential units, small neighbourhood shops and most importantly the Castle Vale Community campus building “C3”. The building provided meeting rooms, office space and adult education classes;

- The development of Farnborough Road Children’s Home. It was developed with the partnership of Birmingham’s Social Services department and the HAT. The home provides 8 beds for children in need within the Birmingham area;

- The construction of a Centre park, on the previous Centre 8 block site. It has BBQ facilities as well as sporting and play equipment;

- The construction of the Sanctuary, the main hub of the Castle Vale regeneration offices. It houses a variety of facilities including meeting rooms, a library, and computer rooms. Its main aim is to provide a meeting place for charities and organisations that do not have headquarters and form a community centre for the residents of Castle Vale. The Sanctuary was partly funded by the HAT which contributed £1 million to the project but
was mainly funded by private and public organisations forming a joint ownership of the building;

- The construction of Enterprise Park located at the east of the estate, Enterprise Park comprise 44 units for small and medium businesses and cost approximately £3.58 million to establish. This was mainly to draw in more job opportunities into the estate;

- The introduction of local art from local artists to promote community spirit, one of these is the award winning Sentinel sculpture which stands at the entrance of Castle vale. It is a memorial to the land’s former airfield use.

A graphical representation of some of the abovementioned facilities have been highlighted in Figure 3.2.5 on the following page.
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Figure 3.2.5: Map of Castle Vale Developments (adapted Xian, 2009)
3.1.3 Education and Training

Another important aspect of the urban regeneration program was the introduction of education and training for the residents of the Vale. Education and Job training involves the participation of residents and the community.

Castle Vale in 1993 was considered one of the most deprived estates within England. 40% of working adults were registered as unemployed compared to the 14% average in England. 15.7% had never worked and 36.6% had not worked in the last four years (Office of National Statistics, 1991).

The data showed that Castle Vale was in desperate need of training and education but in order to develop the most appropriate and effective programs a deeper understanding of the way that the residents operated and their social circumstances had to be achieved. The Economic and Community Development unit was created to do this and aid residents in training, career development and education. The HAT wanted to bring in a multi-skilled staff which had a variety of different experiences and degrees including specialists, community developers, special aids teachers and trainers. The unit aimed to create a ‘stepping stone’ environment where individuals could slowly learn and realise their optimum economic potential. Through this a number of partnerships and agency relationships were formed by the unit (ECOTEC, 2003).

The progression of the stepping stone program can be seen in Figure 3.2.5 below.

**Figure 3.1.5:** Outline of Education, Training & Support Program (Mornement, 2005 adapted by Xian, 2009)
Surveys into poverty and work relations have shown that welfare support systems and training programs have traditionally neglected the issue of work readiness, which is the ability for the individual to understand punctuality, absenteeism and lines of authority in the workplace (Danziger et.al, 1998). As can be seen, the Castle Vale program specifically targeted this fact by helping residents become ‘work ready’ before they are employed. This ensures the long term sustainability of job retention and employment.

The stepping stone program aided largely by funds from the Trust was able to help residents beyond the typical government initiatives available at the time which simply looked at finding employment for the jobless. The stepping stone program provided assistance in other associated elements in the residents’ daily lives such as providing child care for single parents, providing expenses for travel and clothing for interviews. This approach has since been adopted in many other government programs (ECOTECH, 2003).

The HAT also created a range of training programs aimed at re-skilling and up-skilling residents, many of these were linked directly to the development of the estate. These programs aimed to bridge the gap between interests in particular fields and being actually employed in them. Other similar programs were developed through consultation in order to identify local employment opportunities and work placement positions, some of these included a supported placement with contractors in which residents completed a college course whilst simultaneously working and gaining experience (Mornement, 2005).

The HAT also funded participating contractors in the part work/part learn scheme until the individual was considered to be financially viable (usually within 26 weeks). In addition to this, the Trust entered into discussions with major companies in close proximity to the estate such as the Jaguar factory and devised several a typical 4 week training program which allowed residents to work on a trainee basis. Although jobs were not guaranteed on the completion of the program, it gave experience opportunities and increased confidence to further find other employment in similar fields (Mornement, 2005).

Another scheme was to provide entertainment, broadcasting and marketing experience which led to the formation Vale Fm now known as Switch Radio. Established in 1995, the community radio station provided news, discussion of local issues and entertainment to local residents whilst at the same time offering job training for the unemployed. Vale Fm proved to be successful and hugely popular among a younger audience. In October 2005 it won a 5 year full time broadcasting license from OfCom the government broadcasting regulators (Hollins, 2005).
In addition to training programs, help was also given to local residents in the form of job creation. This was done so by Merlin Venture which is still currently in operation. The Merlin Venture established in 1998 was essentially an evolution of the Economics and Community Development unit and aimed to help develop businesses within the Vale. Under its umbrella, it houses a number of businesses including Twiggy Winkles Day Nurseries, community transport schemes, safety and CCTV monitoring and landscaping firms. The Venture, essentially a social enterprise provides training for local residents while also providing needed services on the estate (Mornement, 2005).

The HAT, over its lifespan has managed to both provide job opportunities for the local community and services to the residents of the estate. Their innovative models have been incorporated in many other schemes nationally and have been used as examples of best practice worldwide. This has been an effort largely due to the collaboration between residents and professionals which have achieved an outcome which balances economic gain with community support.

Currently, the lessons learnt from Castle Vale are being transferred into other estates around the nation. In 2005 the British government designed Castle Vale as a Guide Neighbourhood as part of their Guide Neighbourhood Program and the estate continues to showcase and support other similar areas undergoing regeneration.

3.1.4 Succession

Ever since the inception of the Castle Vale regeneration program, it was known to all those involved that the Trust would eventually end with the completion of the project. The Trust needed a way to ensure that the benefits of regeneration would be sustained indefinitely and the community would continue to take part in the different aspects which involved the estate. Another added problem was that the Trust was continually short on funds in 1993 there were many things to be done in Castle Vale and not enough funds to do them.

To combat these issues, the HAT devised an exit strategy which would both empower residents and result in increased funding for development. The first part of the exit strategy involved partnerships between the HAT and other housing associations within the estate. The Trust devised a scheme which allowed these housing associations to bid for a part of the development program, in this way, the HAT could utilise some of the government funding that the associations could attain to further its development schemes (Mornement, 2005). In the end, two main associations won the role – Focus Group Housing and Sanctuary.
The HAT immediately went about consulting the residents and staff on the best model of organisation to set up, the decided upon model of community housing association and thus the Castle Vale Community Housing Association (CVCHA) was created. The CVCHA is a community led organisation with 15 voluntary board members, 8 of which are local residents. In 2001 it became one of the few fully independent Housing Associations in England with a majority of residents on the board. CVCHA is a member of the Castle Vale Neighbourhood Partnership Board and provides services for other organisations such as Castle Vale Community Care Partnership and the Environmental Trust. It also supports an estate wide network of residents and community groups (CVCHA, n.d). The organisation also works with a variety of other groups and provides services such as the safety strategy which employs community wardens and works in partnership with local police and youth offending services.

The next part of the strategy involved creating a number of bodies or sub-organisations which would be responsible for different roles in the estate. These organisations would be run by a collection of residents, professionals and staff members and the aim was to allow these sub-groups to establish themselves independently to continue after the HAT’s lifespan (CVCHA, n.d).

With the introduction of the exit strategy residents became more active in the role of defining the new organisations’ roles. Prospective tenants who lived in the soon to be demolished tower blocks entered into Saturday morning sessions, working with officers to create and write key service policies for all new tenants. Many of these are now active staff and board members on the CVCHA and other associated organisations. This accordingly means that tenants are not just participants but “local people have been in control” (Mornement, 2005).

Other groups and organisations have worked effectively together to create the Castle Vale Neighbourhood Partnership Board. Figure 3.2.6 below illustrates the inter-relationship of these organisations to the regeneration of castle vale and the years they were created.
It is these organisations which have been a key theme in the development of Castle Vale’s ongoing success. Beazley (2008) noted that success in urban regeneration is not measured by how much the estate has transformed but by how sustainable the urban regeneration efforts are. By establishing the abovementioned organisations, the trust has enabled the service provision efforts and transformation of the estate to continue past its lifetime. This has been exemplified by the creation of the Castle Vale Guide Neighbourhoods chapter of the CVCHA in 2005. Castle Vale was identified by the UK government as one of the 9 organisations which acted as a beacon of good practice for resident led regeneration (DCLG, 2007).

The Guide Neighbourhoods program in Castle Vale aims to transfer the model of community led regeneration to other estates and communities who wish to further renewal their neighbourhood by utilising residents to communicate with other residents. The program includes education, mentoring and advice to newly formed organisations as well as funding and long term support for 8 other communities in the west midlands area. In addition, the Guide Consultancy service which is a spinoff of the Guide Neighbourhoods program works with other organisations within Birmingham to develop a diagnostic assessment tool for neighbourhood organisations to evaluate their progress in urban regeneration (CVCHA, n.d).
Castle Vale was chosen due to the expertise that was bestowed on the local community through the work of the HAT. This includes a wide range of skills and a wide knowledge-base including Neighbourhood action planning, estate wide CCTV planning, health improvement initiatives and community safety policies. The estate currently hosts a number of visits, participate in education programs run by the University of Birmingham and speak at various conferences. Most recently Pete Richmond CEO of CVCHA and local resident has been asked to speak at the 2009 World Sustainable Development City Forum in Korea and 11th National Sustainable Development Convention on the experiences and development of Castle Vale (CVCHA, n.d).

