Letter from the Director

The new PRC is off to a good start. We have run a series of very well-attended events, the most recent of which, ‘Making Sydney’s Future Sustainable’ included the launch of Dialogues in Urban Planning: Towards Sustainable Regions and a panel discussion that attracted 160 registrants and included very lively give-and-take among our panel of well-known experts and the audience.

An earlier seminar, ‘Resilient Cities: Responding to Peak Oil and Climate Change’, given by Peter Newman, Professor of Sustainability at Curtin University and Timothy Beatley, Teresa Heinz Professor of Sustainable Communities at the University of Virginia was as lively and possibly even more contentious. It is clear that the PRC will need to continue talking about the environment, planning and sustainability.

Our first Current Thinking Seminar this year, ‘Does Neighbourhood Matter in the Development of Low-Income, Minority Children?’ was given by George Galster, Clarence B. Hilbery Professor of Urban Affairs at Wayne State University in Detroit, and one of America’s foremost planning economists. George spent a month in Sydney and we had the good fortune to have his company and insights for much of that time. John Elliott’s long interview with George occurs later in this newsletter.

The premier event of the past six months was the Minister for Planning, Hon. Kristina Keneally’s, Sunset Seminar ‘Planning in New South Wales - Responding to the Global Economic Crisis’. The Minister’s speech was jam-packed with substance and policy innovation and was followed by an animated Q & A session chaired by the President of the PRC Council, the Hon. Craig Knowles.

The second half of 2009 is also looking very busy. On the 17th of July Jon Hall will be leading a one day seminar ‘Residential Sydney Through the Downturn’ focusing on the housing market during the past period of decline and market prospects in the near future. From the 29th through 31st July the Australian Property Institute in association with the PRC will provide an Associate Professional Certificate in Expert Evidence. In September Mary-Lynne Taylor will run a day-long seminar on heritage and conservation issues. Most of these events will receive PIA and AIA CPD points.

For the Current Thinking evening seminar series, I will be giving a presentation on the 6th August entitled ‘Beware the Best of Government Intentions’ and looking at the way local governments in America use the tax code and complex financial instruments to plan and to get infrastructure and business development in place, as well as the inherent problems with this system and potential lessons for Australia. On the 12th August Gary Glazebrook at UTS will present his 30-year public transport plan for the Sydney region. And on the 13th August (provisionally) we are planning, with the Geography and Urban Studies Program at the University of Western Sydney, a Round-Table discussion with representatives from planning departments in three growth centres talking about the planning issues that are most important to them. There are some scheduling challenges with these events so please check our website for final dates and times.

There seems to be growing interest in relationships across planning, infrastructure and development. We hope that later in the year we will organise a few sessions looking at this issue and a broader round-table on the future of planning in NSW.

The other less visible faces of the PRC are also progressing well. Much of the first six months of this year was spent getting the basic organisational infrastructure in place. We are nearly there. And I hope that in the second half of 2009 we will be able to expand significantly the research capacity of the organisation.

In all of this I owe a large debt of gratitude to the Dean of the Faculty of Architecture, Design and Planning, Prof. Warren Julian, without whose support the PRC would not exist. Similarly without the help and expertise of the faculty’s marketing department, especially John Elliott, Sue Lalor and Carmen Lau, none of our events (or indeed this newsletter) would happen. Finally the entire PRC Council, especially its current president, Craig Knowles, and ex-PRC Director, John Toon, have been a tremendous help and support.

A note on finance. Running the PRC is expensive; without public support it will not continue to survive. Information about membership is included in this newsletter and I urge you to consider joining.

Regards

Alan Peters, Director

PRC Events

Residential Sydney through the Downturn: Retrospect and Prospect – July 17

Reminder – spaces still available!

A one-day professional development seminar focusing on residential development in Sydney hosted by the Planning Research Centre at Sydney University.

In these tumultuous times and with the many cross currents it is difficult to discern what may be the main trends and issues confronting residential development in Sydney in the latter half of 2009 and in the first half of 2010. This seminar examines in detail what is likely to happen and what may be the main forces shaping the contour of residential development in Sydney.

