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Synopsis

Deindustrialisation and the shift to post-Fordism is changing Australian cities and shaping not just the trajectory of suburban (re)development but what the suburbs mean in contemporary Australian life. Suburban places and spaces reflect the prevailing logics of their development. Australian suburbs, for instance, were predominantly established during the industrial period and many retain an emphasis on cars and a structure that supports an industrial workforce. Deindustrialisation is a process of change that prompts placemaking themes of renewal, one of which is gentrification. Central to gentrification in the context of deindustrialisation is the negotiation of a range of contested images, aesthetics, values and understandings of place. This is the starting point for this thesis, which examines the repositioning of an Australian suburb in the context of such contradictory processes.

Through case study research in Mayfield, a deindustrialising suburb of the Australian city of Newcastle, and utilising complementary qualitative methods, including participant observation, this thesis examines and analyses official and unofficial discourses of place. The thesis argues that in Mayfield, a discourse of gentrification explicitly oriented around regeneration and change was mobilised through the efforts of local interests who positioned themselves as gatekeepers over images of the suburb and its future. Central to this discourse is the concept of heritage, which is used as a key frame of reference for shaping ideas about Mayfield as undergoing gentrification. An analysis of the dynamics of heritage-gentrification in Mayfield reveals subtle meta-themes of transitionality that resonate with broader tropes of placemaking in a post-industrial, post-Fordist context. Where the privileging of gentrification seeks to ‘improve’ or capitalise on elements of Mayfield's physical, social and symbolic environment, it also seeks to control and sanitise others and a tension is evident between the dominant discourse of gentrification and other, less intentional elements of the suburb’s identity. These other ‘placemaking’ activities reflect the pre-existing logics of the suburb that are firmly rooted in its industrial, stigmatised past. Two activities emerged as significant in this context: skateboarding and loitering. An
analysis of these activities again reveals the key theme of transitionality as important but played out and realised in very different ways.

Drawing on the theories of Lefebvre and Baudrillard in particular, the thesis probes the tensions that emerge at the intersection of Fordist and post-Fordist imaginings and uses of suburban space. It argues that deindustrialisation cannot be understood in terms of a dichotomy between the spaces shaped by a Fordist past and those imagined in a post-Fordist future. Rather, Fordism and post-Fordism, and the real and imagined spaces that they create, coexist in tension in the context of transitionality which frames and orders notions of place in the deindustrialising suburb. Transitionality is a dynamic space within which images of a suburb's future are negotiated and contested in the context of its everyday present and stigmatised past.
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Chapter One

Framing change: Deindustrialisation, Post-Fordism and suburban place

Since the 1970s, the role of the western city as a site of mass industrial production in areas such as food and minerals processing and manufacturing is being progressively 'hollowed out' (Amin 1994). Improvements in communication and changes in manufacturing and transport are shifting unskilled and semi-skilled work to the cities of the 'global south', while the nature of economic production in western cities becomes more skilled and flexible in processes of deindustrialisation. Further, the service and commodities sector has boomed. Where the typical post-war city worker might have been factory worker, he or she is now more likely to be a call centre operator, sales worker or middle manager (Allen et al., 1997). Western cities, then, have undergone a shift in the dominant form of production that has dramatically changed the nature of what it means to live in a city. The spatial arrangements of housing have shifted as well. Under Fordism suburbia, or low density housing sprawl, flourished in the west, capitalising in particular on the widespread availability of private cars (Gartman 2009). In Australia, Fordism, combined with post-War prosperity and increasing population, ushered in the rapid expansion of the suburbs, built around principles of low-density housing, road accessibility and a separation, both physical and conceptual, between home and work (and leisure). Mass production and the mass consumption of standardised consumer goods have been at the core of suburban lifestyles. Mass media and communication further solidified the patterns of consumption representative of Fordism. Suburbia became both a geographical and cultural form of living, the patterns of Fordism intrinsically enshrined in the urban form.
Although the life-styles and social organisation of post-Fordism can be viewed as substantively different from those that prevailed in the Fordist period, its practices and processes often unfold over, through and between the landscapes, both physical and imagined, of Fordism. In particular, the nature of involvement and participation in the commodity economy has altered with the shift from Fordism to post-Fordism, evoking new ways of producing and consuming both goods and services, and the meanings represented in, and by, them. For instance, key to the shift into increasingly diverse flexible production, characterised by post-Fordism, is a flourishing consumer market that endlessly creates and maintains the demand for ever more sophisticated goods and services (Castilla et al., 2000; Chattergee 2007; Spierings et al., 2008; Zukin 2009:221). The economic changes of post-Fordism, sometimes referred to as flexible accumulation (Harvey 1989), hold that production increasingly responds to smaller and more diverse demands and in turn, can actually create more diverse needs through creative supply-side management. In other words, western industrial capitalism has shifted from a period of mass standardised production (including the production of consumer ‘needs’ and markets, such as the marketing of ‘lifestyles’ for instance, those that included a particular type of washing machine) to more nuanced and sophisticated forms of production and consumption:

...new logic of production, “flexible specialisation” – emerged as a challenge to mass production once markets for standardised goods were saturated, and higher quality and more specialised goods attracted consumers. Into this volatile environment have stepped flexible producers who can respond quickly to changing market conditions. (Castilla et al., 2000:222)

Amin (1994) argues that the term post-Fordism is increasingly conflated with late capitalism in terms of its implications for studying the processes of commodification and the reification of cultural symbols of value. Post-Fordism, then, is a form of economic and industrial production, but it is also a cultural movement, associated with the production and consumption of an ever-wider variety of products and the corresponding creation of value for these products. This process necessitates a shift in the nature of the consumer market. That is, economic growth in the post-Fordist era is
predicated on an ever-expanding range of values and meanings associated with a concomitant rise in the products to meet them (Harvey 1989; Soja 2000).

The creation, interpretation and value of consumer products are social and cultural processes, and the way people imagine, utilise and appropriate products as part of their identities is more than an economic process, it is embedded in the social milieu. The proliferation of signs associated with objects has become a hallmark of what some term post-modernism (Baudrillard 1983) and this has become part of the shift from Fordism to post-Fordism adding a cultural dimension to the economic and organisational changes inherent in the deindustrialisation of western cities (Harvey 1989; Soja 1989). Post-Fordism is therefore viewed as a structural, economic change in the composition of cities, but also a cultural shift realised through the ever more sophisticated production and consumption of products. Products, their manipulation, appropriation and use, do not just exist as detached, neutral objects; rather, they are socially meaningful and spatially bound. In other words, the consumption of products, the social processes by which people develop, consider and maintain social meaning through material goods, are dialogically realised with space and place (Appadurai 1986; Soja 1989). At one level, of course, this simply means it is impossible to consider the consumption of products independently of their spatial context. At another level, as Lefebvre (1991) argues, though capitalism retains organising logics that hold implications for the imagination of space and place. In this way, the processes of Fordism and post-Fordism are inscribed and produced through the ideoscapes of cities.

The spatialisation of exchange is easier to imagine when one considers places as commodities. That is, the ways in which people realise the processes of novelty, purchase, conspicuous consumption and renewal through their built environments. In other words, participation in the symbolic economy is realised through place and space. Gentrification, where material objects and entities such as houses are produced and consumed, can be viewed as a form of commodification, a site in which the values associated with housing forms are manipulated, capitalised, modified and appropriated as part of social processes of distinction and taste. In this way, place and space are incorporated into regimes of meaning and value-making as part of participation in the broader symbolic economy. Contemporary gentrification can be
seen as entangled in the cultural processes of post-Fordism, allied with the increasing proliferation of regimes of value associated with material goods, the processes of personal distinction, creativity and identity work that are realised through the processes of consumption. Although the broad process of gentrification predate post-Fordism, gentrification has gathered momentum under conditions of post-Fordism, mapping new forms of economic activity (participation in the symbolic economy) onto existing ideoscapes, such as Fordist suburbia.

**Gentrification**

The decline of inner city industrial production (and the higher density workers' housing associated with it) combined with the growth of the suburbs followed by the eventual rejuvenation of the inner city by educated 'knowledge' workers is characteristic of post-Fordism's changing modes of production (Baum 2007). Gentrifying areas directly reflect changing socio-economic changes as a consequence of deindustrialisation. At its broadest, gentrification is the gradual improvement of an area often represented through an increase in property values and housing tenure. British sociologist Ruth Glass coined the term gentrification in the 1960s to describe the pattern of development in the London suburb of Islington (Atkinson and Bridge 2005); however, since the 1960s gentrification has 'played out' in a variety of ways. One popular iteration of gentrification holds that under-utilised or disused industrial or commercial areas are ‘colonised’ by artists and ‘alternative’ residents who appreciate the absence of proscribed or planned notions of place (Evans 2001; Ley 2003). These areas are often not completely devoid of residents prior to gentrification, housing those who may continue to work in surrounding industries that are diminishing as part of broader processes of deindustrialisation (Smith 1986) but gradually they become increasingly residential and middle class with a corresponding increase in property values.

The patterns of gentrification have been much discussed, both in academic literature (Hamnett 1991; Lees 2000; Newman and Wyly 2006; Smith 1996; Wacquant 2008;
Zukin 1987), and the popular press. Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital (1984, 1991) has provided a popular theory for understanding the transformative processes of gentrification (Bridge 2001a; Bridge 2001b; Butler and Robson 2001; Ley 2003), highlighting the colonisation of neglected urban areas by younger residents who may be economically poor but are rich in terms of cultural capital. Evans (2001) refers to these residents as 'stormtroopers of gentrification' opening up downtrodden urban areas to more 'mainstream' or middle class occupants through the development of previously disused, neglected or marginalised areas, often capitalising on their use as enclaves for artistic, creative expression (Johnson 2006; Ley 2003; Strom 2010), and the ability to demonstrate one's 'hipness' (Makagon 2010; Zukin 2009). The second stage of gentrification brings an influx of middle class home-buyers who are attracted by the atmosphere inspired by 'creativity', such as art galleries, restaurants and boutiques, as well as improvements in services as a result of increased property taxes. The artistic ‘stormtroopers’ typically respond to the mainstreaming of their artistic enclave as inauthentic, or gauche (and the neighbourhood becomes too expensive to live in anyway) and move on to another downtrodden, and (therefore) affordable, area. Further, increasing property prices and costs associated with services often force a gentrifying area's remaining working class residents to leave also (Slater 2008; Squires 1996:244; Maraanen and Walks 2008).

From a planning perspective, gentrification, or the 'rejuvenation' of downtrodden urban environments is highly attractive way of addressing socio-economic decline (and increasing land/property rates). And so, gentrification is often positioned as part of a broader strategy for economic success, especially following deindustrialisation (Lees 2000; Stevenson 2005). In Australia, the transformative 'promise' of gentrification, especially as a means to ameliorate the negative consequences of deindustrialisation has resulted in interest from different levels of government keen to propagate development. In particular, Richard Florida's work on gentrification has

---

been influential in local government policies. Florida posits that the success of cities relies on their ability to foster creativity and that those with high cultural capital generate economic success through their work, whether that is artistic creativity or by living in a place that fosters creativity and imagination in the science or technology field. According to Florida (2003) the cultural elements of a city contribute to its economic success by both providing an interesting and inspiring place for highly educated ‘creatives’ to live, and enabling them to express or represent themselves creatively through the spaces and places in which they live. In other words, for Florida (2003), gentrifying urban areas do more than simply accommodate knowledge workers, they are economic generators in themselves, providing the means of creative expression for their residents, and also visitors. In this way gentrifying places become commodities - part of the process through which people realise their creativity in, and through, the symbolic economy (Molotch 1996). Florida's (2003) model has been widely criticised for its simplicity and over-reliance on accessibility to cultural capital through traditional routes, such as formal education (Malanga 2004), and further, its lack of 'fit' in an Australian context (Gibson and Brennan-Horley 2005).