Towards the end of the HAT’s lifespan, there was concern over how the Council would continue the philosophy of resident involvement once the housing stock had been transferred back. To combat this issue, the Trust suggested that the tenant run Castle Vale Community Housing Association would take over the ownership of the dwellings instead of the Council. This was followed by a tenant ballot where 92% of respondents voted for CVCHA and subsequently the Housing Association became the official landlords of the new dwellings further fostering the relationship and belief of local people solving local solutions (Mornement, 2005).

Much of the success of Castle Vale has been attributed to the understanding and active participation exhibited by the residents of the community. As previously stated, the HAT were active in engaging the community in all aspects of the urban regeneration program to ensure that they “took over the reins” after the Trust’s lifetime was completed.

Castle Vale is currently operated by a fully community led Partnership Board which decides on any future development or service provision within the estate. Its ability to move independently beyond government control is a legacy of the highly integrated community building schemes and philosophy of community participation developed by the HATs.

### 3.2 Case Study 2 – Bonnyrigg, Sydney (Australia)

Sydney is the largest city in Australia. Located on the east coast, is located in the state of New South Wales (see Figure 3.3.1).
Sydney has a population of 4.3 million with a majority if inhabitants being 25 – 54 years of age. There are 40 councils and 637 suburbs within the city each varying in geographical size and population (ABS, 2006). Bonnyrigg is located within the local government area (LGA) of Fairfield city.

There are a number of public housing estates in Sydney however the stock of public housing in comparison to privately rented accommodation and owner-occupier dwellings remains relatively small; many of these have undergone renewal over time. These have been characterised by top down and demolish-decant approaches. The current policy seeks to both privatise and improve public housing suburbs through initiatives directed by NSW Housing (Milligan, 2009). Bonnyrigg is considered to be one of the first community oriented urban renewal scheme in Sydney.

3.3 Bonnyrigg, Sydney

Bonnyrigg is located approximately 4km from Liverpool and 25km west of the Sydney CBD (Coates & Shepard, 2005). The renewal area is an 81ha site located within the suburb. It is bounded by Humphries Road, Cabramatta Road, Elizabeth Drive, Bonnyrigg Avenue and Edensor Road (see Figure 3.4.1).
The estate is comprised of 833 public housing dwellings, 88 private dwellings and a large number of open space. According to ABS census data, there is a higher proportion young children living in the area and over 70% of its residents speak a language other than English at home. In addition, there are a higher proportion of people with low English proficiency living within the estate when compared to the Fairfield LGA and Sydney region. Due to a number of factors, including those mentioned previously, the estate has a higher concentration of lower income residents, high unemployment rates and crime numbers. A selection of statistics which describe the socio-economic situation which describes this is displayed in Table 3.4.1 below (ABS, 2006).

Table 3.3.1: Census data comparison of community profile statistics (ABS, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Bonnyrigg</th>
<th>Fairfield LGA</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age of Persons</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Individual Income ($/weekly)</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median family income ($/weekly)</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income ($/weekly)</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median rent ($/weekly)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of persons per bedroom</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken at home other than English (%)</td>
<td>70.94</td>
<td>45.94</td>
<td>26.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency in English (not well at all) (%)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Parent Family with children under 15 years (%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (rented) (%)</td>
<td>45.51</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>31.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The design of the estate is similar to Castle Vale’s in that they were both based on the Radburn Design for public housing. These promoted poor quality open spaces with a focus on automobile development (see Figure 3.4.2). These have caused segregation in pedestrian and vehicular networks resulting perceived and actual safety issues as well as poorly maintained open spaces (Newleaf Communities, 2009).

**Figure 3.3.2: An atypical view of a street in Bonnyrigg (Xian, 2009)**

Unlike Castle Vale, Bonnyrigg also has the added element of a high ethnic population because of this there are a number of different temples and places of worship established in the area. This has largely been a result of the high number of ethnic minorities in the area. The Cambodian Buddhist Society for example is located on Bonnyrigg Avenue next to the Bonnyrigg Shopping Plaza while the Mingyue Lay Buddhist Temple can be found on Cabramatta Road. The Mingyue Lay Temple is one of the biggest in the southern hemisphere (see Figures 13 & 14) (Coates & Shepard, 2008).

**Figure 3.3.3: Cambodian Buddhist Society on Bonnyrigg Ave (Xian, 2009)**

**Figure 3.3.4: Mingyue Lay Buddhist Temple (Xian, 2009)**


The multicultural nature of the estate brings about added difficulties when undertaking the communication processes as additional bilingual translators must be sought. In addition to the language barrier, cultural differences can also associate and become misunderstandings especially within tense environments such as community forums.

For a long period of time, Bonnyrigg had been identified by the Department of Housing as an area in need of regeneration. The SEIFA Score index which ranked neighbourhoods according to multiple deprivation factors found that Bonnyrigg was ranked within the 60% most deprived neighbourhoods in Australia (ABS, 2008). In addition to this, most of the dwellings in the estate were reaching the end of their lifetime and many of these needed to be refurbished or completely rebuilt (Judd et al, 2006).

Hence, the NSW government announced the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project. Bonnyrigg was to become the first regeneration project of its kind under the Living Communities Scheme which aimed to promote community consultation with physical and social development. Under this scheme, a public private partnership organisation would be formed which would head the regeneration efforts ensuring that all stakeholder needs would be met (Newleaf Communities n.d).

Bonnyrigg is the first Public Private Partnership of its kind to involve public housing with a community focus, with the renewal project running for a period of 12 years and the partnership running for 30. Under the renewal plans 813 public house dwellings would be demolished and 2330 would be built in its place. The 88 private dwellings located on the corner of Barraclough Way and Tarlington Parade and an additional 20 of the Department of Planning owned villas at 59 – 61 Tarlington Parade will be retained (Newleaf Communities, n.d). The renewal will significantly alter the tenure mix within the estate with 70% private dwellings and 30% to remain as public housing. However there is not intended to be a net loss of public housing (Newleaf Communities, n.d).

To determine the new public private partnership, the Department of Housing invited a number of organisations to bid for the right of management. Eventually, Bonnyrigg partnerships won out, the partnership is formed by a consortium of 4 companies which are responsible for different aspects of Bonnyrigg’s renewal. These include:

- Becton Property Group (development)
- Westpac Bank (financing)
- St George Community Housing (Community and rental assistance)
- Spotless Group (maintenance) (Newleaf Communities, n.d)
The consortium possesses not only the experience and credentials which would make the project possible but more importantly encourages a holistic approach to regeneration which is similar to the Castle Vale program. Another similarity is that both groups acknowledge the importance of an onsite team to produce a mixture of housing provisions so that the needs of the residents are provided for with minimum disruptions (Newleaf Communities, 2009).

These key objectives and the separate yet inter-related operation of Bonnyrigg Partnerships is similar to the procedures present in the Castle Vale regeneration project. The inclusion of sub organisations tailored to fit the needs of the community and is perhaps one of the success factors in sustainable urban renewal. The master plan is due to be completed over 18 stages in 13 years. The master plan and examples of the dwellings can be seen in Figure 3.4.5 on the next page.
Figure 3.3.5: Land Use Map from Bonnyrigg Master Plan (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008)
Bonnyrigg Partnerships has now been repackaged as Newleaf Communities and a separate organisation which co-ordinates the options of the abovementioned for consortium members has now been established, this organisation is known as Bonnyrigg Management. Bonnyrigg Management is responsible for liaison with the community and the development of consultation programs which dictate the direction of future projects and movements this is similar to the current operation of the Castle Vale Partnership Board as both bodies co-ordinate the activities of various other consortium members (Stevens, 2009). A diagram of their inter-relationships can be seen in Figure 3.4.6 below.

**Figure 3.3.6: Relationship of consortium members in Newleaf Communities (Stevens, 2009 Adapted Xian, 2009)**

The Bonnyrigg project is currently in its first stage which involves selling off 53 dwellings, the display homes were launched in September 2009 and the decanting of residents for this stage was completed in October of 2008 (Stevens, 2009 interview 10 Sept).

Similar to the initial intentions of the HAT, the responsibility of the new dwellings will be transferred back to the Department of Housing once the program has been completed.
3.3.1 Housing and Development

Like Castle Vale, the Bonnyrigg renewal project utilises a holistic approach which works at replacing poor quality housing and at improving the social services available within the estate. To do so, the sub-organisations work together in conjunction with the community to determine future needs (Judd et al, 2005).

According to statistics a higher proportion of residents are renting within the Bonnyrigg estate when compared to the surrounding area and the local government area (LGA). This had been traditionally associated with the public housing component existing on the estate and the Australian trend of the preference for owner-occupier accommodation rather than rentals. As Figure 17 Below indicates, there is a huge disparity between rental numbers in the Bonnyrigg estate when compared to other suburbs such as St. John’s Park (13%) and Cabramatta West (29%).

Figure 3.3.7: Proportion of households renting in the surrounding area (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008: chapter 2)

This is similar to the situation in Castle Vale as both estates have a large percentage of dwellings and units being owned by social housing landlords or the Council. However, the public housing provision mentality between the United Kingdom and Australia are largely different. Whereas England has traditionally been in support of public or social organisation housing ownership, Australia has very much been reliant on private market provisions (Milligan, 2009).
So to this extent, unlike Castle Vale the Bonnyrigg master plan aims to balance the disparity between private and public ownership numbers by increasing the amount of privately owned dwellings available for purchase. The master plan will provide a mix of 30% public housing and 70% private (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008).