Speakers include:
- Graham Larcombe, Director Strategic Economics Group
- Angie Zigomanis, Senior Analyst, BIS Shrapnel
- Dr Jon Hall, Senior Research Associate RMIT
- Tim Robertson, Senior Policy Officer UDIA
- Col Morgan, Director Program Management, NSW Department of Housing
- John Edwards, Managing Director Residex P/L

* This event attracts PIA and AIA Professional Development points.

Booking fees
Individual booking: $615
Multiple booking (2 or more participate): $500 (per person)

Student and PRC Membership discounts also available.

For more information on this event visit www.arch.usyd.edu/prc or contact Sue Lalor on 02 9114 0941.
Your original training was as an economist, how did this prepare you for research into urban affairs?

When I started to study economics the subfield of urban economics was just beginning. I was fortunate to be going to graduate school at MIT to study economics when the seminal thinkers of urban economics were getting their first fame. Most economic programs in the US are very myopic, training you to look at the world in a narrowly defined way. So my entire career has been spent trying to repair the myopia I was taught as a graduate student with healthy doses of other kinds of perspectives; sociology, geography, political science and planning.

The central theme that I have been curious about throughout my entire career is really about metropolitan space; how and why humans produce the metropolitan spaces that look and work like they do. And after humans produce these spaces, how they change, why they change, and most importantly, the consequences for people as these changes work themselves out.

A lot of these consequences evolve into what we generically think of as urban problems. Problems such as pollution, congestion, unsanitary conditions for people to live in and children to grow up in, social conditions that limit opportunity for people, those aspects of inequality and how the way in which we organise space creates and sometimes preserves inequality have been the central nub of my career.

To what extent can you plan away urban problems or is it human nature that they will occur?

Planning can make a huge difference to what type of problems you see popping up in your city. It’s easiest to plan away technological problems like multi-nodal transportation systems and public utility infrastructures. Not saying we have them, but it’s not beyond our capability.

The social aspects of it, however, are much harder. Because unlike electrons that can move through a cable or water that can move through a pipe, people have this nasty thing called volition and consciousness and prejudices and all sorts of different motivations that confound sometimes even the best intentions of the planners.

So it’s the social aspects of planning and urban design that are most fascinating. They’re much trickier and I don’t hold out much hope that I or any other planner will be able to design something, either physically and or with some form of market, economic or command structure, that will avoid all sorts of these problems.

A central hub of your research and recommendations is the relocation of urban poor. As a planning official or politician, how do you overcome the Not In My Back Yard reaction?

First of all there has to be a level of trust in those non-profit organisations or governmental agencies who are delivering the affordable housing around the question of how much affordable housing, at what kind of densities, of what kind of design and how they will be maintained. All these need to be dealt with by the supplier of affordable housing with the right answers as well as the public’s trust.
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that those answers will actually be delivered. There is no magic bullet – this trust needs to be built over time with consistent efforts, including bringing community leaders in the areas you plan to insert affordable housing and where NIMBYism may raise its ugly head, on a field trip to previous, successful, results.

The technical details also need to be done right. There is a lot of evidence in the States that the smaller scale the development will be, more the architectural design of the development is consistent with what is already there and the better the management of buildings and the screening and monitoring of tenants, the less likely it will be to generate opposition.

J: How do you monitor and screen for tenants? Do you vet to try and match certain characteristics?

G: You don’t vet for external characteristics, more for behaviours. If there are particularly sensitive geographic areas, screening new tenants in a way that maximises the chance you aren’t going to have behavioural problems in those places is a wise political strategy.

The other aspect of trying to provide more socially mixed environments through adding low income people to the neighbourhood is to take advantage of opportunities where there are underutilised and undermaintained houses or apartment units already in the neighbourhood. We aren’t talking about green-field site construction but rehabilitation of existing properties. If you can target foreclosure opportunities where the property has at least been boarded up or run down for a period of time and acquire those, neighbourhood opposition is much, much less.

The Denver situation from my talk is a good case study here. Statistical studies showed that when the housing authority acquired single family detached homes at foreclosure sales the neighbours were glad that somebody will be living in there – and Denver is an authority that maintains and manages affordable housing well so it doesn’t look like an eyesore. I have done a lot of ‘windshield surveys’ with people new to the city along streets in Denver where there is scattered site public housing and they can’t pick public housing until I tell them the secret – they are the best maintained houses on the street.