More specifically, planning for gentrification is not as straightforward as Florida's model might posit because gentrifiers are discerning consumers of place and space, ultimately interested in the authenticity of these areas as opportunities to express themselves (Zukin 2009). To put this in Bourdieu's (1984) terms, the aesthetic redevelopment of a gentrifying area, enshrining and capitalising on new residents’ cultural capital, can be perceived by newer residents as being inauthentic or false or, ultimately, too commodified. The cultural capital realised through gentrification is in danger of being delegitimised through an overt connection with formalised representations of economic capital. One 'tactic' aimed at encouraging or securing the process of gentrification in an area are attempts to maintain social 'mix' made by local municipal authorities (Newman and Wyly 2006) in the hope that this will keep a connection with an area's cultural (rather than economic) capital and maintain its 'authenticity'. This frequently means encouraging ‘pre-gentrification’ residents who

---

2 For instance, in 2002, the Australian Local Government Association (National Economics 2002) adopted Florida's creativity indicators to inform their assessment of growth and development in Australian urban areas (Gibson and Brennan-Horley 2006).
are often economically deprived, relative to the gentrifiers, to remain in the area to continue whilst retaining opportunities for 'creatives' to 'make their mark'\textsuperscript{3}.

The idea that 'pre-gentrification' residents' tenure in an up-and-coming area may be protected in order to maintain its authenticity speaks to the broader inequalities that characterise the gentrification process. Despite the widespread popularity of Florida's model with city councils in Australia, sociologists and others criticise the model of 'creative-based' gentrification, and many have noted the development of a new 'un-creative' underclass (Malanga 2004) where, contrary to a model of an inclusive, creative urban community, for many marginalised workers the creative class will remain inaccessible (Peck 2005). Critics claim that in fact more traditional forms of cultural capital, such as education, are still very much in play in creativity and the acquisition of cultural capital, highlighting the inequalities in the provision of, and access to, education (Malanga 2004).

So, planning for gentrification as a deliberate means to improve or regenerate an area is problematic as the processes of 'creative consumption' are subtle and interventions must enable participation in the symbolic economy without being overly prescriptive (Zukin 2009). Further, popular models, such as Florida's 'creative economy' have been criticised for failing to address persistent structural inequalities. Moreover, there are inherent difficulties in talking about the gentrification in Australia as most of the literature surrounding gentrification grows out of older cities overseas, which typically feature higher density inner city housing. Australia’s relatively late expansion however, saw a much higher level of low-density suburban inner city development. Australian cities embraced the suburban form earlier than many other cities in the west (Davison 2006) and this, coupled with more recent (post-World War Two) growth and development means that much of city-adjacent housing in Australia is low density, rather than high density in form (Horne 1964:28; Stevenson 1998:21).

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item[{\textsuperscript{3}}] Newcastle provides a particularly apposite example of this in the Renew Newcastle project, which sponsors artists to set up studios in inner city Newcastle, an area with low occupancy which contributes to its image as a neglected, run-down place. Renew Newcastle is a not-for-profit organisation which is also supported by the Newcastle City Council, both financially and through other forms of assistance, such as organisational advice. For more details see www.renewnewcastle.org (retrieved 24 January 2011)
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Gentrification as a planning strategy as opposed to a more ad hoc, organic process of development is characteristic of the post-Fordist era. It involves recognising and capitalising on the dimensions of the symbolic economy in order to develop urban areas, as opposed to earlier, (Fordist) versions of gentrification where housing value was more closely tied to increasing demands for housing close to the city, and a rejection of suburbia (Zukin 1987). In this way gentrification meshes with the idea that social and economic processes are intrinsically connected and represented spatially (Giddens 1990; Lefebvre 1991; Urry 2007) through the (sub)urban form and as such, the intersection of the processes of Fordism and post-Fordism can be identified in ways-of-knowing urban places. Suburbia is representative of the technologies, social patterns and economic realities of the period within which it was established and developed: Fordism. The shift from Fordism to post-Fordism, therefore, suggests new ways of interpreting space and place, incorporating them into the symbolic economy, engaging space and place in processes of consumption and commodification (Jameson 1991; Shaw 2005b), such as gentrification. The economic and structural changes associated with the shift from Fordism to post-Fordism have been analysed, as has the transformative power of gentrification following deindustrialisation (Lees 2000). Yet, if economic, social and cultural processes can be represented spatially, what are the implications for local practices and processes involved in ways-of-knowing both Fordist and post-Fordist ideoscapes? If gentrification is representative of the incorporation of space and place in the symbolic economy as part of broader processes of post-Fordism, how are we to account for its intersection with the existing ideoscapes of Fordist industrial suburbia so prevalent in Australia? In other words, how can the use and imaginings of place in the context of transition from an industrial past to a post-industrial future be explained?

Through a multi-method approach that included in-depth fieldwork and the analysis of secondary sources, I set out to examine the interplay of the different understandings of place that emerged in Mayfield, a deindustrialising suburb of the Australian city of Newcastle, following the closure in 1999 of the landmark BHP Steelworks located in the suburb. The research aimed to develop a rich account of the discourses of place associated with deindustrialisation ‘on the ground’ and to identify the patterns and processes of change realised through different ways-of-
knowing and imagining place. Cultural understandings and interpretations of place are both implicit and explicit, reached in consensus but also in isolation. They reflect tastes and shared values, and are organised around social cleavages, in particular class. Obtaining an account of these cultural understandings of place requires a particularly comprehensive approach. I therefore undertook ethnographic-style participant observation of Mayfield that involved living, working and positioning myself as part of the place under investigation, as well as undertaking in-depth interviews, observing key meetings, and analysing official documents to gain insights into the imagining and the use of space in this suburb at this time. The PhD research was supported by a scholarship funded by an Australian Research Council Linkage grant. The Chief Investigators, Deborah Stevenson, David Rowe and Kevin Markwell from the University of Newcastle and the Industry Partner, Newcastle City Council through its Mayfield Mainstreet Committee proposed the PhD should examine the ways in which perceptions of Mayfield were changing as a consequence of deindustrialisation, hallmarked in particular, by the closure of BHP. The study 'grew' out of previous investigations into the images of place in Mayfield that had been undertaken by the Chief Investigators.

Finding out: ways-of-knowing Mayfield

Newcastle is a city dominated by its connection with heavy industry. One factor in particular, the closure in 1999 of the Broken Hill Proprietry (BHP) steelworks in the suburb of Mayfield became a pivotal focal point for investigations into how the suburb was changing. Highly significant were the narratives of change in terms of the closure as severing the last ‘tie’ to Mayfield's industrial past, 'freeing' up the suburb for beneficial redevelopment, or gentrification, an idea that McGuirk and Rowe (2001) point out was propagated in the popular media at the time. The closure of BHP therefore, became an apposite starting point for an examination of processes and practices of imagining place in the broader context of a shift from Fordism to post-Fordism. I set out to investigate how locals imagine themselves as part of a changing place. In particular, I wanted to know which elements of change are considered important, contingent, irrelevant, and what are the shared ideas about the suburb’s past and future trajectory. Early in the research process it became clear that
gentrification was highly important to the way in which Mayfield was being imagined especially following the closure of BHP. The idea of Mayfield as a place with a 'rich history' or heritage was mobilised by local business interests and the Newcastle City Council as a key to the formation of an 'official' discourse of gentrification in the suburb, guiding and shaping images of place and space. The gentrification discourse also sought to control and sanitise other ways-of-knowing the suburb, the more marginal uses of the suburb and experiences by its less franchised residents - skateboarding and loitering emerged as important in this context. My research method needed to account for the explicit narratives of gentrification relayed by its adherents but also the implicit values and understandings of place and space as they played out on the ground in the suburb. Therefore I utilised a multi-method approach with a significant proportion of the research data gleaned through ethnographic style participant observation. In order to gain insights into the subtle processes and practices of placemaking in Mayfield, I moved into a house in the suburb and began 'learning to be a Mayfielder' which involved a wide variety of activities from attending meetings of local community organisations to asking questions of my neighbours and friends, such as what they liked about the suburb, how long they had lived there, and why they decided to live there. The research also involved also more subtle observations, such as watching the ways that skaters used the local skatepark, detailing patterns of wear on grass verges in areas commonly used by the homeless and watching small scale drug dealing outside the local supermarket. Once I had established some general themes to follow I began to conduct more structured interviews.

City-scapes develop and change, they are interpreted and reinterpreted as their inhabitants seek new resources through which to construct narratives about their lives in a place. They are resemanticised and contested, revealing a plethora of tensions that comprise the diversity of living in a city. Yet this thesis argues that there are underlying themes that structure particular ways-of-knowing place, especially in the context of deindustrialising cities. In particular, it extends the economic understandings of Fordism and post-Fordism to identify and examine their spatial and cultural dimensions. Making sense of these characteristics enables an understanding of the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism that resonates with literatures surrounding heritage, gentrification and post-industrialism.
In addressing my research question the thesis identifies a tension between 'knowing' Mayfield as an industrial suburb and its emerging identity as a post-industrial place. These intersecting ways-of-knowing place open up a discursive space of transition. Mayfield as a post-Fordist place is represented through the gentrification discourse where gentrification is part of value-production within the broader symbolic economy. Meanwhile, the activities and processes that comprise the 'unofficial' discourses of Mayfield are played out in the 'non-spaces' of Fordist suburbia. Viewing place and space as produced by and through the social, cultural, economic and technological processes of the period enables a more fine-grained understanding of the processes of transition as a contested place. Using the work of Lefebvre (1991), combined with the literature on mobilities from Urry (2007) and others, a synergy between two seemingly contrary versions of place and space is identified and transition is identified as a dynamic space, the site of contested images and understandings of place.

**Thesis outline**

Chapter One introduces the core concerns of this thesis, in particular the cultural consequences of transition in the context of deindustrialisation. The thesis aims to examine how the change from Fordism to post-Fordism is experienced, apprehended and understood in an Australian context. In this chapter, the case study location is introduced and research methods briefly outlined. Also introduced are the broad discourses of knowing Mayfield, the official and unofficial, which are aligned with two competing versions of space and place under conditions of transition.

Chapter Two discusses post-Fordism and deindustrialisation as part of an economic shift in the means of production that is unfolding in cities. It then goes on to identify the cultural changes associated with post-Fordism, in particular the changing role of consumerism in the production of everyday life. Urban regeneration and gentrification, themes introduced in Chapter One, are discussed in detail in Chapter Two, including their framing as antidotes to the negative consequences of deindustrialisation. In particular, the commodification of place and space as part of
'creative' economies is introduced, where places are construed as products in a symbolic economy. In this context strategies of urban regeneration are discussed, including the creation of a 'heritage' discourse in the service of gentrification. Finally, the dimensions of Australian suburbia are discussed and located within the cultural imagination.

Chapter Three begins by mapping the notion of 'place' in urban and cultural studies, culminating in a discussion of constructivist, critical approaches to place and the concept of spatiality. Then, the characteristics of the period of post-Fordism are examined and connections drawn between theories of place and space and the commodification of everyday life. The construction of discourses of place, such as heritage, is also discussed, highlighting the connections to the broad theme of commodification of place. Chapter Four describes the methodology utilised. The opportunities and pitfalls of my approach are discussed. Further, this chapter details how the fieldwork was undertaken, including the meetings that were attended, interviews that were conducted, the use of secondary data and also details of observations taken around the suburb. There is also some discussion of how the data is analysed.

Chapter Five is the first empirical chapter. It introduces Mayfield, its history, demographics, and key characteristics. The chapter explains that the suburb is a stigmatised place in the discourses of Newcastle because of its association with heavy industry, and this remains an important image for Mayfield and the context in which the discourse of gentrification emerged following the closure of BHP in 1999. It then uses secondary sources, such as literature, reports, and statistical data to formulate a picture of the suburb. Mayfield's image as a place in transition is discussed and the suggestion that the suburb is on the cusp of gentrification is examined with reference to housing data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Chapter Five goes on to assess some of the strategies aimed at fostering gentrification in the suburb which have heritage at their core, including Newcastle City Council initiatives and the activities of community working groups.