Currently the master plan includes a variety of housing types within different locations. The main component of the plan include:

**Housing**

- The development of 2330 dwellings with mixed densities including detached housing, attached housing and apartment buildings. The higher density developments will be located closer to services;
- Replace 833 public dwellings houses and build 1,500 new private dwellings;
- 11% of the dwellings in the renewal project will be designed as adaptable housing which will benefit high risk households such as those with members at a frail age or disabilities;
- The development of a senior living area with 200 private independent units, a residential care facility and a aged service centre;
- 70 public housing apartments will be located adjacent to the senior living area for older tenants so that they may be closer to existing services (NCOSS, 2008; Becton, 2009)

**Development**

- The provision of better access routes to reduce alleyways
- The redesign of open space areas which make a large part of the Bonnyrigg estate
- The construction of a Bonnyrigg Neighbourhood Centre which houses a range of community services and facilities ;
- The construction of a community garden for active participation for residents to contribute to the estate;
- The introduction of local art around the estate and in particular in open space areas to promote a better relationship between the community and the land.

(Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008).

These changes have been designed with the consultation of residents and aims to provide a holistic approach to the transformation of Bonnyrigg.
3.3.2 Education and Training

As previously stated, education and training provides an important arena for communication and relationship building especially towards marginalised groups who do not fit the typical characteristics of most common participants (see section 2.3 of thesis).

Job training and education becomes increasingly important in areas where there is high unemployment and education attainment. Such is the case for Bonnyrigg. According to ABS census data, 7% of residents in the area are unemployed compared to the 5% in the Fairfield LGA and while the mean weekly income for a household is $590, this is significantly less when compared to the Fairfield LGA ($1078) and Sydney at $1417 (ABS, 2006).

In terms of education attainment, Bonnyrigg residents have relatively low educational qualifications. ABS (2006) data found that, the most common level of education attainment is a level III & IV certificate (23%) which equates to a high school graduate. A person holding this qualification as the highest educational attainment is greater in the Fairfield LGA with 26%. In addition there are a large proportion of migrants with poor language skills within the area. These factors limit the job opportunities available for residents within the estate (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008).

An extensive education and training program needs to be developed if residents wish to break the cycle of poverty which currently exists on the estate. Bonnyrigg Management has realised this and have created a number of equal access and development programs under the Community Renewal Service Plan (CRSP) (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008).

The CRSP is a multi-faceted strategy which helps to improve the different aspects of Bonnyrigg. Similar to the Castle Vale Neighbourhood Plan which looked at incorporating services and providing a better environment for local residents, the CRSP is divided into 13 sub strategies which aims to improve the migration experience into Bonnyrigg, improve health, promote further education and training, development community capacity building, promote affordable housing and develop ways to bring about better affordable housing and accommodation for various needs. The proposed education and training programs currently form part of the CRSP (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008).

The aim of the education and training program is to work with existing services to provide the best outcomes possible, target local disadvantaged people in the labour market, create accessible programs for both private and public residents and maximise opportunities for job creation within the field of renewal. To achieve this, Newleaf Communities hosted several consultation meetings to identify the main target groups which would use the program the most. The following were established as target groups for the scheme:
Older workers who need to be up skilled;
Young people at risk of leaving school without a formal qualification;
Sole parents;
People with disabilities;
Long term unemployed;
New residents in need. (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008)

To do this, Bonnyrigg Management worked with the community through bi-weekly coffee sessions to determine the direction in which these projects should be undertaken. These bi-weekly sessions which are still being held provide an informal arena where local people and the community are able to express their views and ideas (Newleaf Communities, n.d).

Preliminary sub strategies and a timeline for the education and training programs has now been determined. They are detailed in Appendix B of this thesis. The aim of the education and training schemes is to attempt to provide support for residents who wish to work but cannot due to various reasons. The scheme will include strategies to deal with disincentives to employment for tenants who are concerned about increased rental rates, loss of benefits and the need to provide additional financial means for family care (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008).

The Tenant Employment Incentive Scheme (TEIS) deals with these concerns by providing support for those entering employment. Participants of the scheme are given a 12 month grace period of non-adjustment of their subsidy of new income levels. In addition, St. George Community Housing is also working on developing a tenant support plan with the community to help those with return to work anxieties.

The education & training strategy contains 7 sub-categories which include:

**Labour Market Programs**

Newleaf Communities are working with AEMS & AEMS NESB Employment, companies based in Fairfield to create job support, training, job search, English classes and vocational classes for residents in the estate. Additional part time roles will be created for those who cannot work full time.

**Works Venture**

Similar to the Merlin Venture in Castle Vale, the Works Venture aims to provide services which are considered to be lacking in the estate. These will be identified by through a series of meetings with residents (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008).
Bonnyrigg Management and Newleaf Communities have acknowledged that modern day communications can become costly. Thus this project aims to provide public use computers with internet access in the neighbourhood centre. In addition, the Works Venture will devise a recycling scheme where computers such as Westpac donate superseded computers which are subsequently sold at affordable prices to the community (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008).

Access and Equality Programs

A number of programs under this category will provide services to marginalised members of the community including mentoring programs, English classes, literature and numeracy classes, and family oriented programs such as childcare services will be developed.

A total of 70 classes will be developed ranging from Tai Chi classes to swimming to promote healthy living. In addition, there are regular bi monthly newsletters published in the 6 main languages (Arabic, Spanish, Khmer, Lao, Vietnamese and English) and regularly monthly community get together in attempts to integrate the community (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008).

Youth Needs Services

These will target early leavers and young people at risk. Current talks are underway to extend mentoring programs and staff-to-teacher ratio programs which exist in Fairfield to Bonnyrigg. In addition, Newleaf Communities are preparing strategies to work with the existing Youth Centre located at Bonnyrigg Avenue in order to develop extensions to the work currently undertaken by the centre. There are also current plans to provide further educational programs through Smith family (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008).

Targeted Apprenticeship Programs

This specific sub strategy aims to crate apprenticeship programs with the renewal partners such as St. George Community Housing and Spotless. These programs are to provide support and work readiness training. Training for tenant management, landscaping and other skills will help give the community experience and confidence to gain further employment in similar fields.

Newleaf also proposes to create partnerships with other local training groups to result in additional education for tenants which do not necessarily relate to the regeneration efforts, these could include retail or business training. In total there will be 36 apprenticeships created from the 60 jobs which have resulted from the renewal program.
These programs, as can be seen are on a similar vein to the education programs which currently exist within Castle Vale. Both estates have created job opportunities from renewal activities which not only empowers the community but provides experience for residents as well (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008).

**Encourage & Support Entrepreneurial Activities**

Newleaf Communities will provide incubator space and seek funding for local micro-businesses to prosper. This in turn will provide additional job opportunities on the estate. In addition, the development of home based businesses will also be encouraged through Council revisions and rezoning applications (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008).

The organisation has also recently received a $1.8 million grant from the Federal Governments National Building Jobs Fund to develop a training and education program around green skills. This grant enables Bonnyrigg Management to create a variety of different employment opportunities ranging from full time roles to traineeships (Newleaf Communities, n.d; Becton, 2009). It is estimated that the fund will create additional opportunities for the community to participate in further renewal activities.

Bonnyrigg utilises a holistic approach to urban regeneration much like the case in Castle Vale. This approach includes an intensive public participation program in which the residents decide the route and pace of the regeneration schemes. This has provided opportunities for further development and greater working knowledge of the area. This will be discussed further in the Chapter 4.

### 3.4 Summary

Through the examination of the master planning operations, one key defining factor remains common in both case studies. This is the active promotion of community development as a way to improve social circumstances. This is evident through the job training consultation and tailor made programs and also in the way in which both case studies actively encourage resident participation in the sub-organisations.

In Castle Vale’s case we see how the regeneration program has improved and transformed the estate significantly to the extent where most of the social services provided are now run by members of the community. Bonnyrigg is currently undergoing their regeneration program and although it is in early stages, appears to be working successfully with the community to develop an estate which complements both the socio-economic circumstances in the surrounding area and the needs of the community.
4. RESEARCH FINDINGS
As part of the research one structured and one semi-structured interview was undertaken with two key professionals within the urban regeneration programs. The interviews aimed to gauge the professional’s opinion on the different aspects of public participation operating in their respective organisations.

Both of the interviewees had a long standing relationship with their respective case studies and have been actively involved in the projects. Professionals were specifically chosen over residents as they could provide an adequate examination of community development in relation to the theories studied in Chapter 2. A more detailed methodology of the interviews is located in Chapter 1 of this thesis.

4.1 Interviewees

**Castle Vale Community Housing Association – Ian Bingham (IB)**

Ian has been a resident in Castle Vale for 31 years. He has been a community activist since 1993 and was elected to the Tenants Representative Alliance (TRA) in 1996 finally becoming chair in 1999. Using his experience in community participation he became a Community Regeneration Outreach Worker and Co-operative Liaison Officer for the Co-operative Housing Services in 2000 and later joined the Castle Vale Community Housing Association as their Guide Neighbourhoods Co-ordinator in 2005.

As Co-ordinator, he manages the Castle Vale Neighbourhoods work, participates in lectures and liaisons with other regeneration programs to provide support and guidance. He has been an active member in most successor organisations which have been created within the estate. A copy of the signed project consent form has been attached in Appendix C of this thesis.

**Newleaf Communities – Claudia Stevens (CS)**

Claudia Stevens is the managing director of Bonnyrigg Management which is responsible for co-ordinating operations within Newleaf Communities and integrating services provided by the four consortiums (St. George Community Housing, Spotless, Becton Properties and Westpac). Prior to this role, she has worked as a consultant for Fairfield Council and Housing NSW on various projects.