J: Is the model of isolated individual housing rather than blocks successful in the US?

G: Absolutely, the construction of large-scale public housing developments in the US has essentially ceased for 30 years and that is a good thing. The major change in social housing that we have seen beginning in 1990s was the HOPE (Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere) VI project. Communities that have an old-fashioned-style high density and run down housing development apply to Washington for a grant based on a physical plan for converting what usually are a series of semi-vacant or abandoned public housing buildings into a mixed income community on that same plot of ground. Some of the community that ends up back there should be the original public housing tenants but there is no requirement for the same number or same tenants. There is a requirement that other income groups should be amongst the composition to create diversity. I’m not completely in favour of that strategy but it is the dominant strategy in place right now that is in the process of converting what were definite areas of concentrated poverty into visually stunning and seemingly workable places in terms of all the indicators (crime, trash, graffiti, gang or drug wars etc) being absent.

J: Does this ‘organic’ market-forced movement, or gentrification, achieve the same results as planned movement of people out of high-poverty areas?

G: No – in a pure market economy the governing principle of who lives where is driven by who has the money and can afford to be in the most desirable places. Affordable places change historically within any given city. So not only can the rich essentially govern where they want to live, because the market will respond to them, but then by default, if you work down, those with the most money get the best spots, what they leave over is the second best, for the next class down who can compete for this level and so on. The residual spots, least desirable spots will be ‘won’ by those with the least disposable income. And there is no reason why the market should keep those areas below a certain threshold of social problems. In fact the market will just keep cramming the least-advantaged people into these residual areas unless the economy is so prosperous that no one is poor. So it is crucial, in my view, that planning steps in to keep that market dynamic from happening. This is the central social challenge of today’s urban world – the market naturally leads to segregation by income groups.

The trick is how to do this intervention in the housing market process. And this is what we in the US and Australia have not been able to do directly with public housing because it does not control a big enough share of the market. In Australia, 5% of housing stock is social housing. The US only has 1%, although there are rental vouchers available to a lot more people.

In the US, decent and affordable housing, supported by the government if necessary, is not a right or social entitlement. So low-income people are forced to scramble in the market for the cheapest housing available. And it is cheap only in comparison with what the rich pay. As a percentage of income it is hugely burdensome. Low income people in the US typically pay more than half their income in
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private-market rent leaving paltry amounts for the rest of life.

J: **What do low-income renters get for their money?**

G: These are not high-quality housing options. The immediate home environment is unhealthy and the larger environment is full of barriers to advancement such as geographical isolation from employment and educational opportunities, as well as all the sociological problems of concentrated poverty such as social norms, role models, inducements to get involved in things like gangs, drug markets, and early teenage sex that aren't going to promote individual economic advancement.

The whole environment is something that most public housing policy doesn't touch. Less than a quarter of people eligible for financial assistance in their housing in the U.S. actually get it as it is not funded to scale – a purely a political decision. But even if we were to fund it, we would still have a problem because the way most housing assistance is delivered is not a spatially sensitive program.

J: **How does the rental voucher system work?**

G: Here's how the rental voucher (formerly called Section 8) system works; for each metro area there is an average rent identified for the distribution of various sizes of apartments, depending on the household size. They then ask the tenants to contribute 30% of their income to rent, and the government provides a voucher for the balance, based on the average rent. If people want to spend more or less of their income, it is up to them.

People can use rental vouchers wherever they want, so they typically still live in or close to high poverty neighbourhoods, and the reason is simple: social networks, religious institutions, family childcare options. Also the rental voucher system is optional for landlords. If they don’t want to accept them they do not have to. If they have an aversion to low-income tenants or if they don’t like minorities, they simply say they don’t want to participate in the rental voucher program. So this clearly limits where some people who might want to move to better neighbourhoods can actually move. The hotter neighbourhoods, where you ideally would want to move low-socio-economic tenants to, are where the landlords say “no way.”