Chapter Six identifies and introduces the discourse of heritage operating in relation to the suburb, highlighting its position as part of broader reimagining strategies.
Mayfield's heritage discourse is drawn as an official discourse that is sanctioned and supported within the community. The heritage discourse is identified as centred on the suburb's 'period' housing, and the dimensions of this view are explored with reference to interview data. The heritage discourse is then discussed and theorised in terms of the literature laid out in Chapters Two and Three, first to position its importance in attempts to gentrify the suburb, and second, to examine the meta-narratives of heritage, identifying subtle tropes of hyperreality as Baudrillard (1983) might consider them. This chapter ends by identifying what the heritage discourse excludes, asking what elements of Mayfield's image do not fit with the image of the suburb as gentrifying. It introduces another discourse at work in Mayfield, this time an 'unofficial' discourse, one that is characterised by the immediate and un-edited uses of public spaces in the suburb. Chapter Seven discusses this 'unofficial' discourse of placemaking and the nuanced, subtle ways in which the suburb is brought into being through the activities of its residents. The data in Chapter Seven was obtained through extended periods of observation assessing how the suburb was used and invoked through the movements and patterns of mobility by some of its residents. These alternate 'ways of knowing' the suburb were positioned as undermining the official gentrification discourse, because they often included 'deviant' or 'anti-social' uses of public space, such as skateboarding, loitering and public drinking. Again, the theme of transition is identified and explored in terms of these unofficial ways-of-knowing Mayfield. They are theorised in relation to Lefebvre's ideas about the production of space, discussed in Chapter Three, and again resonances are identified between the production of 'everyday' (capitalist) places and the key cultural characteristics of post-Fordism.

Chapter Eight identifies Mayfield's two ways-of-knowing the suburb, the official and unofficial as central to the discursive space opened up by the idea of Mayfield as a place in transition within the broader context of the intersection of Fordism and post-Fordism. It argues that although the two placemaking discourses identified in this thesis emerge from different social groups with different agendas, with different images of the suburb's future and different uses of the suburb's spaces, both pivot on the idea of Mayfield in transition, at the intersection of the spatial processes of Fordism and post-Fordism. The idea of place as a cultural representation of social processes is also explored using Lefebvre's (1991) work in particular,
identifying an underlying theme of commodification of place and space. Overall, though, the identification and exploration of transition as a discursive site for contested images of deindustrialisation and renewal make a significant contribution to cultural understandings of urban place and space.
Chapter Two

Fordist and Post-Fordist places: suburbia, renewal and gentrification

Crucial to an understanding of the shift to post-Fordism is the shifting relationship of creativity and work, that is, post-Fordism involves more than a change in the nature of economic production, rather, it has altered the nature of consumption. Chapter One outlined the ways in which economic and social processes are spatialised, represented in urban landscapes from Fordist suburbia to post-Fordist notions of gentrification. This chapter builds on the key ideas introduced in Chapter One and the idea that an understanding of the patterns and processes of the symbolic economy, especially as realised and represented through (sub)urban landscapes is key to making sense of deindustrialisation and the tensions that arise in the imagination of transitional spaces located at the intersection of Fordist and post-Fordist ways-of-knowing place.

Fordism and post-Fordism: the Australian city

Australian cities are experiencing a transition from being organised to support Fordist economic production to post-Fordism. As discussed in Chapter One, this shift involves a change in cities' modes of production, from industrial manufacturing to the provision of research and services (Amin 1994; Cooke 1995; Harvey 1989; Jessop and Sum 2006; Koch 2006; Tonkiss 2006). Fordism refers to a period of industrial expansion, beginning in the early 20th century, that has produced an increasing range of goods ever more cheaply through increasingly efficient techniques, and controlled by large companies who regulated the processing of raw materials from beginning to their eventual point of sale (Siegel 1988:5). Key to Fordism was a concomitant rise in wages, and an increasing closeness between the producer and the market. That is, during the Fordist period, workers were able to purchase the goods they produced, and the producers were increasingly attuned to the demands of the marketplace.
Importantly, Fordism was the beginning of the age of mass consumption. Post-Fordism, on the other hand, refers to a reorganisation of the mass production characteristic of Fordism. Accounts differ as to the ‘starting point’ of post-Fordism, however, the decline of heavy industries in the US, Canada and Britain from the 1970s is generally viewed as a characteristic of post-Fordism. During this period, heavy industry and manufacturing was increasingly compartmentalised and relocated to areas with lower production costs, often in developing countries (Cooke 1995; Tonkiss 2006). Production itself became more specialised, responding to greater variations in demand. Post-Fordism is a feature of the developed countries of the west, with Fordism increasingly taking place in the second, developing world, or global South.

Post-Fordism has however come to stand for more than an economic regime. It typically describes the methods and institutions of capitalist economies. For instance, Koch (2006) argues that post-Fordism refers to regulationist approaches to understanding capitalist society, describing the interconnections of social, municipal and government institutions on the trajectory of capitalism. Jessop and Sum (2006:59) argue that post-Fordism has been utilised both rigidly, describing particular forms of manufacturing, to extremely broadly, incorporating economic but also social and cultural elements of contemporary life, including the shifting role of consumption. Fordism led to the:

Consumerist representation of urban life as manifest in ideals about the nuclear family, suburban residence, and private car ownership.
(Scott and Storper 2002:212)

Post-Fordism on the other hand evokes the extrapolation and diversification of these manifestations of consumer-based lifestyle. This is an important point and one to which I will return. One of the most striking characteristics of post-Fordism is deindustrialisation in the cities of the west. As discussed in Chapter One, as heavy industrial production has moved to cheaper economies, technical, marketing and artistic development is increasingly based in the economies of the west. These two changes in the nature of production have ushered in a change in the nature of work with the rise of 'creativity' as contingent in economic success of urban areas. Like
industrial cities overseas, Australia’s cities have undergone a post-Fordist transformation in line with the changes in their economic profile:

The post-war domestic economy, which relied on agriculture, mining and domestic manufacturing, produced distinct socio-economic suburban landscapes. In the 1980s and 1990s, Australia’s growth owed much to strong performance in different exports, communications, the service and tertiary sectors and tourism. The declining significance of old industrial economies and the emerging dominance of new industrial economies has meant a different understanding of, and roles for, Australian cities. Increasingly, cities are valued for their capacity to be economically competitive in the global market place. As economic-growth engines, cities are more likened to spaces of consumption than places of production. (Oakley and Rofe 2005:1)

In the post-Fordist city, flexible, 'creative work' or inclusion in the 'knowledge economy' (Drucker 1969; Romer 1986, 1990; Hearn et al., 2005) (the economy of high technology and cultural production), are viewed as key economic motivators. As manufacturing and processing, once the 'backbone' of western industrial economy increasingly shift to cheaper regions, first world industrial economies aim to provide economic growth through the development of research, mobilising intellectual capital to 'improve' existing technologies, and bring into being new services and commodities. Education and human capital are therefore crucial to the post-Fordist agenda. Of course, the shift from manufacturing and mass production to flexible specialisation is not linear. Cities that have deindustrialised, and are experiencing widespread unemployment and often poverty as a result, are sometimes referred to as the 'rust belt'. This term initially referred to the cities in the north-eastern US (although its usage is more widespread now) which were previously engaged in the production of steel and steel products, but are now experiencing social and economic decline (Cooke 1995). Rust belt cities are an example of the variegated trajectory of post-Fordist economic growth, where the economy experiences a 'hollowing out' of heavy industry with no immediate economic generator to replace it with. Pockets of knowledge and technology-based economic growth are becoming established in the
'rust belt' cities of the north-eastern US (Lopez 2004); however, their scale and scope is far from close to rejuvenating the economic base. Australia too, retains a 'rust belt' (Baum 2002; Stimson 2001). Baum (2008) maps Australia’s ‘rust belt’ areas, largely that have been affected by the processes of deindustrialisation where McManus (2005) argues that Newcastle and Wollongong, two cities with histories of steel production, stand out as having similarities with the rust belt cities of the US. In both cities, industrial production has shifted to cheaper areas offshore, undermining the economic base of these cities. Another tenet of post-Fordism is the changing form of production and consumption. One of the key elements of post-Fordism is referred to as ‘flexible accumulation’ (Harvey 1989) where production increasingly responds to smaller and more diverse demands.

Economic growth in the post-Fordist era is oriented around inverting the simple relationship of supply and demand. Post-Fordism is the development and sophistication of a process of consumption that began under Fordism, where producers began to create markets for their products. Under post-Fordism, consumption shifts from the relatively straightforward consumption of mass produced goods valued primarily for their use value, to the consumption of numerous goods with similar (or identical) use values, to retaining a variety of symbolic values, developed through marketing, and appropriated by consumers into their personal projects of distinction (Baudrillard 1983, 1988; Castilla et al., 2000; Harvey 1989; Jessop and Sum 2006; Lury 1996). In other words, there has been a change in the relationship of production to consumption. For Baudrillard, this is a self-generating, self-energising form of consumption, a fundamental change in the manner in which people make sense of their lives, increasingly mediating their understandings through the processes of consumption. This change, argues Baudrillard (1983, 1988), was promulgated by a massive growth and sophistication in the sectors of retail, fashion and consumer products. Baudrillard (1983, 1988) argues that the lives of modern western people would be unrecognisable to them without this proliferation of consumption through which to actualise themselves. As Knox (1991:184) explains:

Now class differentiation is increasingly based on refinement of consumption: the style of consumption itself becomes crucial to the maintenance of social differentiation. Thus we move from the 'vulgar
functionalism' of modernist mass consumption to the 'aestheticized commodity' of postmodernity, where secondary connections - status, chic, humor etc. - rather than the function of the object itself are important (Eagleton 1990; Haung 1987; Hebdige 1988; Works 1985). Superimposed in this general shift is the so-called 'Diderot effect,' a force that encourages individuals to maintain a cultural consistency in their ensemble of material possessions.

Further, there is a circular energy to these post-Fordist processes of consumption:

The use or appropriation of an object is more often than not both a moment of consumption and production, of undoing and doing, of destruction and construction. (Lury 1996:1)

In this way, consumption is about depleting, digesting and appropriating an object, but it is also about using that product as a means to produce more meanings, distinguishing oneself culturally in some way. The relationship between production and consumption is no longer linear, from one to the other, rather, they are co-termingled (Baudrillard 1983; Lury 1996). In the period of post-Fordism consumption is an increasingly convoluted and self-referential regime of values and status realised through aesthetic signs and processes. People make and remake their sense of themselves and their location in relation to others through modes of consumption. As discussed in Chapter One, the ability to identify, manipulate and develop products in the post-Fordist economy involves more than simply the technical skill to design useful products, it is to participate in the symbolic economy, something that requires cultural creativity. The increasingly sophisticated role of consumption in the period of post-Fordism plays an important role in urban placemaking in the cities of the west (Johnson 2006). The economic means of production is increasingly oriented around creativity in both the creation and imagination of the value of products or, the symbolic economy, but also in research and development. That is, in science and technology, creativity can be viewed as a form of imagination that extends known knowledge into the ‘bleeding edge’ of research and development. Further, planning in the post-Fordist city attempts to incubate, foster and attract these ‘creatives’ attempting to provide stimulating environments that enable participation in the
knowledge economy (Baum 2007; Florida 2003). The increasing role of creativity as a key economic generator in the post-Fordist economy has implications for the organisation and production of urban space and place. As Lefebvre (1991) notes, place and space are intrinsically realised through the social, economic and technological processes of the period. Knox (1991) argues that post-Fordist geographies cannot be understood without taking into account the co-termingling of production and consumption.

At one level, the geographies of the symbolic economy are represented through rather inelegant planning objectives, ever-more elaborate attempts to attract people who are conversant in the symbolic economy, or 'creatives', as described by Florida (2003), in a process that often takes the form of gentrification. Urban places are becoming more than backdrops to the consumption of goods and services, they are becoming commodities in and of themselves (Shaw 2005b) as creativity is factored into planning rubrics, to encourage ‘creative workers’ and the ‘knowledge economy’ as a means of regenerating deindustrialising urban places (Johnson 2009:25; Lees 2000; Stevenson 2005). This shift to 'creative economies' that (theoretically) involve productive activity that integrates personal aspects of outlook and educational background as well as technical skills holds significant implications for urban planning (Evans 2001). Municipal authorities increasingly aim to provide cities that cater to the artistic and philosophical interests of their workers and become successful as incubators of ‘creativity’ (Landry 2008). Planning for creative cities is a potent example of the spatialisation of the social and economic processes of post-Fordism. Where the spatial arrangements of Fordism reflected the patterns of industrial work, including gender, ethnicity and class divisions, as well as patterns of consumption in geographies such as suburbia, post-Fordist places attempt to respond to increasingly sophisticated and arguably diffuse patterns of creative work and consumption. The dimensions of the creative or symbolic economy, intrinsically connected with patterns of consumption are key to making sense of post-Fordist places and spaces. Where Fordism was about the suburbs, post-Fordism celebrates with the (inner) city.