She has 13 years experience in the community involvement field and comes from a cultural development background. She has had extensive knowledge of Bonnyrigg, and has worked with Housing NSW and Fairfield Council during the initial stages of the Bonnyrigg scheme. A copy of the signed project consent form has been attached in Appendix C of this thesis.
4.2 Findings

Although both interviews were conducted in a very different manner, the results were surprisingly similar. In general there was a positive appreciation for community development especially in using this as a tool for further communication with the residents. One of the key themes from these interviews was the enthusiasm and passion for the projects and also a firm belief in seeing the “community as local experts” (Stevens, 2009. Interview, 10 Sept).

Despite very different demographics, circumstances and geography many of the opinions expressed in both interviews are comparable and the projects which were described (especially the consultation processes) were similar to one another. In both interviews there were key specific focuses which came out as a defining aspect of the regeneration project. For Bingham, it was the importance of the establishment of sub-organisations throughout the lifetime of the project.

For Stevens, it was the consideration of how information was to become accessible to a wider audience especially in respect to the multi-cultural nature of each estate (Bingham, 2009, interview, 17 Sept; Stevens, 2009, interview, 10 Sept).

There were however some differences in respect to the future direction of both organisations. As both the projects are at different stages of development, the focus for future activity remains dissimilar. Castle Vale for example is currently working on the continued success of the sub-organisations to provide long term service sustainability. As Ian works with the Castle Vale Community Housing Association (CVCHA), a community-led organisation which is responsible for service provision and housing support on the estate, many of the future questions relate to the direction of the CVCHA.

On the other hand, Newleaf Communities are currently undergoing the development of Stage 1 of their operations as such Claudia Stevens’ answers are very much focused on the future of their development and ways to get the community involved at various stages. In order to determine and compare opinions in regard to the operation of the projects and of community development itself, I have separated the interview into various topics. The discussion below aims to evaluate the similarities and differences in the interviewee answers.

4.2.1 Methods of Public Participation and Community Development

Questions relating to the operationalisation of the different methods of public participation were asked. In general, both case studies seemed to exhibit an integrated public participation approach where strategy is devised with the help of consultations and workshops.
Ian Bingham noted that:

“Residents have been involved at every stage of the development of CVCHA. Prospective tenants who lived in the high rise flats and maisonettes due to be demolished and replaced with new CVCHA homes spent Saturday mornings working with officers to write the key policies that would be used to deliver services to CVCHA tenants. A number of the prospective tenants are now experienced board members. This has meant that CVCHA doesn’t just consult residents, but the local people are in control.” (Bingham, 2009, interview, 17 Sept).

In addition, the HAT had always intended for maximum resident involvement in all aspects of the project. This is reflected in the high proportions of participation and a greater number of the community make up the board of sub-organisations (listed in Chapter 3). Strategies for crime prevention, safety, education, and service provision therefore have been created along with the community.

Methods for participation included surveys, focus group meetings, discussions with community group, one-to-one consultations, active community participation sessions with tenants and tenant management teams, regular Tenant Representative Alliance (TRA) meetings with CVHAT staff and the community so that instead of tenants and landowners there was just a community that finally ensured the successful continuation of subgroups after the life of the HAT.

Furthermore a Community development team was also set up on site and staffed to deal with community opinions and to lead further consultation processes (Bingham, 2009, interview, 17 Sept). The effective use of this community development team meant that resident groups and the tenant boards could be more easily established. These boards were instrumental in giving the community a voice and would heavily advocate for resident agendas and changes in the scheme if it was not suitable for the community.

One good example of this was introduction of the tenant decant expenses packages which was a result of heavy lobbying by the TRA. This eventually led to a much better process being established with a community contract put in place between contractors, the community and the HAT. This particular incident is considered a milestone which improved the relationship of the organisation and the community (SPP, 2004). Presently, the Castle Vale Housing Action Trust, now the CVCHA is concentrating on the provision of services especially with the inclusion of the Guide Neighbourhoods Programs (see Chapter 3 for additional information on Guide Neighbourhoods).
In response to a similar question, Claudia Stevens said that due to the initial work developed by NSW Housing, the continued consultation process had been mostly directed by the members of the community. In her interview she mentions that:

“We had to find a new way of re-energising that [the community consultation process] so in typical community development spirit we handed it over to the community and asked ‘what would you like to make these monthly meetings into’ and it’s picked up really well. So now its community led, they will tell us if they want to have something about diabetes one week and something else about Centrelink payments another. So they direct the ‘traffic’ and they also give us the opportunity to present them with new information as it comes and it’s a two way flow so they can also ask us. It’s really useful and we also do these in the 5 main community languages.” (Stevens, 2009, interview, 10 Sept).

NSW Housing in collaboration with Fairfield City Council undertook a variety of programs in order to help develop the project and inform the chosen consortium (in this case, Newleaf Communities) of resident input. This is an improvement to Castle Vale where the initial participation efforts were met with little enthusiasm and at times anxiety. A community engagement review published in 2004 found that the HAT and residents were not prepared in the early years of the project. This was a result of funding uncertainties and inexperience when dealing with community development.

Bonnyrigg which has been established later than Castle Vale has had more experience dealing with communities. Many of the strategies in operation within the program have been a result of academic collaboration. The estate has combined the lessons learnt from successful existing regeneration programs such as Castle Vale to create a model which develops upon previous best practice guidelines. Here we see transference of experience and information from one case study (Castle Vale) to another (Bonnyrigg).

To this end a variety of different resources have also been used in addition to consultation meetings and workshops. These include a community newsletter which has been designed by one of the residents, the translation of that newsletter in 6 key languages, the production of CDs materials and Braille for the impaired, the creation of a community development and a housing team which looks after services and tenant needs including one-on-one interviews, and in-house consultation. The team ensures that there is no distinction between tenant and the focus on needs in a “holistic kind of way” (Stevens, 2009, interview, 10 Sept).
As the project progresses and the organisation learns more about the community. Consultation activities will be altered to be better suited to the surrounding environment. This learning process is especially important and has been aided by the fact that the organisation is onsite at all times during the project. This ensures that the organisation is easily accessible to residents and can be seen as part of the community.

Another point of difference between the two case studies is that Bonnyrigg has opted to utilise a more pragmatic role in communication. Language barriers are dealt with by using the *Bilingual Community Education* (BCE) rather than the traditional interpreter approach to communication. The model, originally developed from the South West Sydney Area Health Service approach looks at educating certain members of the community in leadership role to run workshops in each of the main language groups. The separate groups would then meet at common functions in order to further communicate opinions and input (Coates & Shepard, 2008).

It is interesting to see that both estates have chosen to allow the community to lead the participation program so that the community can have a more direct role in the renewal activities. Perhaps this has more to do with the need to devise service provision policies rather than the actual physical regeneration itself but the aspects and similar operations are undeniable. Both have community development and housing teams with Castle Vale further developing this to form the community-led Castle Vale Neighbourhood Partnership Board.

### 4.2.2 Key philosophies behind the respective programs

“As involving residents from the onset to achieve ‘community buy in’ was a critical success factor” (Bingham, 2009, interview, 17 Sept).

“It’s all about relationship building” (Stevens, 2009, interview, 10 Sep).

When asked what the key philosophies behind the programs were, both emphasised the importance of capacity building within the community. Both Ian and Claudia spoke about ways of creating stronger bonds within the community to foster relationships which can be transferred to other organisations.

Castle Vale has achieved this and ultimately the sub organisations have taken on responsibility once the HAT had dissolved. This is currently happening in Bonnyrigg, as Newleaf Communities are working to allow the community to eventually function independently.
4.2.3 How were community relationships achieved from the onset

A series of questions regarding the initial stages of the regeneration project were asked. These questions aimed to gauge how relationships were created from the onset. For Castle Vale the establishing years of the HAT were difficult as there was an overall lack of experience and practical theory in relation to capacity building and community participation and largely due to a change in political power. Birmingham City Council has traditionally been Labour controlled and the transference of housing stock to a national government funded operation was perceived as a scheme for the Conservative government (the political body in power at the time) to take over.

There were initial concerns over public participation and errors relating to the community development programs as the Thatcher Government had a history of removing local government powers. Even though the HATs were set up as independent organisations, there were still elements of distrust from residents and Council members. This was most evident during the initial master planning process where only 20% of residents responded to the opinion questionnaires.

The early attempts of community engagement in the estate lacked appeal and the slow action of the HAT meant that the relationship of residents was very strained. As time passed, both the HAT and residents learnt the best ways to give residents a voice. One of these approaches was the democratically elected Tenant Representatives Alliance (TRA) was operated solely by the community. The TRA became the first port of call for the HAT when community opinions were needed and thus the Alliance became an important factor in the effective operationalisation of the Castle Vale development. Through the Alliance residents were able to choose who they were represented by and the board members who were essentially members of the community. These members were further given experience which translated to the ability to work on other similar projects with other estates.

One of the main problems with a tenant alliance is that they appear to the only members that can influence major decisions within the project. Although the board itself works in the common good of the estate, their opinions might not necessarily represent all the views of the community. In this case, the diversity of groups is lost. This is unlikely to occur with outreach consultation methods such as the coffee session workshops existing in Bonnyrigg, the use of a tenant board could result in a very ‘one sided’ approach to community involvement.

This is supported in research conducted by the School of Public Policy at the University of Birmingham which found that some residents believed that they were not fully involved in the process of regeneration (SPP, 2004).
“I would have to say that there have been a core of about 100 active residents that have influenced the regeneration of Castle Vale through persistence, belligerence and sometimes through complete opposition, but always with the best interests of the community at heart” (SPP, 2004: 18).