So to get a mix of people's income in neighbourhoods you need both a housing assistance strategy that covers the lower income population that you care about as well as a special strategy that thinks very carefully about how and where those subsidised dwellings can be used – should they scattered about or concentrated.

J: **How would you change the system to work better?**

G: We need to change the system to make it double sided. First, you make it a requirement for any landlord to participate in the voucher program if a tenant requests it. Secondly, and this is controversial amongst all my more liberal colleagues, you tell recipients of these scarce rental vouchers that they have to use them in a low poverty neighbourhood. It’s a tough decision. On the one hand you are telling people that they can no longer live next door to mum and have her look after the kids, but on the other hand, there are all the social indicators of what happens in high-poverty concentrations. You have the trade-off between individual rights and greater social well-being and at this point I am coming down on the side of the social well-being. We have a scarce resource in these rental vouchers and we have an obligation, as a nation, to use it in a way in which we get the most social benefit from it. And that should be for those who want to get out of the ghetto and reduce the chances that their children will end up in the ghetto.

J: **Is the support for this idea growing?**

G: I know that there has been a political backlash against the rental vouchers, precisely because it has not been controlled geographically as I have advocated. But people are turning the argument on its head.

In the summer of 2008, the Atlantic Magazine ran a story by Hanna Rosin called “American Murder Mystery” arguing that the reason why the crime rate in some suburbs has gone up is because people with rental housing vouchers began moving in. This included a map that plotted where rental voucher recipients were located with an “X” and where crimes happened with an ‘O’ and concluded that they were in the same place. But nobody bothered to check if the crime was actually committed by the voucher recipients.

Other studies have shown that the landlords who most often participate in the rental voucher system are those in weaker neighbourhood markets, where there already is a high crime rate, for example, who can’t get a regular flow of market rate tenants. Some of these landlords advertise they want voucher tenants. So they are getting a load of voucher tenants but they aren’t necessarily the cause of crime in these neighbourhoods. So what is cause and what is effect?

This is a classic fallacy, in so many ways. Yet it makes all the sensationalist TV talk shows and journalists want to run stories ‘proving’ that the government policy is ruining your neighbourhood.

J: **Why does taking people out of their existing high-poverty neighbourhoods work better than pumping money into providing more opportunities within these neighbourhoods?**

G: This notion of taking an existing low-income area and investing a lot to improve that place has been around in the US since the mid 1960's. It was called the “gilding the ghetto” strategy.

I personally believe that for those who want to leave such areas we should facilitate and encourage that. I am very sceptical of the ability of federal, state and local governments to come up with enough resources to “gild the ghetto” sufficiently to overcome the systemic barriers as to why that place doesn’t work so well.

J: **What are these barriers?**

G: These include the market forces that work to under maintain housing. Lower income people can’t afford the upkeep on their homes if they own them or don’t pay enough rent to landlords to encourage them to upkeep dwellings. So these should be subsidised to keep the physical environment up.

The US school system is generally geographically based, with set catchment areas. Examples of cross-district schools and now charter schools try to break the link between where you live and where you go to school, but it is pretty slow going. And as long as this link remains there is an impact on your educational opportunity. Kids entering schools coming from poverty backgrounds tend not to come to school educationally ready, so just keeping order in the classroom is a problem. Kids in these classes spout the American dream about their aspirations, doctors, lawyers, the odd sports star etc, but have no knowledge about the behavioural, academic or intellectual performance you need to become one.

Environmental Systems in many of these areas are a real problem with environmental pollution in the soil and air that is not easy to fix to the point where it is a healthy environment for children to grow up in. Depending on where the neighbourhood is located it may or may not be accessible to where the job opportunities are that provide
mobility up the economic ladder. For instance, in Detroit, more and more of these jobs are located on the periphery but all the poor neighbourhoods are in the core, with miserable public bus transportation as a feeble linkage.

The fact is, there are limited resources you can invest in improving the living quality of people in poor neighbourhoods, and I am interested in getting the most bang for your buck for that investment to ensure disadvantaged people get the most benefit.

J: Another topic you cover is urban sprawl. Is there a way that we can contain urban sprawl and should we be combating urban sprawl?