As discussed in Chapter One, Richard Florida's (2003) work on 'creative cities' has been influential in Australian planning. For instance, a recent Australian research paper by Baum (2007) identifies similarities with the 'creative economy' outlined by
Florida (2003), arguing that a knowledge-based economy is predicated on economic, but also social and community requirements, including the integration of work and lifestyle, a vibrant arts community and higher density pedestrian friendly urban development:

Symbolic economies are based on a flexible mix of cultural, service and tourism economies that blur the boundaries between luxury residential and professional workspaces. While cultural industries such as graphic design, media and IT businesses and art galleries may create employment their importance also lies in the way that these industries attract additional economic activity. The clustering of cafés, designer bars, boutiques, restaurants, haircutters and retail outlets in close proximity offer diversity of economic activity. Hence, symbolic economies facilitate a particular lifestyle both in terms of urban design as well as residential, work and leisure lifestyles. (Baum 2007:5)

Florida describes desirable cities as places that are open-minded, diverse and flexible, appealing to ‘creative’ highly educated workers (Florida 2003; Baum 2007). In the post-Fordist model, places considered to be good places to live are viewed as economic generators unto themselves. Whereas, under the Fordist model of development people 'followed' jobs the relationship is now more fragmented. More subtly, there is the expectation that remuneration is no longer the key to high status job – for many people it is remuneration coupled with good working arrangements that include a good ‘work/life balance’ (Baum 2007; Gambles et al., 2006). Further, and perhaps more subtly, a ‘good’ job will be personally rewarding in that it will ideally involve personal investment and self-actualisation within the work. Florida (2003) strategises the creative economy with his ‘bohemian index’ that identifies critical masses of artists, musicians and designers within given areas. This index borrows heavily from French theorist Pierre Bourdieu’s idea of cultural capital (1984) involving the production and acquisition of social legitimacy through the creation and reification of aesthetic values (Ley 2003). Bourdieu’s work on social distinction and differentiation is useful in making sense of the symbolic economy. Bourdieu argues that consumption, understood as the meaningful appropriation of products, images
and services, is contingent in the making of ‘cultural capital’ (1984, 1991). Cultural capital refers to a social competence oriented around aesthetic or artistic appreciation (in its broadest sense), from the desirability of places, to attractive houses, to fashion. Cultural capital informs and produces aesthetics that help secure and legitimise the social status of those who are literate in its dimensions. Cultural capital is produced and reproduced through cultural fields of production (Bourdieu 1991). For Bourdieu, cultural capital is a way of reinforcing class distinctions. In addition to economic success, the middle class is versed in the patterns and knowledges of cultural capital as a means further to exclude the ‘lower classes’ who might gain access to economic wealth and success, but will struggle to break into the middle class (Danaher et al., 2002). In the artistic field, where cultural capital is often played out, artists are positioned as having an antagonistic relationship with the market which would mainstream and commodify of their work - popularity and economic success is seen as an anathema to their creativity or cultural capital (Johnson 2009; Danaher et al., 2002).

Florida’s ‘bohemian index’ therefore, can be seen an example of the broader symbolic economy, where cultural capital is produced and reproduced through the definition, consumption and appropriation of goods. The importance of consumption in the symbolic economy should not be overlooked: Florida’s bohemian index references art, but a particular participatory form of art, that is, artists as part of a process of social distinction, enabled and propagated through the regimes of consumption. As Zukin (2009) argues, making a successful ‘artistic’ place, in the hope of regenerating or enhancing urban places, is more than the provision of public facilities such as art galleries or museums, it is the opportunity for privatised, cultural consumption. The idea of a creative or cultural economy as economic generator is not without its critics. Where Florida suggests that the value of the creative economy is its attractiveness to highly educated workers, many of whom work in areas more commonly associated with economic development, such as science and technology, Cunningham (2005) argues that the creative economy is misrepresented as an economic generator in itself, asserting its role as an attractant of skilled science and technology workers. For Cunningham, the success of areas with a ‘creative economy’ is ‘adduced' (2005:93), in other words, it is incidental rather than causative. Cunningham argues that the export of film and video games and retail contribute to the ‘creative’ statistics, yet these
industries require technological capital as well as creativity. Further, they are not replicable in economies much outside the US and the UK. In short, creativity is a key component of a ‘knowledge’ society, attracting and retaining scientists and engineers, but it is not, in itself, an economic generator. Florida’s ideas about the creative economy have also attracted criticism for reasons of social justice, citing, in particular, the exclusionary nature of his formulation of the creative class. Peck (2005) argues that the creative economy is predicated on minimal government intervention, mirroring neoliberal socio-political strategies while Malanga (2004) notes that, in spite of its emphasis on education, the creative economy will retain an un-creative underclass that does not have access to education. In other words, the traditional structural and social inequalities that persist in many urban areas are not adequately ameliorated by a new ‘creative class’ and that, contrary to the post-Fordist model of inclusive creative urban community, for many marginalised workers, the creative lifestyle, and its benefits, will remain inaccessible (Peck 2005). For left wing commentators, the creative economy is simply another term for the type of middle class/lower class divisions that characterise contemporary cities, with one group of people working in personally rewarding, high-paying work, serviced by an economically disadvantaged underclass.

It should be clear at this point that there is an image of post-Fordism in official discourses of urban planning where the creative or symbolic economy has significant spatial dimensions with urban places being positioned as contingent in the consumption and production of distinction, realised in part through the establishment of the creative economy. Yet, urban places are more than the backdrop to 'bohemians' or 'creatives'. Rather, their architecture, aesthetics, history and heritage are drawn into the processes of consumption. That is, the growing focus on social and cultural self-actualisation through the consumption and manipulation of products has increasingly incorporated places themselves. The example of the bohemian index, for instance, highlights the changing interconnection between production and consumption under conditions of post-Fordism, and identifies the linkages with the wider context of urban planning. Continuing on with these theme, city space is actively recruited in social processes of differentiation and creativity, enlisted in projects of self-distinction, they are consumed as products, blurring the line between tourism and 'at home' consumption of place (Bagwell et al., 2004). According to Lefebvre, (1991:86)
life 'style' as a form of identity work inveigles place into a syncretic axiom of consumption:

The increasing symbolic role of consumption has contributed to the commodification of a way of urban living; one that emphasizes exchange-value over use-value. Exchange-value typifies urban landscapes bought and sold, the consumption of products and places while use-value value relates to city and urban life.

In this way, places themselves are key economic generators because they are operators within the post-Fordist production/consumption cycle.

…Fordism to post-Fordism, and postmodernism usurped the modern as the dominant form of cultural expression. In the city, the result has been a change in the relationship between its material and symbolic aspects with attention becoming focused on consumption and the nature of potential urban cultures, diversity and creativity and their spaces, rather than on production and its spaces. To the fore have come urban identity and the urban experience, with lifestyle and tourism emerging as the major pivots of the 'new' service economy (Stevenson 2003:93)

The notion of creativity is important to making sense of the construction of place and space as consumable commodities. It informs the sorts of discussions that happen at the level of cultural planning (Bianchini and Landry 1995), whereby the signs and representations of a place are viewed as crucial to its eventual success (or failure). In urban settings where cultural consumption is regarded as key to the success or failure of a place, consumers become highly attuned to authenticity (Zukin 2009) or the correct combination of novelty and an 'accurate' reading of the profligate cultural signs that have gone before. Florida (2003) argues that the key to the success of urban environments (for success, read: integrated work, leisure and home-life of creative workers) is a sense of permissiveness and diversity. A paradox exists, therefore, in planning for creative urban places; as Bourdieu (1984) shows, through his work on cultural and economic capitals, authentic or legitimate art is confronted and
undermined by attempts to capitalize on its economic benefits. The post-Fordist ‘creative city’ aims to seed creativity but also provide enough freedom for individual expression, or participation in the symbolic economy. In other words, the spatialisation of the symbolic economy means that 'authentic' urban places participate in the creative processes of filtering, apportioning, assessing and ultimately judging the proliferation of signs that emerge around, and are produced by, its residents. 'Savvy' consumers judiciously recognise and consume these places in ways that contribute to their sense of popularity, cultural capital and success. This brings particular challenges for urban planning, which is charged with creating or supporting these new and increasingly diverse urban environments (Worpole 1991:143) and managing and propagating the development of places that encourage and channel patterns of symbolic capital and cultural consumption in order to foster economic growth and a ‘creative class’. It is a difficult task, requiring an astute sensitivity to the vagaries of symbolic distinction and fashion, cultural soothsaying that carefully aims to stimulate seemingly organic urban growth by encouraging nascent themes and trends, without appearing manufactured, inauthentic or gauche. Sometimes the negative or 'gritty' aspects of urban places are emphasised to demonstrate the absence of planning or editing, reinforcing the idea that an urban place or space retains the opportunity to appropriate and express one’s creativity through place, especially in areas where gentrification is taking place (more of this below). Successful development of an area's cultural idiosyncrasies carries benefits including economic development (Zukin 2009) and in this way the economic and ‘cultural’ spheres are combined.

The nature of production in the post-Fordist environment has altered the ways in which urban spaces develop, retain and realise desirability. It is at this point that cultural planning, placemaking and the economic success of creative cities intersect. Creative cities are positioned as ameliorating the impacts of decline following deindustrialisation so where cultural planning was formerly seen as tangential to urban planning, with artistic and aesthetic projects seen as auxiliary to the industrial production that underpinned the success (or failure) of places. The creative aspects of place, such as the arts are now firmly embedded in a broad rubric of planning for creative cities (Evans 2001), especially in the spectre of rejuvenating urban areas suffering from decline as part of processes of deindustrialisation (Lees 2000;
The arts now play a significant role in framing the shift from the image of a place as Fordist industrial to post-Fordist through arts initiatives, including arts festivals. The livability and cultural attractiveness of a city, its desirability as a ‘consuming’ or ‘consumed’ place, is crucial to its ongoing viability: 'Urban space, amenity and urban cultures have become valuable commodities for sale in the global marketplace' (Stevenson, 2003:97). Like the more general criticisms of the creative economy discussed above, arts initiatives that are positioned as part of regeneration strategies are criticised for their exclusivity and at times impotence in the face of social problems that arise following deindustrialisation.

The official discourse of post-Fordism is therefore marked by a shift away from mass industrial production to flexible or specialised production. The ‘knowledge economy’ retains a cultural dimension that is inseparable from the strictly economic aspects of production. Creative workers integrate their vision and imagination with their academic and vocational training simultaneously producing and consuming their world, which includes the product of their labour (work) but also the spaces and places in which they live. In this way, urban spaces are integrated into the symbolic economy. In other words, place is no longer a background to activity, it is a cultural entity imbued with ideas about how inhabitants view themselves and others. As mentioned above, these approaches and understandings of the processes of post-Fordism are more easily positioned as official discourses of placemaking being well-represented in literature surrounding planning and the arts. Less well-attended are criticisms of 'creative'-based placemaking, noting the endurance of pre-existing social distinctions and disadvantages, such as access to education and cultural (and economic) capital. Post-Fordism, as described above is characterised by placemaking regimes that respond and reflect participation in the symbolic economy. It is overlaid through and between the geographies, both physical and social, of Fordism, including its inequities. Keeping this tension in mind, it is important to now consider the ways in which the processes of the symbolic economy are spatially represented. As post-Fordism includes the production and consumption of places as well as commodities, urban areas are increasingly incorporated into the regimes of identity work carried out by educated, culturally literate consumers, and urban planning is charged with strategically managing and propagating culturally meaningful places and spaces. One of the most crucial operators in the realisation of cultural capital, or place-
consumption, in cities, is gentrification (Knox 1991; Zukin 1987, 2009) because gentrification spatialises the processes of the symbolic economy, representing the processes and regimes involved in realising cultural capital.