Bonnyrigg has learnt from this idea have it is perhaps because of this that Newleaf Communities has not opted for a resident alliance

For Bonnyrigg, the initial consultation process began with Housing NSW’s onsite community regeneration team. At first the team was unsure as to how to approach the community and tried a number of different techniques in an attempt to gather information, eventually they “ended up adopting the Health Model of Bilingual Community Educators and that has been very, very successful here. So they continued to do the big events when we have something big to talk about, milestone kind of focus but they also did regularly monthly meetings, coffee sessions to try and build capacity in people to let them know how the design are put together, how to read maps and they’d take them out on bus tours and show them how the project is progressing.” (Stevens, 2009, interview, 10 Sep).

We can see here that Bonnyrigg has taken a more direct approach in the education of the community. The use of a Bilingual Community Educators has been a result of the multi-cultural nature of the estate; this is likely to yield different results from Castle Vale.

As mentioned previously Bonnyrigg must consider language barriers, this issue is not as prevalent in Castle Vale. Due to this fact, instead of establishing a consortium or alliance group which is run solely by the community Bonnyrigg has opted for an organisational directed approach which has proven to be more effective in their particular circumstance. The use of educators means that language and cultural traditions are brought into the discussion groups. This in turn allows the consortium to identify points that may or may not work.

On the other hand, the establishment of the TRA in Castle Vale was born from the need to quickly mobilise the community to ensure a co-ordinated approach is achieved during the development phase. This has been largely a result of unstable funding; an element which does not appear to be evident in Bonnyrigg. This stability in funding gives Bonnyrigg a level of assurance which Castle Vale did not have.

4.2.4 Changes to the master plan and planning due to public participation
The most obvious change to the development process was a result of tenant and community opinions during the master planning process. In both case studies, an initial or draft plan was presented and then the residents were invited to comment or give ideas.
In Castle Vale a preferred master plan created by Hunt Thompson Architects was presented in October 1994 accompanied by a number of drop in sessions held throughout the week. These sessions were accompanied by land use proposals and questionnaires which were to be returned to CVHAT staff by November (Bingham, 2009 interview 17 Sept).

In addition to this, residents also worked with the architects during weekend sessions to learn and develop ideas on ideal housing types. Many of these were designed to be adaptable so that when circumstances changes, so did the housing. Most notably, Ian mentioned that various parts of the master plan were changed due to community opinion these included:

- The change in the number of demolished tower blocks and maisonettes (from 17 tower blocks and 24 maisonettes to 32 tower blocks, 27 maisonettes and 114 bungalows)
- The removal or closing off of alleyways which were later turned into community or recreational gardens
- Redevelopment of the main shopping district due to concerns raised about safety by residents

Ian further stated that as residents became more knowledgeable, empowered and engaged throughout these sessions they became more involved in design changes and adapted policies to suit their needs.

In Bonnyrigg, Claudia Stevens is of the opinion that community engagement in the master planning process has a very positive effect on the outcome of master plans. Claudia advocates the use of the community as experts who understand the most appropriate solutions for the area. She lists a number of changes which have occurred since formation of consultation groups these include:

- BBQ points and gas cooking spots
- Making properties Feng Shui
- Keeping homes below the height of the nearby Khmer temple (where the Cambodian Buddhist Society reside)
- The retention of the basketball courts at Bunker Reserve (see master plan in Chapter 3)
- The design of a multi-purpose centre to incorporate community gardens
- Design changes relating to attached housing such as the inclusion of more traditional styled two storey terraces.
There has also been a particular emphasis resolving neighbourhood disputes and crime, this has been dealt with primarily by re-aligning frontages to streets, providing lock up garages so that the most important assets of the resident i.e. their cars are protected and providing fencing so that there are no boundary disputes (which currently exist due to Radburn design).

The above changes in both case studies have effectively dealt the main concerns of the community and the factors which made the estate undesirable to live in. Here we see a specific change in the philosophy of master planning, urban renewal and indeed planning through the active advocacy of bottom up approaches.

Instead of the one-size-fits-all philosophy which was evident in the early days of public housing and planning (the Radburn design was a good example) we see the master plan changes and adapts according to community needs and opinions. We even see the community taking an active role in the design of specific dwellings and buildings and more importantly the acknowledgement that the community are there to provide their expertise.

### 4.2.5 The importance of marketing and image

Marketing and image plays a vital role in urban regeneration especially in public housing estates. The connotations associated with social housing are all decidedly negative and regeneration organisations are faced with the test of challenging these connotations to give the estate a new life.

The importance of advertising the estate changes to the wider community is critical to retaining the project sustainability as it has the potential to attract more services and businesses to the area.

Bingham mentions that:

“Improving the image of the estate through effective PR and positive media coverage enabled the HAT to reel in private finance and investment in the area to build private houses, nursing homes and to attract Sainsbury’s [large UK retailer] to develop a retail park in the place of the old run down shopping centre on the estate.” (Bingham, 2009, interview, 17 Sept).

This has also been combined with the development of the Reed Park Retail area and the Enterprise Park which houses a variety of commercial businesses. The development of the Sainsbury’s retail centre has been one of the most successful aspects of the Castle Vale renewal as it not only brought jobs to the estate but attracted a variety of other businesses and users from the surrounding region. It was instrumental in the continued sustainability of Castle Vale.
Marketing and PR is equally important in Bonnyrigg. Claudia Stevens states that:

“Newleaf Communities is actually just a brand that we’ve developed the idea of this project is the integrated physical and social renewal so not just so not just doing the physical redevelopment, so bricks and mortar stream we’re also doing a considerable amount of work on the community development here and supporting them through a time of change. So Newleaf Communities, how we got that was the brand that we were using to sell the new properties, we wanted to sure it was strongly linked to the whole project, so including the services as well not just the product. So that’s how we got Newleaf.....So I think the key services we deliver are the design of the homes, the construction of the homes and the sales and marketing because that obviously drives the whole project because our construction is actually leading to the sales so we sell off plan and we need to have a certain percentage of sales before we can go forward so that’s obviously a big process for us here.” (Stevens, 2009, interview, 10 Sept).

In the interview Claudia advocated the need for a holistic approach to urban regeneration. The marketing component of the program and by utilising the name Newleaf Communities allows the wider public to identify the philosophies behind Bonnyrigg’s regeneration project.

Newleaf with connotations of renewal, sustainability and a fresh start the inclusion of communities suggests that the project. The Newleaf Communities brand is effective in conveying both the message of the renewal to potential buyers and also the existing community.

Bonnyrigg is currently undergoing Stage 1 of its development phase. This stage includes selling off 58 newly built dwellings which will be aimed at younger households. It is important that purchasing during this phase takes places as it contributes to a portion of the regeneration funds. Newleaf Communities therefore must have an effective marketing campaign to ensure that funding is available so that service provision and development remains at a high standard. Figure 4.2.1 below shows one of the billboards which make up part of Newleaf’s marketing campaign; these are located along the perimeter of the Bonnyrigg estate.

**Figure 4.2.1: Newleaf Communities billboard on Cabramatta Road (Xian, 2009)**
4.2.6 How the particular regeneration project has been different from others.

Both Bonnyrigg and Castle Vale have operated differently from other urban regeneration projects in the past. The case studies present an avenue for active community engagement which has proven to be effective in both the areas of development and service provision/support.

Castle Vale is the first urban regeneration project to both involve a heavily integrated community engagement component along with an independent renewal organisation. Its models and strategies have since been incorporated into government and public sector policies.

Bonnyrigg is the first renewal project under the NSW Housing’s Living Communities Program. The public private partnership component to regeneration especially focusing heavily on resident involvement has never been undertaken in New South Wales. The pathfinder program also has the added unique nature a 30 year social funding component which is a legacy to the realisation that an incorporated approach to planning is needed.

Ian Bingham notes that a critical success factor was “the community ‘buy in’ which allowed the community to take responsibility of parts of the estate. Other critical factors included community empowerment to the extent that they can lead the process and drive forward the improvements.

The integration of social funding with the development is what differentiates Bonnyrigg from its predecessors. This has been supported by Claudia who mentions that:

“I think that it’s one of the key differences and coming from a community development background and one of the genius points of Housing NSW was the thought to include a community development budget in the process so that it’s actually funded for the full 30 years of the project. So it’s not just the development which happens then the developer moves away and pulls the plug so the whole community goes black. We are actually here for the full 30 years.” (Stevens, 2009, interview, 10 Sep).

As can be seen, the key similarity is the schemes’ holistic approach to development. That is not only focusing on the physical building but also on the social and economic aspects of the community. According to the SPP (2004) report, this is a reason why Castle Vale has become such a success.

4.2.7 Training and Education

Chapter 3 focused on two main topics in the regeneration program; urban development and job training and education. During the interview, several questions were asked regarding the education prospects and programs in place within the case studies.
Claudia Stevens mentioned that Bonnyrigg were busy putting in place and developing several job training programs to aid the community. Notably, Bonnyrigg needs to allow the education and training programs to permeate into more marginalised groups which would not necessarily take part in the regeneration scheme. The organisation has also recently received a $1.8 million grant from the Federal Governments National Building Jobs Fund to develop a training and education program around green skills. This grant enables Bonnyrigg Management to create a variety of different employment opportunities ranging from full time roles to traineeships (Stevens, 2009; Becton, 2009). It is estimated that the fund will create additional opportunities for the community to participate in further renewal activities.