G: There is an old saying that Americans only hate one thing more than sprawl – that's density. It is a real tough sell but this is a good time to think about reforming the classic American ideology of a single family in a detached home on a large plot of land, the 21st century equivalent of the “house on the plains” myth.

The challenge is that in today’s world it is difficult to think about having the world you want as an individual, yet having that same world you want for everybody else. What we want as individuals can’t be generalised to the whole society because it becomes irrational. If everybody had a 2-acre plot, how could you ever service such a community with effective public transport, or build enough roads to keep them from getting congested. You can’t build a city based on this and we are seeing congestion now on circumferential highways that are forced to be built to service these low-density suburbs in most American cities. It is difficult to make public transport financially viable in low-density cities. It is more than just driving a car with better gas mileage. If we can get some political purchase on this notion of ‘clean and green’ and as a citizen of Earth we rethink about our places of working and living, then maybe we can start building a constituency for anti-sprawl measures.

Some people and places are catching on. Portland Oregon is probably the leading U.S. city – in the 1970’s as a State-wide policy, created an urban boundary that literally drew a line on a map that marked the point beyond which building permits would not be granted. This forced builders to use higher densities and to revisit sites that needed environmental remediation because now there was an incentive to do so rather than going for a cheaper green field site on the fringe. And the city was smart enough to plan for this increased density by adding light rail lines, adding dedicated bike paths and physical designs that got people out of their cars and into public transport and on their bikes. It is a really un-American city in that regard, almost European.

So we know how to do anti-sprawl actions if we have the political will to do so, and this energy shortage/environmental nexus of issues can play out well as urban sprawl discussion points.

J: Onto the Global Economic Crisis, how bad is the foreclosure problem in the US and is this affecting all spectrums of American society equally?

G: The expectations are that one in 30 U.S. homeowners next year will foreclose and there have been estimates that lost property value, just due to foreclosures nearby, is around US$360 Billion in the next two years. That's the lost value due to the neighbours around foreclosed properties having their value eroded due to under-maintenance associated with foreclosures. It is not just a monetary phenomenon it is a real quality of life loss.

And it's incredibly widespread geographically and across income distributions. It is certainly more intense in certain locations. In Ohio and Michigan this is because the underlying economic problems of a manufacturing-based economy have been there for a decade, and they were already declining economies and people were induced to make big gambles with mortgage offers. Then when their job got shifted to China, so did their house, in some sense. In other, faster-growing regions like Florida and California, risky mortgages were acquired on the false assumption of ever-rising home prices that would permit refinancing or sales at a profit were repayment difficulties to arise. When the housing speculative bubble burst, so did this false assumptions.

Certainly foreclosure rates are higher in moderate income neighbourhoods but even high income neighbourhoods have been hit. This is because the mortgage products that were developed and aggressively sold in the US up until the mid 2000’s offered all people the chance to take big gambles to reach into sections of the housing market that were ultimately well beyond their long term ability to sustain. So people in every income class got low-documentation loans with variable interest rates and high debt-income ratios in order to get into that dream house in a nicer neighbourhood, based on the long-shot bet that their income and home values would go up and interest rates would drop in the future.

J: Is there an opportunity for public housing to buy out some of the foreclosed mortgages?

G: In principal it is a great opportunity. In practice I don’t think we have the institutional capability to undertake this. A year ago Congress passed a Neighbourhood Stabilisation Plan, where jurisdictions with a high rate of foreclosures could apply for a special allocation of moneys that they could use to deal with foreclosure crises. It was done on such a short lead time that plans were cobbled together and most plans focused on demolishing foreclosed properties. But my idea would have been to what Denver did. This is a great opportunity to buy up foreclosed houses in nice neighbourhoods that could be used for affordable housing in perpetuity. It would make the neighbourhoods happy as it buys up foreclosed housing and ideally maintains them better. It would create opportunities for social mixing and is a win-win situation but unfortunately most jurisdictions are not going to use the money this way.

J: Finally, what is your early take on Sydney as an urban centre?