**Gentrification: cultural capital and renewal**

Gentrification describes the regeneration and development of a comparatively neglected area. As discussed in Chapter One, above, British sociologist Ruth Glass (Atkinson and Bridge 2005) coined the term in the 1960s to describe the pattern of development in the London suburb of Islington, as it transformed from a high-density declining area to an affluent, desirable middle class area. Much of the literature on gentrification is oriented around the cities of Europe and North America and deals primarily with the development of inner city, or high-density areas in well-established urban centres, rather than Australian contexts. Gentrification is often described as a process where down-trodden inner city residential areas or disused industrial or commercial areas are ‘colonised’ by artists and low-income residents who appreciate the absence of proscribed notions of place (Ley 2003; Evans 2001; Strom 2010). Gradually these areas become increasingly residential and middle class, and there is a corresponding increase in property values. Gentrification can also take place without necessarily progressing through a period of an increase in cultural capital through the colonisation and development of disused inner city areas by artists and middle class 'creatives'. For instance, the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute report: *Gentrification and Displacement: the household impacts of neighbourhood change* (Atkinson et al., 2011) discusses increasing housing unaffordability in Sydney and Melbourne, where high demand for housing leads to increasing property prices, which in turn reduces the ability of those on low incomes to stay in an area, especially as rents rise. Intentional attempts to stimulate gentrification and the nationwide shortage of housing are positioned as contributing factors in the gentrification rubric.

Gentrification can be seen as part of the broader processes of post-Fordism, with the proliferation of the service sector, such as banking, insurance, legal services, advertising and retail, oriented around the central city expanding and taking over city-adjacent areas that hosted commercial enterprises more oriented around heavy
industry or manufacturing and their concomitant workers. The growth of the suburbs propagated a growth in commuters, especially those who worked in the service sector in the central city. With the growth and consolidation of the service sector and outer suburbia, the inner city has become increasingly appealing to its middle class workers as a residential area (Hamnett 1991:177). Shaw (2005b) discusses the stages of gentrification, beginning with marginal gentrifiers, who are different to the original residents of an area, but their impact on the area is so small as to not change the area in any substantive or noticeable way. The second step changes with property ownership, where cheap houses and apartments are gradually bought and renovated. It is at this point that Smith’s (1987) rent gap theory comes into play - the gap between rents and capital investment begins to close encouraging property investment and speculation. From an economic perspective, gentrification can be divided between supply side and demand side explanations. Smith's (1987) rent gap theory argues that a discrepancy in prices between urban land and suburban land following World War Two led to the decline of inner city areas, which were later picked up and capitalised in the 1960s, in a process of gentrification that continues today. Although this theory has appeal in its simplicity, it ultimately falls short in its explanatory power. Rent gap theory is focused on the development of suburbia and its economic explanations but ultimately fails to make a real connection between the re-capitalisation of urban areas compared, for instance, with other areas. In other words, there is a discrepancy between the most popular developing areas, in this case suburbia following World War Two, and all other areas. Value is a relative term and rent gap theory fails to explain adequately why urban areas, as opposed to all the other areas, such as land around cities were not picked up and capitalised. The last stage is high-end, high cost dwellings.

There are other economic factors involved in gentrification. Gentrification sits alongside property speculation that often takes the form of investors buying a house, living in it, ‘doing it up’ and then selling it again. It can also include investors buying a second property in an ‘up and coming’ (gentrifying) area, for development. Gentrification is the ‘silent partner’ in these deals, adding value to purchases concomitant with the increasing desirability of the suburb. Further, in Australia,
negative gearing and tax breaks encourage property speculation. From the perspective of local government, gentrification is seen in a positive light as it increases the rates base (Hamnett 1991:174). The increase in property value can (but not always) be accompanied by a drop in social problems, such as crime and vandalism (Atkinson and Bridge 2005:169-170).

The perception that an area is gentrifying is often propagated by more franchised property owners and real estate developers who are able to present favourable images of a place to the exclusion of others (Bridge 2001a). Further, Beauregard (1985:56) notes that gentrification ‘punches above its weight’ in terms of its profile because it represents favourable cultural ideals of mobility and consumption. Gentrification:

…represents a highly esteemed lifestyle…confirms the possibilities of upward mobility…the gentrifiers are the educated, striving toward affluence…Both they and the process of gentrification reinforce the intrinsic viability of the marketplace, and to that extent gentrification fits the ideology of the 1980s with its private sector orientation and its emphasis on individual initiative. (1985:56)

Here, the economic, political and social forces that contribute to gentrification are highlighted. Social hierarchies, and the ability to develop, maintain and produce regimes of social status are expressed through the unfolding processes of gentrification. Bourdieu's (1984, 1991) theory of cultural capital is popular for making sense of the transformative processes of gentrification (Bridge 2006; Butler and Robson 2001; Ley 2003), because it is said to highlight the colonisation of neglected urban areas by residents who are high in cultural capital and low in economic capital. A clear resonance with the ‘creative’ or symbolic economy, described above, exists where places are appropriated as commodities and enlisted in

---

4 Negative gearing in terms of housing, commonly refers to the practice of buying a property in which the income/rent from that property does not meet the interest on the loan and the difference or loss is tax deductible. Instead, the loss is offset by the increasing value of the house, often in concert with a tax break on that capital gain. Under negative gearing agents fees and losses made on the property are tax deductible.
projects of self-distinction (Atkinson et al., 2003; Bridge 2001a). Zukin (1987:131) argues that gentrifiers are viewed as:

…different from other middle class people. Their collective residential choices, the amenities that clustered around them, and their generally high educational and occupational status were structured by – and in turn expressed – a distinctive habitus, a class culture and milieu in Bourdieu’s (1984) sense. Thus, gentrification can be described as a process of spatial and social differentiation.

Jackson and Thrift (1995:207) note that many academic accounts of gentrification interpret its processes through the prism of Bourdieu’s work on cultural fields, focusing on the, ’…ceaseless attempt by the new middle classes to convert economic capital into cultural capital and vice versa’. Jackson and Thrift go on to cite Jager’s Australian based work on gentrification in Melbourne that talks more specifically to the link between consumption and gentrification:

In a generalised consumption society where class distinctions no longer appear so rigid and where consumption habits are no longer so rigidly dictated by class position, there is a constant jockeying for class position, played out in the sphere of consumption. (Jagar 1986:90)

In an Australian context, Bridge (2001a) describes the role of cultural capital in inner city Sydney real estate marketing practices arguing that:

...one of the features of gentrification has been that the deployment of a cultural aesthetic to provide social distinction has in turn enhanced material capital. The legitimation of this process has been seen in considerable house price rises in the gentrified neighbourhoods of most large western capitalist cities (as noted for Sydney's inner West). (2001a:93)
The cultural or social aspects of gentrification show places - neighbourhoods - as changing and progressing through stages of development. Zukin (2009) argues that authenticity is a crucial component to this process, enabling the production of gentrified places that resonate with inhabitants, and retain the energy of consumption to continue the process. Authenticity:

…can also be deliberately made up of bits and pieces of cultural references, artfully painted graffiti on a shop window, sawdust on the floor of a music bar, an address in a gritty but not too thoroughly crime-ridden part of town. These fictional qualities of authenticity are not “real” but they have a real effect on our imagination of the city, and a real effect as well on the new cafes, stores, and gentrified places where we like to live and shop. Because the emergence of the term reflects the importance of our roles as cultural consumers who consume the city’s art, food, and images and also its real estate, authenticity becomes a tool, along with economic and political power, to control not just the look, but the use of real urban places. (Zukin 2009: xii)

Authenticity, then, plays out aspects of cultural capital in Bourdieu’s terms, first as a precursor to gentrification and then, once an area’s cultural capital has been ‘converted’ to economic capital through redevelopment, as planned ‘representations’ of cultural capital. Here authenticity is key to making sense of gentrification. Zukin’s statement above talks about maintaining connections to cultural capital within the built environment through either enshrining existing ‘poor’ or struggling elements of the place or producing facsimiles of them. More cynically, retaining a core group of pre-gentrification residents is another way in which municipal authorities and gentrifier’s interests can retain some of the ‘seeds’ of gentrification, as foreshadowed above. Some planning authorities are keen to retain the ‘social mix’ of a neighbourhood ostensibly to meet a social justice agenda but this can be seen as an effort to retain some of the ‘grit’ or authenticity that secured the area’s trajectory as gentrifying (Marcuse 1984; Rose 2004; Massey et al., 2002; Zukin 1995:124). These attempts may be viewed as somewhat hollow: the evidence shows that social exclusion, typically of renters, young families, and those on fixed incomes, by virtue
of increasing requirements of economic capital, is a common consequence of gentrification (Atkinson et al., 2005; Marcuse 1984; Massey et al., 2002; Zukin 1987, 1995:124). Further, once gentrification has gathered momentum in an area, local authorities are keen to maximise the increasing property rates (Zukin 1987) and other benefits that gentrification provides.

Zukin (2009) says above, cultural capital-based authenticity - maintaining a connection to the area’s anti-economic capital - can be 'genuine', spurring gentrification, and then, later, 'manufactured', as attempts to continue the process of redevelopment consolidate with the efforts of well franchised, second stage gentrifiers. Here, places are sites for the contestation, realisation and inevitable conversion of cultural capital. The conversion of cultural capital to economic capital can be seen as a process of commodification, where places are incorporated into the symbolic economy, produced and consumed and, eventually, appropriated. This is an important point, as gentrification is drawn as increasingly incorporating social and cultural regimes of value into the perception of landscapes. Shaw (2005b) argues that the aesthetic of heritage is intertwined with this process, emerging as an organising strategy, securing and solidifying gentrification as entrenched in an area:

Bourdieu’s (1984) notion of cultural, or symbolic capital considered the ‘social uses of art and culture and the way that "tastes" function as markers of “class” (Bourdieu in Jackson 1991:220, see also Butler 1997). As gentrification cycles mature, the cultural capital in heritage becomes increasingly attractive and higher premiums are paid…First stage gentrifiers provide legitimacy for living in such housing, and then second stage gentrifiers move into area with established heritage pedigrees. (Shaw 2005b:64)

Heritage is recognised as a dominant discourse in gentrification (Relph 1987), playing a role in the symbolic economy and contributing to the processes of meaning-making that unfold in regenerating places. That is, actors in the symbolic economy can mobilise their cultural capital through the meanings and values associated with heritage. Of course, all places are understood or apprehended through heritage to an extent as memory, or ideas about what has gone before which inform and shape
images of contemporary place and space. Urban places are repositories of collective and individual memories. Yet, memories are not necessarily accurate depictions of history, rather, they are subjective, emotional evocations about the way things used to be. Importantly, these evocations are edited with reference to the changing circumstances of the present (Confino 1997). History is the history of memory, or cultural history; history that includes an examination of the process through which it came to be (Confino 1997). As Foucault (1970) explains, received historical facts are in fact a cultural construct, with patterns, aesthetics and key tropes that contribute to the construction of a meta-narrative describing a period (Bal et al., 1999:216). History therefore, is a powerful mnemonic for interpreting and reifying social hegemonies, and memory, is as much about the past as it is about the present. The memories of a place, therefore, will be as diverse as its occupants. Given this diversity, it takes not an insignificant amount of power to establish collective memories: that is, to shape the collective images ascribed to, and inscribed on, places (Hobsbawm 1992). In this way, places and built environments reflect dominant ideas about what has gone before, in their aesthetics and uses. Lynch’s What Time is this Place? (1972) introduces preservation into development paradigms, arguing that heritage and preservation efforts are often not in fact accurate representations of a place. Rather, they reflect the power structures in place at the time. Gable and Handler (2003) make the point that critical accounts of heritage projects tend to start from the position that all heritage is not only socially constructed, but that these constructions reflect entrenched power relations. With these general elements of heritage covered, I now move to consider the dimensions of heritage in terms of housing and gentrification more specifically.