Stevens (2009) states that the green skills program is designed to include all types of residents from the estate:

“The main advantage of the program is that it’s really flexible so we’ve got different levels of employment opportunities. So we’ve got full time roles as well as traineeships quite heavily. I think 36 out of the 60 jobs created are going to be for traineeships and then we’ve got heaps of part time work for carers and such so that they can meet their Centrelink obligations but also skills, confidence and socialization from being back in the workforce so that’s really huge. We’re really very thankful for the work that’s bought on and that’ll make a very big kick start I think.” The contributions of the $1.8 million dollar grant will kick start the training and education programs while also funding research to ensure that the local economy grows.

The approach to education is similar in Castle Vale. However there is an emphasis of using public participation as a learning tool for residents to gather experience. Many of the education and training initiatives in Castle Vale has been discussed in Chapter 3 but Ian Bingham observes that an important aspect in the education programs was to allow residents to gather confidence and become knowledgeable in the field of regeneration.

He notes that:

“Residents living and working in a community that has undergone a program of regeneration and renewal have developed an array of skills and have gained vast experience of the regeneration process, and, residents and staff from various resident led organisations who had gone through the regeneration of Castle Vale have a vast pool of knowledge of processes of regeneration that could be shared with others.” (Bingham, 2009 interview 17 Sept).
In this instance, by participating in the urban regeneration process residents became experienced on how to deal with community participation, design processes and strategy development. Many of these residents have gone on to become board members of the resultant sub-organisations or have worked as community engagement officers on a professional basis. Many have found professional, practical jobs in the in the field of urban regeneration as a result.

4.2.8 What are the plans for the long term sustainability of the project?
As Arthurson et. al (2005) notes, the benefits of strategic planning in the long term sustainability of renewal project have been recognised as an area of importance for many programs. How then has this factor been incorporated into Bonnyrigg and Castle Vale?

Towards the end of the HAT lifetime, residents and members became concerned in respect to the future financial stability of the sub-organisations which were created. Some organisations such as the Merlin Venture and CVCHA had the ability to become self sustaining however others such as the TRA did not.

To solve this, the HAT set up the Endowment Fund to provide support to these bodies. The Endowment Fund is operated by the Neighbourhood Partnership Board determines services which are absent within the estate and provides grants for the establishment of them. Thus a way to sustain the organisations which would provide a vital role in supporting the community was established.

The Bonnyrigg project has a lifespan of 30 years which provides ample time for successor organisations to take form and become independent. This 30 year social project aims to ensure that all services within the area are established so that they become a permanent fixture. The 30 year time span means that Newleaf Communities are able to provide services which effectively run for one generation allowing the organisation to adapt to any unaccountable changes which may result from the regeneration efforts.

This means that any successor organisations or future strategies will be highly adaptable to changing environments. The lifespan funding also means that projects are able to run for a longer period of time allowing for a greater and more stable evolution and establishment process.
4.3 Summary

In essence, the two case studies are not dissimilar, the exception is that while Newleaf Communities remains onsite to provide for needed services through funding, the original organisation (HAT) is no longer in operation, instead their responsibilities have been transferred to the Endowment Fund and Neighbourhood Partnership Board take over a similar role due to the resolution of the HAT. Both schemes identify and provide model which aims to maintain the estates as prosperous and sustainable communities.

Both interviews emphasised the importance of community participation in public housing regeneration projects. Both Claudia Stevens from Newleaf Communities and Ian Bingham from Castle Vale Community Housing Association saw the importance of using the local people as experts and maintaining respect throughout encounters to facilitate the smooth operation of the regeneration schemes.

When asked what the new challenges facing the schemes were, both mentioned the recent economic crisis as a key event which would affect the operation of the projects. For Castle Vale the crisis means a reduction in government funding and economic activity. This means that the organisation’s ability to provide services for the community is dramatically restricted and further monetary contributions must be sought out. This also means that resources which could potentially go to the community instead get transferred to developing methods of gaining money.

For Bonnyrigg, the global financial crisis has brought about challenges in the selling off of private dwellings especially in this critical first stage of development. The predicted slow down in the NSW housing market marked by the reduction in the New Dwelling First Home Buyers Grant (ended September 2009) and the halving of stamp for newly constructed houses (ending 31 December 2009) will mean that the purchase of off-the-plan dwellings in Bonnyrigg will become a greater challenge.

Never-the-less, these interviews have proved to present an insight into the public participation operations of both estates, it provided an understanding of the aims, goals and aspirations of both Bonnyrigg and the now independent Castle Vale Community Housing Association and presented ideas as to the need for more co-ordinated community led approaches to development.
5. CONCLUSION
Deprivation, social exclusion, increased crime levels, poor job attainment and subpar housing stock are common issues associated with older public housing estates particularly those built during the 1950s – 1980s (Houghton & Power, 2007). These issues are often an effect of both the existing environmental state and also the types of tenants living in the area. Troubled or marginalised households are common in these public housing estates and they often contribute to an area’s deprivation (Dey et. al, 2008).

In NSW public housing tenants are chosen in accordance to socio-economic circumstances, those who require the most assistance are often chosen first. This has been largely due to the small number of housing stock under NSW Housing control (Milligan, 2009). For Bonnyrigg, this has meant a concentration of marginalised and people with lower incomes leading to the cycle of neighbourhood decline (see Chapter 1 theories).

In England, where there are 5 million public sector dwellings, the story is largely different (National Office of Statistics, 2005). Castle Vale’s deprivation was largely a result of the dislocated position of the estate (being away from services) and the eventual deterioration of the experimentally built tower blocks (Mornement, 2005). This in turn has led to the relocation of more well-to-do tenants and the replacement of those who were socially disadvantaged as housing within the estate became last choice once again, this led to the estate experiencing neighbourhood decline.

In order to break the cycle, government agencies are working on regenerating and renewing these estates. New ideological approaches to urban policy and the driving pragmatic actions of the community have led governments to develop new policies to tackle complex problems associated with urban regeneration; these have in turn developed fruitful partnerships and a number of best practice examples (Tsenkova, 2001). In particular, new policies seek to actively engage the community in a ‘place based’ approach to regeneration; they do not solely deal with the physical redevelopment but with the socio-economic aspects that have fallen on the wayside. It is these components which ensure that change takes place and remains long after the physical transformation has been complete (Bingham, 2009, interview, 17 Sep; Stevens, 2009, interview, 10 Sep). These new programs take on a holistic approach to regeneration; they do not solely deal with the physical redevelopment but with the socio-economic aspects that have fallen on the wayside. It is these components which ensure that change takes place and remains long after the physical transformation has been complete.
This thesis examines how these approaches are functionalised. To do so, two case studies of public housing regeneration in two very different countries are examined. In England, this thesis explored the regeneration of Castle Vale located in the city of Birmingham. Once in England’s top 10 most deprived areas, Castle Vale has undergone a tremendous transformation instigated by the setting up of the initial HAT. Its services are now determined by the Castle Vale Community Housing Association (CVCHA), one of the very few community led organisations in the UK. Four years on, even though the physical regeneration has been completed CVCHA is continuing to maintain the social services created by the HAT and has been considered as an example of best practice for community focused urban regeneration.

In Australia, this thesis explored the regeneration of the Bonnyrigg estate located in the south western region of Sydney. The Bonnyrigg estate is led by Newleaf Communities; a consortium of 4 organisations formed by a Public Private Partnership and is currently undergoing the first stage of their regeneration process. Originally identified as potential area for expansion in the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy, Bonnyrigg’s renewal program combines the need of the residents with the rebuilding of the area.

From these examinations, it is hoped that a further understanding of community focused urban regeneration programs especially in public housing estates can be gained.

5.1 Comparison of Case Studies
Chapter 3 & 4 of this thesis look at the different aspects of the case studies. Although both estates are very different demographically, socially and geographically both regeneration programs involve a very intense and integrated public engagement component. Table 5.1.1 below lists some of the details of each case study.
Table 5.1.1: Comparison Table of Case studies (ABS, 2006; National Office of Statistics, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Bonnyrigg</th>
<th>Castle Vale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>8,303</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Area</td>
<td>81ha</td>
<td>250ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Body</td>
<td>Newleaf Communities</td>
<td>Castle Vale Housing Action Trust (during regeneration) Castle Vale Partnership Board (current)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime of Organisation</td>
<td>13 years (development) 30 years (social)</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Development</td>
<td>833 public housing 88 private homes</td>
<td>34 high rise blocks 27 maisonette blocks 2700 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dwellings constructed/to be constructed</td>
<td>2330 constructed 20 retained 88 private retained</td>
<td>1486 constructed 1333 refurbished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is most interesting in Table 5.1.1 is that both case studies run for the same period of time but Bonnyrigg has the added advantage of a social development program which has been put in place for a period of 30 years to ensure that a total change in the socio-economic conditions of the community are met. This is a definite improvement over the Castle Vale case study as it ensures a stable future for all programs in terms of funding.

The table finds that Castle Vale has a greater number of dwellings under development than Bonnyrigg one of the reasons for this is that Castle Vale has a greater amount of stock under public ownership than the Bonnyrigg estate. It can be seen from the table one of the main focuses within the Castle Vale regeneration program is the refurbishment of buildings rather than new construction. This is interesting considering in most cases, a new construction is often cheaper. Bonnyrigg on the other hand plans to increase the density of dwellings and seems to have included more development within their program.