G: My thoughts are almost entirely positive. I am a very visually oriented person and do a lot of painting, especially of urban scenes. So I am very drawn to how the portrait of how the city lays itself out. And this is one gorgeous city, one of the most beautiful cities I have ever seen. This comes from the natural setting, with the incredibly intricate pattern of peninsula and inlets creating interesting edges. Edges, which could be water, canyons, mountains, whatever, help make a city unique. These edges offer landmarks, you can see where you are, and the city has done a wonderful job of taking these natural edges and enhancing them with distinctive, human-built icons. The Opera House and the Harbour Bridge are the most famous but by no means the only outstanding illustrations.

Also, I think the rhetoric does have some congruence with reality in terms of social equity. Income is much more evenly distributed throughout neighbourhoods than anywhere in the US, and this shows up in the inequalities of space. The absolutely homogenous areas of wealth you see in major US cities are much smaller and more dispersed amid other income groups in Sydney. These may be selective observations based on my wanderings but while there are pockets of wealth they are not completely isolated from non-affluent pockets. I don’t see barriers to access into wealthy suburbs that are present in some cities in America.
Membership with the Planning Research Centre for 2009-2010 now open

The PRC is inviting members of the planning, development and urban design professions to become members.

Your support will see us able to expand our events and publication program in 2010 and assist in funding new and ongoing research projects that directly benefit the urban and regional environment in NSW.

Benefits of membership include receiving the regular PRC Newsletter, free attendance at Sunset Seminars, Current Thinking Seminars and other evening lectures and discussions held by the Planning Research Centre, and discounts to short courses and other educational opportunities.

Membership levels include student, individual and corporate membership. Opportunities also exist to sponsor evening events, with branding and other exposure available.

For a full list of membership benefits and levels please review the following table.

To obtain your membership simply complete the form on the following page of this newsletter or for more information contact Sue Lalor on 02 9114 0941 or via email at slalor@arch.usyd.edu.au.

### 2010 Membership Levels and Benefits (Prices include GST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Level</th>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Individual Student       | $65 per year | • Free attendance at all PRC Sunset Seminars and Current Thinking in Planning Seminars and networking functions  
|                          |            | • Distribution of regular online PRC Newsletter  
|                          |            | • Open to all undergraduate and postgraduate students at all Universities |
| Individual Professional  | $130 per year | • Free attendance at all PRC Sunset Seminars and Current Thinking in Planning Seminars and networking functions  
|                          |            | • Distribution of regular online PRC Newsletter  
|                          |            | • 20% discount on all Professional Education short courses |
| Corporate                | $550 per year | • Free attendance for up to 5 staff at all PRC Sunset Seminars and Current Thinking in Planning Seminars and networking functions  
|                          |            | • Distribution of regular online PRC Newsletter to all staff on list  
|                          |            | • 20% discount on all Professional Education short courses for all staff attending |
| PRC Corporate Sponsorship | $5,000 for 3 years | • Free attendance for up to 15 staff at all PRC Sunset Seminars and Current Thinking in Planning Seminars and networking functions  
|                          |            | • Monthly online PRC Newsletter with free Banner Advertising opportunities  
|                          |            | • Corporate listing on PRC website  
|                          |            | • 20% discount on all Professional Education short courses for all staff attending |

### Proposed Event Charges (Prices include GST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Current Thinking in Planning/Round Table   | Free  
| Discussions                                | PRC Members and University of Sydney students |
|                                            | $10  
|                                            | Students (other)                        |
|                                            | $20  
|                                            | Individual Professional                 |
|                                            | $50  
|                                            | Corporate (up to 5 guests)              |
| Sunset Seminar Series                      | Free  
|                                            | PRC Members and University of Sydney students |
|                                            | $15  
|                                            | Students (other)                        |
|                                            | $30  
|                                            | Individual Professional                 |
|                                            | $75  
|                                            | Corporate (up to 5 guests)              |
| Short Courses (1 Day) - No GST applicable  | $300  
|                                            | Students (all University of Sydney students) |
|                                            | $490  
|                                            | PRC Members                             |
|                                            | $615  
|                                            | Individual Professional                 |
|                                            | $500 (pp)  
|                                            | Corporate (2 or more staff from one booking, $400 for PRC Corporate member multiple bookings) |
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