**Heritage housing and gentrification**

As Zukin (2009) notes heritage is a popular aesthetic regime that organizes and energises attempts to develop and/or gentrify a downtrodden area, especially in the wake of deindustrialisation. Heritage projects often play a role in the reimagina-tion of the suburb, especially in the context of deindustrialisation. Mansfield (2005:179) positions the development of a heritage discourse as increasingly desirable in the context of late capitalism, providing unifying and readable cultural signs that counter
the polyphonic proliferation of signs in the contemporary world. She highlights placemaking as connecting memory with contemporary life, but in edited and sometimes 'sanitised' ways (2005:180; Markwell et al., 2004) noting, in particular, Laws' (1983) observation that heritage is often the handmaiden of commercial development:

Heritage’s marketability and its assumed capacity to foster a sense of place-identity and belonging make it a standard focal point for placemaking strategies. (Mansfield 2005:180)

Wendy Shaw (2005b:61) discusses the gentrification of areas in inner Sydney through ‘heritage’, focusing in particular on the marginalisation of 'other' readings of place and the privileging of an Anglo-Australian version of history. Correspondingly, the forms and styles of housing that come to be viewed as worthy of preservation and attracting higher real estate values, generally reflect an Anglo Victorian or Georgian bias. Explanations for the Australian bias toward a particular historical period vary. It has been argued that there is a peculiarly Australian understanding of a lack of history, an absence of a historical trajectory in relation to the key cultural referent of England (Meinig 2004:26; Veracini 2007). The attraction of houses that reference English styles goes some way to ameliorating this sense of 'newness', whilst reinforcing an underlying 'lack' of history in Australia (in comparison to Europe). It is worth noting too that Carmona and Punter (1997:267) argue Victorian or Georgian housing as the only 'legitimate' period housing in Britain.

Heritage housing as a repository for placemaking ideas relegates other more holistic understandings of place, that including local narratives, events and images that are not oriented specifically around the built environment, sometimes referred to as 'cultural heritage' (Armstrong 2001:8). In this way, heritage is captured by well-franchised residents who own the properties they renovate (Zukin 2009). In particular, ideas

---

5 In terms of real estate value, 'heritage houses' tend to be more expensive than most others in medium density areas, as Bridge (2001) shows in a discussion of Sydney housing prices. Deodhar (2004) shows even when property size and amenity is controlled for, heritage housing obtains higher prices in the Australian real estate market.
about the history of a place are concentrated and encapsulated in housing, thus reflecting the economic capital (those who can afford to purchase houses) of a select group of residents. Gadsby and Chidester (2007: 227-228) cite anthropologist Hartigan (2000:16), who:

…has written about the propensity of working class whites to regard history in terms of people and events in the past, while middle class whites tend to regard it as being related to material culture, particularly houses. In the second formulation, houses are of course also imbued with elevated monetary value because of their possession of (any) history. Thus what was once particular history - the history of working-class struggle, or alternately of neighbourhood unity - is transformed into a generic kind of history that is assumed to exist in old houses. Places become worth something not because they are associated with a particular person or event, but because they have "something about them", a "character" or "style" that speaks to the aesthetic sensibilities of middle class gentrifiers. (Gadsby and Chidester 2007:227-228)

Further, Zukin (1995:124-125) notes that the designation of heritage status increases the cost of housing in an area, while And Gadsby and Chidester (2007) suggest that the costs of heritage preservation often fall on those least able to bear them.

The values and understandings that underpin the value of heritage housing are 'slippery' (Dovey et al., 2006). Clearly, heritage is not simply an attempt to recreate the past. Bondi (2003:211), for instance, highlights the irony of Victorian heritage as a resource for gentrification, where the physical and aesthetic aspects of Victorian gender relations are ossified through preservation. Yet, the very process of gentrification represents the social and economic mobility of the middle class. Heritage, as one operator in gentrification, has political and economic dimensions, representing and reproducing cleavages of class in particular. Yet, it is a cultural axiom, processing and producing ideas and images of place and space in an area. The meta-narratives of heritage that organize and energise the images and processes of aesthetic appreciation are subtle. The built environment, the 'modest' preservation of
'heritage' housing, represents a pastiche of 'slippery' ideas about what it means to live in a place. Heritage, in this sense, is also about homogeneity, preserving a consistency of housing design and aesthetic. For instance, in an Australian example, Dovey et al., (2005) describe the character of a Melbourne suburb of Camberwell, where the suburb combines (homogenous) heritage housing with sububaneity to dictate a formidable image of place:

Camberwell's place-identity is largely defined through what it is not, nothing stands out, neither houses nor people call attention to themselves. In Fitzroy it is social and formal differences that comprise place-identity and many of the gentrifiers are resisting developments that will produce more of themselves. (Dovey et al., 2006:5)

The housing form is intrinsically imagined in concert with the personal attributes and characteristics of residents, which goes some way to explaining the vehement protests against neighbourhood change. So, heritage and heritage housing can be seen as representative of certain images of the past, controlled and mediated through power structures, but its popularity can also be viewed as its homogeneity. In this way, heritage housing can be seen as a distanciated, yet organising theme, comforting, providing a sense of unreality, connoting the idea that everyday life can be edited. The homogeneity of housing contributes to a sense of internal order in the ideoscape. Wakely (2003) argues that the symbolic or cultural meanings associated with housing developments reference, through their homogeneity and also their fantasy aesthetics (for instance, Cape Cod or Mediterranean), a time and place conceptually removed from everyday life. According to Wakely (2003), the dislocation from the tropes of everyday time and space in the suburb manufactures the value of heritage, its historical distanciation. Lyth (2006) furthers this idea, arguing that heritage in the contemporary era although taking the shape of knowable histories and images is in fact a baseless façade oriented around novelty. For Lyth (2006) heritage reflects, and is utilised as a response to the characteristics of modern life, involving a new quality to modern reality, a search for a reality that is at once more 'real' and more authentic than contemporary. Lyth (2006) discusses the search for a different type of spatialised reality realised through heritage:
postmodernism has caused the distinction between reality and representation to fade; the idea of reality has become more important than reality itself. The experience of an image or a simulation of reality has become as real, indeed more real, than reality itself; it has become what the French theorist Jean Baudrillard calls ‘hyperreal’. Within the context of postmodernism, tourism, and in particular heritage tourism, is more easily analysed… (Lyth 2006:2)

Zumkhawala-Cook (2008:114) argues that heritage is the, 'ever-diminishing ‘real’ behind heritage’s hyperreal' citing Hewison's (1991) reading of contemporary heritage whereby:

History is gradually being bent into something called heritage…Its focus on an idealized past is entropic, its social values are those of an earlier age of privilege and exploitation that serves to preserve and bring forward into the present. Heritage is gradually effacing history by substituting an image of the past for its reality. (Hewison 1991:169)

Further, Hewison (1991:176) argues that this construction of heritage is an increasingly dominant form of place, and is gradually totalising emplaced history into images of place that are characterised by the meta-narrative of consumption, rather than any tangible connection to the places themselves. In other words, a disembodied, 'hyperreal' heritage positions heritage as a commodity. Wakely (2003) draws attention to the commonalities between a hyperreal heritage as making a form of 'newness' out of 'old' in the service of commodifying place. Wakely (2003) argues that new housing developments often reference ‘past’ aesthetics, such as American Cape Cod beach houses or Mediterranean villas. In this way, whole suburbs are created as referencing a ‘real’ historical period, but one that is completely disconnected from the history of the place. Following Hewison (1991) heritage housing can be seen to be sharing this ‘totalising’ or homogenising narrative of history where ‘character’ is developed at the neighbourhood level and houses are preserved in accordance with this aesthetic.
Heritage housing, then, is a key operator in the construction of place as a dehistoricised, homogenous ideoscape.

These meta-narratives of heritage and the ideas that organize and energise a discourse of history mobilized through both the imagined and built environment are explored further in the upcoming theory chapter. Yet, important cultural elements of the Australian heritage discourse are already apparent. As Dovey et al., (2006) note above, placemaking in the Melbourne suburb of Camberwell utilises notions of heritage through which to express aspects of the residents themselves: that is, the desire for homogeneity, comfort and modesty (Dovey et al., 2006:8). This reading resonates with broader notions of suburbia. The cultural tropes of homogeneity, sameness and the construction of denatured, hyperreal images of place and space, as in heritage speak to the key ordering principles of Fordist suburbia. This idea is developed in the upcoming Chapter Three, yet at this point it is useful to describe and contextualise the key tenets of Australian suburbia, especially with regard to gentrification.

**Suburbia in Australia**

As outlined above, most of the literature on gentrification refers to the development of inner city areas as part of a chronological process that proceeds the growth of suburbs (Hamnett 1991; Lees 2000; Newman and Wyly 2006; Smith 1996; Zukin 1987, 1989). Further, Zukin (1987) notes that inner city gentrification is largely a rejection of suburban living, and a response to the changing types of work that take place in the inner city, post-Fordist environment. Poor suburban transport and the perception of suburbia as banal also contributed to the regeneration of the inner city in the 1980s (Zukin 1987). Zukin’s assertion exemplifies one of the problems with gentrification literature: it is prejudiced toward the re-development of inner city, high-density areas (Atkinson 2003). For instance, Zukin cites gentrification as an antidote to suburban life, where the suburbs are positioned as peripheral to the urban core. Yet, in Australia, the role and scope of suburbia is different from overseas examples and as such Australia's gentrification follows a slightly different course. Australia's built environment did not follow the same growth trends as industrialising cities overseas,
such as the building of concentrated high-density inner city housing directly adjacent to the industrial zone. Unlike the cities of other western countries such as Canada, Britain and the United States, which moved through stages such as rural to peri-urban then urban, then suburban, Australia instead ‘jumped’ more rapidly from rural to suburban (Stevenson 1998).

Suburbia is commonly thought of as a movement in housing development and planning that largely took place in the cities of the west as changes in technology (in particular transport) coupled with an increase in wealth in the western world set in place particular patterns of housing and living. In many western cities, suburbia involves the expansion of housing on the fringes of cities, and the degeneration of inner city, more concentrated forms of housing. Historically this form of housing is directly associated with increases in wealth and the expanding middle class following World War Two. In Australia, however, suburban housing came to prominence before the Second World War, with the building of large, planned housing estates located adjacent to the central city, estates that were consolidated and expanded in response to large increases in population. Australia developed relatively quickly from a rural to a (sub) urban society. As one of the last of the British colonies to be settled, much of Australia’s urban areas were built in the spectre of urbanisation following the Industrial Revolution in Britain at the end of the nineteenth century (Davison 2006). Settlement in both Melbourne and Sydney (Australia's two main cities at the time) was much more disparate, more spread out, than urban housing in Britain. Further, the Australian suburbs were the outcomes of social and political changes of the time, including the increasing secularisation and democratisation of society that repositioned the nuclear family (rather than the church) as at the centre of social life. Technological advances, such as the building of sewerage systems, also contributed to the development of a more expansive suburban area. As Davison (2006) notes:

By the end of the 1880s, well over half of all houses in the colonies were owner- or purchaser-occupied (Butlin, 1964, p. 259). The urban working classes effectively constituted a suburban peasantry in their achievement of a high degree of self-reliance, economic independence and relative affluence. Private homes and yards became important spaces of vegetable, fruit and meat production, food
preservation and processing, clothes making, home and furniture building and repair, water collection, waste disposal and cottage industry (Mullins, 1981a). The result was (a racially circumscribed) democracy founded upon the “self-contained man”. (Davison 2006:205)

By the turn of the century, suburbia was already an entrenched form of housing in Australia (Davison 2006:205). Further industrial advancements, especially in transport, continued the strong Australian pattern of suburban living (Stevenson 1998). Particular formulations of space and time that were contingent in the form of these new suburban areas, for instance, transport technologies such as rail, and social factors that reflected the dominant ideals of English ‘country’ housing made urban (Stevenson 1998:20). Following the Second World War the widespread mechanisation characteristic of the Fordist era further consolidated the suburban lifestyle with the widespread availability of the private car (Davison 2006:207; Stevenson 1998:21). This is an important point, as a British colony, Australian suburbia was most receptive to the widespread adoption of the private motor car, as its suburbs were already well established with regard to the benefits of 'sprawl' or lower density housing than Britain (Davison 2006:202). Consequently:

Australia has variously been described as the world’s 'first suburban nation’ (Horne 1964: 28), 'Britain’s farthest suburb’ (Davison 1994: 102), and of being suburban before ever being urban (Sandercock 1977: 9). (Stevenson 1999:213)

Crucially, home ownership increased dramatically from just under fifty percent in the period immediately following the Second World War to around seventy percent by the 1960s (Berry 1999) reflecting increasing affluence, but also sanguinity with not just the mechanics of private property but the individualisation of community it espoused. The huge increases in home ownership following the Second World War is emblematic of the growth of the Australian middle class, and remains a key social operator in the neighbourhood dynamics of Australian suburbia (Gleeson 2006:19; Stevenson 1998:24). Suburban housing certainly followed some British traditions, but it broke with others, for instance, discouraging urban designs that supported social
mingling on ‘the step’ (Birch 1994) in favour of more spacious, single level dwellings, more familiar in the American or Canadian models.