Table 5.1.2 relates specifically to information obtained from the interviews. The focus of the interviews was to gather information regarding community development and gage opinions on the importance of these in urban regeneration programs. Table 5.1.2 reveals an enthusiasm for citizenship participation exhibited by both professionals and an understanding of role that participation plays in the development of social and physical timeframes. Both interviewees firmly believed that community participation was one of the key factors relating to the long term success of urban renewal.
### Table 5.1.2: Outcomes of Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Bonnyrigg</th>
<th>Castle Vale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods of Public Participation and Community Development</strong></td>
<td>● Consultation meetings and workshops (in 5 main languages) ● Morning Coffee sessions ● Youth engagement projects ● Information days ● BBQ and outing days ● One-to-one sessions ● In house consultations ● Field Trips ● Communicators ● Community Newsletters (further information in Appendix B)</td>
<td>● Set up of a democratically community elected tenant organisation (TRA) ● One-on-one sessions ● Information days ● Consultation meetings and workshops ● Development of subgroups as part of the exit strategy ● Community education and empowerment programs ● Youth engagement projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Key Philosophies behind the respective programs.** | “It’s all about relationship building” (Stevens, 2009, interview, 10 Sep). | “Involving residents from the onset to achieve ‘community buy in’ was a critical success factor” (Bingham, 2009, interview, 17 Sept). |

| **How were community relationships achieved from the onset** | Initial process set up by NSW Housing in collaboration with Fairfield City Council, these included: ● Bilingual Community Educators ● Engagement Activities (see above) ● Setting up Community engagement team | ● Setting up a tenant board (TRA) ● Allowing residents and the community to take part in development ● Undertaking votes as to the direction of certain projects |

| **Changes to the master plan and planning due to public participation.** | ● BBQ points and gas cooking spots ● Making properties Feng Shui ● Keeping homes below the height of the nearby Khmer temple (where the Cambodian Buddhist Society reside) ● The retention of the basketball courts at Bunker Reserve (see master plan in Chapter 3) ● The design of a multi-purpose centre to incorporate community gardens ● Design changes relating to attached housing such as the inclusion of more traditional styled two storey terraces. | ● The change in the number of demolished tower blocks and maisonnets ● The removal or closing off of alleyways which were later turned into community or recreational gardens ● Redevelopment of main shopping centre |
The importance of marketing and image

“Newleaf Communities, how we got that was the brand that we were using to sell the new properties, we wanted to make sure it was strongly linked to the whole project, so including the services as well as not just the product. So that’s how we got Newleaf. (Stevens, 2009, interview, 10 Sept).

“Improving the image of the estate through effective PR and positive media coverage enabled the HAT to level in private finance and investment in the area to build private houses, nursing homes and to attract Sainsbury’s to develop a retail park in the place of the old run down shopping centre on the estate.” (Bingham, 2009, interview, 17 Sept).

How the particular regeneration project has been different from others.

- First PPP in public housing in NSW
- First to utilise Bilingual Community Educator in urban regeneration
- Funding for social project over lifetime of regeneration

- First HAT project to effectively engage the community
- Community ‘buy in’ option and empowerment

What are the plans for the long term sustainability of the project?

The 30 year lifespan of Newleaf communities means programs can be highly adaptable and gives organisations a longer evolution and establishment period

The Endowment Fund was created to provide for services which may be identified as absent from the estate

5.2 Suggested Outcomes and Observations

The purpose of this section is to combine the information obtained from the research to develop observations for better urban regeneration schemes. These observations intend to provide a starting point for policies relating to the regeneration of public housing.

5.2.1 Include a social development component in the regeneration budget

One of the key problems associated with the establishment of Castle Vale was budgetary. Although the Housing Action Trust was part of a government scheme, the allocated grant from the government did not cover the majority of the social programs which were intended for the estate.

This meant that the HAT had to find other ways of obtaining money for development and social improvement. Subsequent re-negotiations and additional discussions on funding delayed the project and served to result in a lack of direction by the HAT. As a result, community relations deteriorated as residents perceived the HAT’s lack of action as laziness.
On the contrary, Housing NSW and Newleaf Communities have accounted for a social development budget in their urban regeneration program. This has been partly due to previous problems experienced by other urban programs such as Castle Vale. By accounting a social development budget within the regeneration funding Newleaf Communities are able to develop a variety of schemes to help the community from the onset. This has sped up learning time and allowed the organisation to develop bonds with certain members. The advantage of this can be seen through their highly developed social programs currently running.

5.2.2 Develop an exit strategy.
Exit strategies are policies put in place by organisations to sustain the end results of specific regeneration programs. Studies have shown that exit strategies are effective in maintaining the benefits of urban regeneration after the project’s lifespan (Arthurson et. al, 2007; Brooke, 2004).

There are several points of action in the development of an exit strategy. These are:

- Developing a formal plan;
- The integration of stakeholders and residents;
- Conflict resolution – in which devices are put in place to effectively mediate differences in opinion experienced by various stakeholders;
- Transition of responsibility;
- Capacity Building and leadership development;
- Planning and evaluation. (Arthurson et.al, 2007)

Exit strategies should be an important element of regeneration programs. However they are often neglected due to funding uncertainties and timing difficulties. The exit strategies implemented in Castle Vale have been instrumental in allowing for further service provision after the lifespan of the Castle Vale HAT.

The most pronounced element in the Castle Vale exit strategy was the establishment of sub-organisations which took on various responsibilities during and after the urban regeneration process. These organisations served to educated residents, facilitated capacity building and provided a tool for further tenant/institutional relationships.

The lesson learnt from Castle Vale is to effectively integrate an exit strategy in every aspect of the urban regeneration program. This means that exit strategies should be devised in several stages so that successor bodies are given time to grown, establish themselves, become self-sufficient and develop relationships with other organisations.
This similar approach is currently being undertaken in Bonnyrigg. Sustainable partnership building and the effective development of an exit strategy was identified as one of the main areas of development in the 2001 Public Private Partnership Conference. As previously stated, this funding for service provision and education for a period of 30 years in which a variety of community building tools will be used.

5.2.3 Early relationship development with stakeholders and residents
A common theme derived from speakers in the 2006 Urban Regeneration Conference held in Perth was the importance of relationship building with residents and surrounding stakeholders. This not only includes those living in the community but those who work, own businesses and regularly use the area as well.

One of the reasons for the successful transfer of responsibility in the Bonnyrigg project from NSW Department of Housing to Newleaf Communities and the subsequent smooth community engagement process was partly a result of Housing’s determination to actively engage with the community at the onset.

5.2.4 Establish a performance criteria
A firm performance criteria and action plans in urban regeneration programs are extremely important as it not only denotes the progress but allows stakeholders to see that changes have been undertaken even if it not immediately noticeable (Roberts & Sykes, 2000).

The performance criteria should be created through a participation process to include stakeholder objectives and the action plan should list how the criterion will be addressed. This particular model is useful as the community and participants are able to track changes during the progression of the regeneration scheme. This will mediate any concerns or disputes relating to development and improve confidence in the regeneration body.

Bonnyrigg currently undertakes a similar task by using communicators. These identify key concerns raised by residents and deals with these accordingly. The results are then exhibited to the residents so that the community may understand that the organisation have attempted to change according to suggestions.
5.2.5 Emphasise on Capacity Building Activities

The literature review in Chapter 2 covers the importance of capacity building in communities and urban regeneration projects. These have been exhibited in both case studies as priorities in obtaining long term stability. Capacity building is important as it not only provides a better communication forum but also allows for community empowerment.

In Bonnyrigg and Castle Vale, capacity building is done through a number of ways, these include community education, allowing the community to take part in specific groups and activities, supporting initiatives run by local residents and organisations, providing better communication opportunities between residents, business owners and other stakeholders in the surrounding area and working with stakeholders to achieve a better outcome.

5.2.6 Place a greater emphasis on community participation activities.

For the purpose of this thesis, community participation activities include programs where attendants and participants actively partake in defining the direction of projects and programs these include design workshops in collaboration with other partnerships and organisations and cohesion building activities.

These have been successfully engaged in both Bonnyrigg and Castle Vale. The community engagement components in Bonnyrigg contain a wide range of activities. These have been effective in encouraging the community to participate in different aspects of the project. This has largely been a result of organisation’s determination to provide information on all levels through a variety of different programs which appeal to different groups. In Castle Vale, the active inclusion of tenants on sub-organisation boards and the creation of the TRA has meant that residents are able to direct the pace and path in which programs were developed. The Figure on the following page shows the attendance rates of programs in Bonnyrigg according to the type of activity.
Discounting large group events, the most successful community engagement activities include capacity building workshops and community participation events. These inherently involve the community taking action rather to achieve certain goals rather than using traditional learning tools.

Capacity Building Workshops in this sense include projects which promote bonding between residents and educate the community so that they can effectively partake in decision making processes. For Castle Vale these capacity building workshops were useful in both educating residents and raising community self-esteem and confidence.

The capacity building programs varied according to the type of information the HAT was trying to gather, in general they included learning workshops in which the residents and school children were educated on different technical aspects of the project, these workshops were later expanded to include brainstorming to indentify some of the main elements to be included in the master plan.

Other capacity building programs included the street art program where local artists and the community to were asked to contribute pieces to the estate, selecting members of the community to become part of organisational boards, educating members to help co-ordinate various aspects of the project.
Community Participation Events are events which involve different aspects of the community. These can come in the form of workshops designed to target specific areas of the estate or programs which are run to incorporate, educate and involve something ‘fun’ for residents. In Bonnyrigg these participation events included a Men’s Shed Program which encouraged male members of the community to work together to build various ancillary buildings, resident to resident art exchanges, workshops relating to different concerns e.g. crime, health and community building workshops which allow different members which would not normally associate to meet and familiarise with one another.

Programs and activities such as the ones described above have been successful in allowing regeneration organisations to develop community bonds and obtained or alter various aspects of the regeneration scheme. These activities can make a big difference in the contribution rates and produce a better result for the urban regeneration program.