Suburbia, then, is an important physical, but also cultural, construct in the imagination of space and place in an Australian context. The implications of this importance have spread to gentrification and the manufacturing of notions of heritage, played out through both the built environment and the suburban ideoscapes. In short, the housing directly surrounding Australia's cities is more likely to look like medium density suburban housing, rather than high-density housing. Therefore, although the pattern of gentrification in Australian cities retains commonalities with that overseas (from the inner city outwards), the style of housing undergoing gentrification differs. This is not to suggest that all gentrification that unfolds in Australia is suburban, nor that inner city redevelopment, akin to that overseas does not happen in Australia. Rather, Australian suburbia is a dominant residential form that lies closer to cities than in overseas examples. Therefore, I want to open up a space for talking about the regeneration of suburban areas that are located close to the city centre, guided and influenced by the cultural tropes of suburban life that are popular in an Australian context. Examining gentrification in Australian cities necessarily involves a consideration of the cultural dimensions of suburbia.

Paradoxically, given its prominence suburbia as a discourse, is marginalised in Australia. According to Troy (2003), suburbia is often positioned as an urban form foisted on a somewhat unwilling citizenry, an approach that borrows heavily from the US and British based literatures. Davison (2005) also notes the way in which the Australian suburb is drawn as 'unsustainable', its trajectory heading toward inevitable extinguishment. Gleeson and Hamnett (2007) describe a 'blind spot' in critical approaches to Australian suburban life, citing a lack of focused assessment has led to disorganised, ad hoc sprawl, especially in regards to sustainability. In their comprehensive summary of Australian suburban life and planning, suburbia is located as the domain of irresponsible, but citizen-driven, unsustainable sprawl. More subtly, suburbia has been criticized in Australia as the epitome of banality, depoliticising its inhabitants and nefariously perpetrating 'materialism, anti-intellectualism, banality, false consciousness, marginalisation of women and cultural disinterest' (Greig 2003:50). Stretton and McAuliffe (1994) highlight a well-attended intellectual
snobbery regarding the suburbs, noting its association with safe, pedestrian or insular
thinking, and American sociologist Zukin (1987:131) argues that suburbia’s role as
‘good for children’ renders it as organised around simple needs and safety, with an
insularity that avoids challenges and disruption. More than simply a model of
development spreading across the urban areas of the western world, suburbia is can be
viewed as a cultural edifice, ‘suburbia’ refers to a state of mind' (Healy 1994:xiv).

Further Australian suburbia is often positioned as a 'shadowland', or dormitory suburb
(Stevenson 1999: 214), peripheralised in relation to 'legitimate' work that takes place
in the city, noting that gender relations are mapped onto this relationship, where
suburbia is historically seen as feminine and passive, and the city is masculine and
productive/active. Rowse (1992) cites the mass pacification of Australians in the
thrall of an all-encompassing consumerism that began in the 1950s. Gleeson notes the
tendency of Australian academics to extract and reify suburbia, homogenizing its key
elements into stereotype, or engaging in ' spatial fetishism' (Gleeson 2008:2):

Both poles of our urban debates tend to freeze suburbia in time; either
as eco-villain, the contemporary McMansion (large house, small lot)
or as nostalgic hero, the white picket hearth-land from which has
flowed a pure river of human improvement. The first fails to
recognise that earlier Australian suburbia was both low density and
infinitely more sustainable in terms of make up and lifestyles than
any contemporary urban setting (see Gaynor, 2006), most especially
the dense, über consumption landscapes of our inner cities (and not
all contemporary suburban development is McMansionesque). (Gleeson 2008:2)

Further, the patterns and processes of suburban life, work, gender, ethnicity and space
and place are all interwoven with other forms of Australian life, such as the inner city,
and the (imagined) spaces of the bush, all of which are historically and spatially
bound:

The city in this view is not a series fixed dioramas (suburb,
apartment-scape, knowledge city, urban playground) set in lifeless
juxtaposition but a flow of nested systems that comprise a
continuously evolving urban structure. (Gleeson 2008:3)

Gleeson is describing an image of suburbia as fixed and unyielding to the newer models of life and work. More generally, Low (2003:387) notes that the suburban/urban dichotomy is often construed in terms of an older urban/rural dichotomy, refracted through the post-Fordist age of mass consumerism and deindustrialisation. Here, suburbia is positioned as an in-between space, occupying an inverse relationship to the poles of rural and urban that locates it as an amplifier for the social relations of the city:

The shift to spatial analysis of the city requires reconsidering this separation in that contradictions and conflicts at the centre are often drawn more clearly at the edge. So we find that the suburban 'malling of America' is a spatial counterpart of economic restructuring and the deindustrialisation of central cities (Zukin 1991); and the cultural diversity and racial tensions of the centre are reflected in the segregation and social hegemony of the suburbs (Massey and Denton 1988). (Low 2003:387)

Repositioning Low’s (2003) theme of suburbia as liminal to an Australian context illuminates a version of Australian suburbia as located between the conceptual poles of the city and the bush (Hogan 2003:54; Stevenson 1999:213; Stretton 1994). Suburbia colonises the bush, playing intermediary between the bush and the city, transmuting one to the other, but not existing as an entity in its own right. Gleeson (2008) and Low (2003) note that tendency for suburbia to be positioned as retaining particular 'logics', fixed distanced or unengaged with contemporary post-Fordist life. In this way, it connotes a type of transitionality or liminality, a baseless, disconnected version of reality, separating the 'creative' urbanite from engagement with the 'aesthetic promiscuity' (Zukin 1987:131) of life.

At this point, though, it is important to note that the idea of suburbia as a liminal or transitional place resonates with the key elements of Fordism. Suburbia in Australia is an urban form dominated by low density detached housing that represents the social and economic organisation of Fordism, including mass industrial production and
availability of transport, such as the private car. Suburbia is ordered around commuting, gender roles, nuclear families, and the mass consumption of standardised goods. The production and availability of private cars, in particular, is crucial to making sense of Fordist suburban landscapes, and the way they came to be imagined and lived. This idea is discussed in depth in the upcoming chapter, at this point it is important to note that the patterns and processes of suburbia oriented around the car and realised through the landscape, continue to shape practices and images of urban Australia through the period of post-Fordism, as the processes of gentrification unfold. In other words, the social, cultural and technological processes of post-Fordism, such as the development of the symbolic economy are unfurling across and through the suburban geographies of Fordism. The tension between these two geographies frames the trajectory of development.

Worth noting is that although gentrification as described by Ruth Glass in 1964 predates the period of post-Fordism, it now presents in a post-Fordist form. Just as the patterns and processes of consumption have shifted with the move from Fordism to post-Fordism, as discussed above, so have the patterns of capitalisation regarding housing. Post-Fordist gentrification incorporates dimensions of the symbolic economy into the development of streetscapes and the imagination of place and space whilst retaining many of the same patterns of socio-economic displacement as its Fordist incarnation. Gentrification highlights the spatial dimensions of the economic processes of Fordism and post-Fordism, and lies at the intersection of Fordist versus post-Fordist images of place and space. Further, gentrification under post-Fordism is incorporated into 'supply-side' attempts to manufacture or stimulate development or rejuvenation, in order to secure market-based solutions to areas suffering from social decline. Post-Fordist gentrification is located within the planning discourse, especially regarding areas suffering from the consequences of deindustrialisation.

**Conclusion**

Australian cities are deindustrialising as part of global processes of post-Fordism, their means of production is shifting from heavy industry to services, technology and knowledge based economies. With the shift to flexible accumulation as a process of
post-Fordism, comes the supply-side manipulation of consumer markets and a proliferation of values associated with consumer goods. A new market dynamic has emerged, where the line between production and consumption is increasingly blurred. Now, both producers and consumers develop, utilise and appropriate goods in processes of meaning-making, sometimes referred to as the ‘symbolic economy’. These approaches to post-Fordism pivot on the incorporation of the symbolic economy into the broader economic success of places, are embedded within official accounts of placemaking especially in places where deindustrialisation has had significant negative impacts. In terms of urban planning and development, the symbolic economy is positioned as a new means of production in the period of post-Fordism, ameliorating the urban impacts of deindustrialisation in western cities. In this way landscapes become commodities. Gentrification incorporates the built environment into social and cultural processes of distinction and cultural capital. Like the principles of the creative or symbolic economy, gentrification is favoured by municipal and local government planning authorities as a way of addressing some of the social problems associated with urban decline. Yet, its emphasis on private capital and ownership has drawn criticisms for its neo-liberal, non-interventionist political characteristics, criticised for transforming urban spaces and places without sufficient regard to those who remain embedded in the structural disadvantages of previous social arrangements, such as industrial Fordism.

Moreover, most literature on gentrification deals with the redevelopment of inner city urban areas overseas. In these versions, gentrification is, amongst other things, a rejection of suburban living. Yet, Australia’s development history features a much higher proportion of low density housing close to the centre of the city. So, although gentrification shares elements with overseas examples (such as the commodification of places through processes of cultural distinction) it differs in that it predominantly transforms inner suburban areas. In addition, suburbia is an important cultural trope in the imagination of Australian place, especially in its positioning as a transitional, or in-between place. Further, a dominant discourse of heritage provides a guiding theme for this redevelopment and gentrification in an Australian context.

The structural changes (economic, industrial) associated with post-Fordism and processes of deindustrialisation are reasonably well attended. Yet, post-Fordism holds
cultural changes as well, especially regarding consumption. Gentrification in an Australian context can be viewed as part of broader regimes of value as part of the symbolic economy. The values and ideas associated with the preservation and renovation of heritage housing positions gentrification as a site for the perpetration and reification of social hierarchies of distinction and taste. The processes of gentrification demonstrate the commodification of place and space as a component of social distinction in the post-Fordist era. Suburban gentrification combines the post-Fordist models of placemaking (including gentrification as part of the symbolic economy) with an urban form that refracts and reflects its Fordist, car-centred industrial 'roots'. This aim of this thesis is to examine the intersection of these two ways-of-knowing place, the official post-Fordist knowledges of place and space, and the unofficial, 'out-dated' regimes of spatiality, such as Fordist suburbia. In order to develop the conceptual tools needed for this analysis Chapter Three explores the spatial and cultural characteristics of placemaking, drawing on key themes in the imagination of Fordist and post-Fordist places.
Chapter Three

Theorising Place and Space

Places are more than physical geographies, they are spatial representations of social and cultural understandings, values and interactions between people, processes, technologies, values and images. Chapters One and Two introduced the idea of Fordist and post-Fordist places, arguing that both are formulations of their composite processes: economic, social, cultural and technological. Where suburbia represents the Fordist period of industrial expansion, post-Fordism represents themes of placemaking oriented around the symbolic economy with forms of gentrification and built heritage at its core. This chapter provides the theoretical basis for investigating these two ways-of-knowing place and space, beginning with a general discussion of the main concepts of socially constructed geographies, and then homing in on themes, such as technology and consumption, to reveal more subtle conceptualisations about the way spaces and places come to represent social, cultural and economic arrangements of a period. In particular, this chapter introduces the theories of Lefebvre (1991) as powerful tools for explaining the concepts of urban space and place.