5.2.7 Clearly identify and familiarise with the area before devising strategy plans
A place-based approach is important to the success of the urban regeneration schemes especially in public housing estates. This particular approach allows the organisation to better familiarise themselves with the processes operating in the area.

Historical planning approaches have seen the failure of standard policy initiatives or models as they do not necessarily complement the area in which they are implemented in (see DSDNI, n.d). Some believe that the one-size-fits-all approach can often result in undesirable consequences which will exacerbate the issue it is trying to combat or cause additional problems in the future. Both the Castle Vale and Bonnyrigg case studies are an example of this.

The need for a government response to growing demand for housing saw a number of largescale public housing estates emerge within both England and Australia with little consideration on its linkages to existing infrastructure or the previous environments in which tenants were accustomed to have resulted in low quality housing and social issues in these public housing estates. This policy is an example of a one-size-fits-all approach.

Greater understand is what makes a successful regeneration program. As Houghton & Power state we must “think of cities as the human equivalent of trees – dense, diverse, light and dark, self-regenerating” (Houghton & Power, 2007:215). We must begin to understand these complexities before we can develop solutions for “the problems of cities are not problems of chaos but of ‘organised complexity’ for which new solutions will emerge (Houghton & Power, 2007: 215).
We must adequately develop community participation programs which cater for the different dynamics existing in the city and estate. It is these programs which have been proven to be suitable for the community and have gone on to create successful urban regeneration projects. Both Bonnyrigg & Castle Vale have proven to do this by developing participation programs which have incorporated academic principles relating to community engagement (these have been discussed in Chapter 2). Sandoff (2000) in particular outlines a list of principles which should be considered when designing public participation programs.

Table 5.2.1 below shows Castle Vale and Bonnyrigg’s activities in relation to these principles. From this examination, it can be seen that the mentioned principles have defined the character or of the respective urban regeneration programs and have played a huge part in shaping the estate.

Table 5.2.1: Bonnyrigg and Castle Vale participation program in accordance with Sandoff’s participation principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Bonnyrigg</th>
<th>Castle Vale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage debate and promote awareness within the community.</td>
<td>Coffee sessions, workshops, master planning consultations all encourage the community to decide the direction of the projects and allow them to give opinions on different aspects of the program</td>
<td>Surveys, Saturday workshops and the setting up of the TRA all allowed residents to have a voice within the urban regeneration process. The TRA especially helped give experience and advice on the different aspects of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designs and projects should be transparent</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg uses ‘communicators’ which allows residents to see what type of work has been done in the community. The communicators list the concerns raised by residents and the subsequent responses or actions undertaken by Newleaf Communities. This adds an element of transparency to the project.</td>
<td>Castle Vale opted for resident representation in all the sub-organisations as well as holding regular update meetings. This was to ensure that all residents from the community were well informed of any progress or changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public participation meetings should be undertaken</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg have held a number of public participation workshops which help bring forth community expertise. These are undertaken in the 6 main languages with the BCE model so that language and cultural barriers may be broken.</td>
<td>Meetings were regularly held regularly held both by the HAT and the TRA to gather opinions regarding the progress of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foster multi-disciplinary relationships with other fields of expertise</strong></td>
<td>Newleaf includes a consortium of members from different fields. They include development (Becton), tenant management (St. George), funding and financial support (Westpac) and maintenance (Spotless). These companies are managed by Bonnyrigg Management which helps foster a strong bond between all stakeholders.</td>
<td>The HAT set up a number of departments within their organisation to deal with different aspects of the project. These were separate to the sub-organisations. These departments were multi-disciplinary in nature and aimed to help the community if they were experiencing a variety of problems. In particular the Economic and Community Development department was designed to incorporate staff from a number of different backgrounds. This particular department aimed to allow the local people realise their potential therefore they subsequently had to have experience in a number of different fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final decisions within projects are not necessarily final and can change and differ according to new information or community opinion. Theoretical solutions to problems may not always work and thus practical efforts and experience may be required</strong></td>
<td>The model of regeneration existing on the estate has been a combination of practical experience and academic theory. UNSW and UWS have worked closely with NSW Housing and Fairfield Council to develop the urban regeneration/public participation plan which currently exists. The model and master plan is constantly changing as Newleaf and the community works with one another. For example, many of the programs currently running have changed several times according to residents’ suggestions.</td>
<td>It should be noted that contrary to Bonnyrigg, Castle Vale started with no prior knowledge of similar models for public participation and regeneration. In this sense, the program evolved as the HAT grew more experienced and the residents grew more confidence. In this sense, the plans for Castle Vale were never really finalised; they would change according to the situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3 Final Words

This thesis seeks to demonstrate and explore how community participation affects the urban regeneration process. It considered different operational aspects of urban regeneration (particularly in public housing) and relate these to regeneration theory. It is hoped that the observations above can become a tool to better understand and integrate full participation within renewal programs.
There is a growing need for better regeneration public housing estates as dwellings become older and housing stock reaches the end of its lifetime. In this instance, the input of residents, stakeholders and the inclusion of partnerships are especially important. To better understand the operation of community engagement in urban regeneration, research has been undertaken to compare two very different case studies. This comparison allows the reader to determine the strengths and weaknesses in both programs which can lead to better implementation in the future.

Although there is a lot of literature relating to public participation and urban regeneration available, researchers and academics are only beginning to scratch the surface operational-wise and many practitioners still agree that more research can be undertaken to actively develop observations for better community engagement. There is no absolute correct way to undertake an urban regeneration program especially as each area is so different and contain so many different factors but proper experience can result in a fruitful and sustainable program which benefits all stakeholders.

The lessons learnt from this research are many but the most important principle is the need for practitioners and organisations to fully acknowledge the need to utilise the existing assets in the community to create a project which, rather than change the existing environment, complement it. Regeneration projects always have a lifespan and organisations will inevitably leave the estate once this is complete. Therefore it is important for organisations to mobilise the community and build leadership so that the benefits of these programs can be sustained in the future.
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APPENDIX B

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES
approaches. The team believes these open and flexible approaches contributed to the high level of engagement achieved.

In this way, community engagement sought to contribute to the achievement of the overall project objectives as follows:

1. Providing better services and opportunities for residents.

Community engagement allows service improvements to be identified through consultation, giving the community the opportunity to contribute ideas and help make decisions about how services and opportunities can be enhanced and for the community to participate in service improvement projects.

2. Building a stronger community

Community engagement activities contribute to skill development and therefore to the building of a stronger community, better able to meet the challenges which face it and work for common purposes.

3. Renewing the houses and public areas

Community views about the new houses and changes in the public domain can contribute to the quality of the plans, to community support for proposed physical changes and to community participation in projects to implement those changes and build ownership, community pride and social cohesion - all critical to the success of new communities.

5. Community Engagement Activities

The Project went through a number of distinct stages since its launch by the (then) Minister of Housing, Carl Scully, in December 2004 through to the point where Bonnyrigg Partnerships took prime control of the project in October 2007. The stages relate primarily to the necessary steps in the PPP procurement process and each marked a distinct phase in the community engagement process, as detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPP Procurement Stages</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Major PPP Activities</th>
<th>Key Community Engagement Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project announcement</td>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td>• Public announcement</td>
<td>• Produce written material about the project and its impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct community information sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Build relationships with the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Call for Expression of Interest (EOI):</td>
<td>Dec 2004 – Feb 2005 (2 months)</td>
<td>• Develop the EOI documents</td>
<td>• Provide basic information and answer questions about the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Call for EOI submissions from the market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop the Request for Development Proposals (RDP):</td>
<td>Feb 2005 – Aug 2005 (8 months)</td>
<td>• Evaluate and shortlist proponents from EOI submissions</td>
<td>• Conclude Phase 1 community consultation to provide input to the RDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop the contract documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop the RDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Procurement Stages</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Major PPP Activities</td>
<td>Key Community Engagement Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. RDP submissions put together by shortlisted proponents | Aug 2005 – Mar 2006 (7 months) | • Receive RDP submissions from shortlisted proponents | • Consult regarding community renewal  
• Build capacity |
| 4. Evaluation of RDP submissions and selection of preferred proponent | Mar 2006 – Sept 2006 | • Evaluate RDP submissions  
• Secure Cabinet agreement to preferred proponent | • Facilitate neighbourhood participation  
• Conduct information activities |
| 5. Contract negotiations with preferred proponent | Sept 2006 – Dec 2006 | • Contract negotiations with preferred proponent  
• Cabinet agreement to contract | • Maintain neighbourhood participation  
• Continue information activities  
• Conduct special projects with population groups not well represented previously (Indigenous people; youth) |
| 6. Financial close of contract | Dec 2006 – Apr 2007 | • Announcement of successful PPP company  
• Financial arrangements finalised | • Provide information on the BP draft plans  
• Consult on the proposed development plan  
• BP establish their relationships with the community |
| 7. Mobilisation | Apr 2007 – Oct 2007 | • Bonnyrigg Partnerships (BP) get ready to provide services  
• BP assume responsibility for the project  
• Further development of BP’s plans  
• BP assume prime responsibility for all project activities |  |

A complete list of activities held and the number of people who attended is at Appendix A. An analysis of activities by type is at Appendix B. The key community engagement activities are outlined by stage below.

**Prior to announcement**

Prior to the public announcement of the Project, there was a relatively short period available for planning the community engagement program, assembling resources and drawing together available information about the Bonnyrigg community. Activities included:

- The collection of baseline data from Housing NSW and Census sources
- ‘Low key’ research undertaken by Prof Tony Vinson, of Sydney University, on the characteristics of disadvantage at Bonnyrigg, interviews with some key informants about the dynamics of the community and identification of community leaders.
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