Conceptualising space and place

The field of urban studies has incorporated psycho-social insights into the socially constructed elements of spatial perception into a diverse range of fields from sociology, anthropology, linguistics, and human geography. Agnew (2005) notes that many of the early theories of urban space and place were bifurcated between conceptual poles, where space was viewed as an inert background, and place as the specific location of active, often human enterprise and agency reflecting an underlying Cartesian logic embedded in Western metaphysics (Barnes and Wainright 2009). The Cartesian model of space that is based on binary distinctions such as
active or passive, background and foreground, agency and structure provided a start-point for critical interpretations of urban place and space. By the 1970s, the move away from a conceptual separation of space and place was gathering momentum, looking towards imagined geographies of power, agency and identities, mutually constructed through spaces and places, or praxis (Agnew 2005; Rodman 1992). Space came to be positioned as unique instances of spatialised experience, constructed, edited and played out in diverse and non-discrete ways, a 'sociospatial dialectic' (Soja 1980). Space as a ‘text’, referred to the prosaics, poetics, metaphors and cadences, the impressions and experiences and interpretations of space as well as its geographical dimensions. Key theorists, such as Henri Lefebvre (1991), Michel Foucault (1991) and Michel de Certeau (1984) provided important insights into the cultural construction of space and place. For all that these approaches were radical and new at the time, the key theme of macro (theory at the level of broad, over-arching structures) versus micro ('bottom-up' theory built from the experiences and perceptions of individuals) remained a key characteristic of understandings of place and space (Gottdiener and Hutchinson 2006; Soja 1997; Walton 1993). New sub-fields of urban studies emerged, including New Urban Sociology (Walton 1993), which examine the social construction and interpretation of spatial phenomena as cultural artefacts, rather than universal and homogenous processes conforming to an internally consistent topography such as Cartesian geography or the logic of the market (Smith 1995).

Blanchard (1992) traces the trajectory of spatiality as a concept through the theoretical changes in sociology, concluding that space is best thought of as located between two theoretical poles: the fixed and inert abstract geographies of Cartesian space (characteristic of modernist approaches), and the entirely cultural view of space, 'dematerialised into a place of pure ideation, a place of reference for the cycles and crises of history' (Blanchard 1992:496). Space is located in direct conjunction with its social outcomes, neither preceding them as a backdrop nor totally coming into being as a consequence of them:

…the post-modern position would be that space is both internal and external...it is also part of a structured, multilayered geography nesting around a mobile individual or collective places or topoi
constantly sedimented and in flux. (Blanchard 1992:496)

Similarly, de Certeau (1984:117) argues:

Space occurs as the effect produced by the operations that orient it, situate it, temporalise it and make it function in a polyvalent unity of conflictual programs or contractual proximities. On this view, in relation to place, space is like the word when it is spoken, that is when it is caught in a proximity of an actualization, transformed into a term dependent upon many different conventions, situated as an act of a present (or of a time), and modified by the transformations caused by successive contexts. (de Certeau 1984:117)

Vidler (1993:31) traces the social construction of space through to early industrial cities, pointing out that urban space was re-construed at the end of the nineteenth century, which had a major impact on the ways in which planners and architects thought about designing cities and buildings. During this period a new emphasis on the subjective and perspectival qualities of space, or space as a constant and universal geometrical construct, was reformulated to account for the ways in which people actually saw the world. The work of psycho-analyst Lacan who talks about the construction of the self through space and the other, or 'interior space, space as projection' (1993:32) informed, introduced and problematised the notion of embodiment, asking: How do people conceive of spaces and their positions within (or outside) of them? Where does the ‘self’ end and the ‘other’ begin? These ideas culminated in theoretical themes such as embodiment and control, and the dissociation of nature and culture. For instance, Vidler (1993:32) cites Panofsky’s version of space, where space is considered a 'symbolic form' construed as the attempt to:

…join the notion of universal geometrical space to what he calls individual “psycho physiological space” by constructing perspective as the attempt to transform the latter in to the former – psycho physiological space into mathematical space. (1993:32)
Understandings of the role, patterns and dimensions of power were also dominant in the changing sociological approaches to space and place. For Lefebvre, the Cartesian model was one of many modes of rendering space as a knowable and commodifiable place, enabling the reproduction of power relations. Space as a power-enabling device can be seen by ‘follow[ing] the physical and instrumental expansion of territories and boundaries, assisted by technologies of mapping and viewing’ (Vidler 1993:31).

These descriptions of meaning-making emphasise the relativistic nature of post-modern understandings of space and place. This thesis uses 'space' and 'place' in accordance with the constructivist, post-Cartesian model described above, emphasising the irruption of the idea of space as a passive background to active place. However, the terms place and 'placemaking' are not dissolved into relativism, rather they are used to describe the social processes of producing meaningful ideoscapes, whereas 'space' refers more specifically to the sites and locations of these forms of production. Moreover, there are generalisations to be found amongst these diverse and fragmented approaches discussed above. There remains a core Marxist-oriented concern with the economic relations of production and their social consequences, played out through urban spaces and places. Theorists such as Baudrillard (1983) Lefebvre (1991) and Jameson (1991) criticise and dissect both the strategies and mechanisms of placemaking, and their energising logics, to illuminate the patterns of capitalism at work. In the period of late capitalism, or post-Fordism, the concern with capitalist modes of power is particularly apposite. As Kellner (2005:3), following Baudrillard, notes, there has been a shift from 'competitive market capitalism to the stage of monopoly capitalism' which 'required increased attention to demand side management' during the major sociological shift in approach at the end of the modernist period. Here, the period of consolidation and commodity production, or the period from the 1900s to the 1960s, is drawn as the beginning of the modes of a period of all-encompassing consumption (Baudrillard 1973:36) as discussed in Chapter Two above. In discussing Baudrillard’s work tracing the development of the contemporary social form and implications of consumption, Kellner (2005:2) maintains Baudrillard's idea that:

In the logic of signs, as of that of symbols, objects are no longer linked in any sense to a definite function or need...objects and needs
are here substitutable, within reason, like the symptoms of hysterical or psychosomatic conversion. (Baudrillard 1998:77)

According to Kellner (2005:2), Baudrillard argues that work and jobs have been transformed into commodities, complete with their own regimes of sign values, recast in:

…a new era of simulation in which social reproduction (information processing, socialization, and knowledge industries, media, cybernetic control models, etc.) replaces production as the organising principle of society.

Baudrillard’s work is characterised by an overarching concern with the way in which places and spaces are enlisted in the production and reproduction of power relations, through the evolution of a symbolic economy in which social meaning is appropriated into consumer products/objects.

...objects are categories of objects which quite tyrannically induce categories of persons. They undertake the policing of social meanings, and the significations they engender are controlled. (Baudrillard 2005:209)

This shift in the conceptualisation of the symbolic economy has implications for the built environment, especially in regard to the urban form. It is important, though, to note that the combination of a praxis-based, post Cartesian, Marxist oriented approach to urban space was not completely a product of the post-war period. Georg Simmel - one of the first social theorists - recorded misgivings about the domination of the ‘objective’ over the ‘subjective’, a form of urban alienation, where sign values associated with commodification and consumption render space as floating and self-referential, lost for genuine or authentic anchors to real human experience (Simmel 1997:138-140 [1908]). According to Prigg (2008:59) Simmel's work was concerned with:

The crystallization of objective culture, created by individuals
themselves, is so far advanced that they no longer have a relationship to the individual practices of perception in quotidian urban lifeworlds. Much the same applies to the diagnosis of space today. There is no coherent representation of space (the symbolic) that mediates between the existential experiences in the spatial practice of urban lifeworlds (the real) and the spaces of imagining the world and nature (the imaginary). Image, concept, and reality are dissociated to the point of provoking a crisis of meaning and representation. (Prigg 2008:59)

For Simmel, the city was a capitalist space, ordered and produced through the processes of consumption. Simmel’s work signals an early concern with the totalising regimes of capitalism in the construction and imagination of urban places. Later, prominent Marxist theorists such as Harvey (1989) and Castells (1977) embraced the concern with the commodification of urban life. For Marxist inspired theorists, cities concentrate and enshrine economic patterns and relations of exchange, where the discourses of economic processes and urban space remain tightly intertwined. Marxists argue that the economic relations of production underpin all social relations and many social theorists, from the macro oriented, such as Lefebvre (1991), Harvey (1989) and Castells (1977) who take a wide view of the social relations of the city, to the more micro oriented, such as Baudrillard (1983), who focus on the subtle symbolism of economic processes, centre their work on the mode of production and concomitantly, consumption. How people work, what they get paid, the things they make and, crucially, the ways in which these commodities are valued and consumed are of prime concern to these theorists.

Marxist theory informs analyses and criticisms of post-Fordism. As Slater (2003:152) notes, consumption connects the processes of post-Fordism and the cultural elements of consumption, as discussed above by Harvey (1989) and Jameson (1984). One of the key characteristics of post-Fordism is a change in the conceptualisation of goods and their values, or, what Marxists call ‘commodity fetishism’. Adorno and Horkheimer (2002) argue that the period of late capitalism is characterised by a new form of commodity fetishism, where a proliferation of additional cultural values are manufactured as a method of pacifying the polity. As outlined in Chapter Two, post-
Fordism is characterised by a shift in the logic of production, where production and consumption are intermingled and objects are produced and consumed simultaneously. It should be noted that late capitalism and post-Fordism are not completely interchangeable terms, however as noted above, synergies are increasingly established between the two (Slater 2003:152; Amin 1994). Further, in the period of post-Fordism, places are commodified becoming incorporated into the regime of capitalist processes that produce the economic growth of urban places, the:

…production in space to production of space occurred because of the growth of the productive forces themselves and because of the direct intervention of knowledge in the material production. (Lefebvre 2009: [1979]:186)

Jameson (1991) goes further, arguing that the period of late capitalism is not just about an increasing ‘churn’ of consumer values attached to objects, but that the very process of their commodification has been reified in itself, characterised by the '…consumption of sheer commodification as a process' (Jameson 1991:x). The work of Henri Lefebvre is perhaps the most useful in conjugating social notions of place and space with general observations of the cultural dimensions of urban place discussed above.

**Lefebvre and The Production of Space**

Lefebvre argues that space is ‘active’ in that it is produced and reproduced in concert with the social processes of the time. In the period of late capitalism, space is produced with, and through, consumption and commodification (Lefebvre 1991). Lefebvre’s image of space is not an empty or passive background against which active social processes take place. Rather, space is historically contingent and reflexively produced in line with the social processes of the time: there is no separation between social processes and space. Lefebvre (1991) draws space as the aggregation of current social networks of interconnectedness. As people imagine movement they inherently imagine its spatial dimensions and thus new forms of movement coalesce and coincide. Space then, changes with changes in epochal
dimensions. Lefebvre’s key focus is the shift from older human oriented modes of apprehending spatiality (largely oriented around the body) to increasingly industrial ones. Space is produced in concert with interpretations of the everyday world, and the realisation of these interpretations. Lefebvre posits a three-part concept to account for and interpret space, consisting of:

1. *Spatial practice*, which embraces production and reproduction, and the particular locations and spatial sets characteristic of each social formulation. Spatial practice ensures continuity and some degree of cohesion. In terms of social space, and of member of a given society's relationship to that space, this cohesion implies a guaranteed level of *competence* and a specific level of *performance*.

2. *Representations of space*, which are tied to the relations of production and the other 'order' which those relations impose and hence to knowledge, to signs, to codes, and to 'frontal' relations.

3. *Representational spaces*, embodying complex symbolisms, sometimes coded, sometimes not, linked to the clandestine or underground side of social life, as also to art, (which may some eventually to be defined less as a code of space than as a code of representational spaces). (Lefebvre 1991:33)

Lefebvre's three-part structure resists the dualisms that commonly structure knowledges of space. Spaces in particular are representations of everyday life, but also how life and space is imagined and modelled. So, space is first physical, the proximal experience of the environment. Second, it is the mental, cultural and linguistic axioms that apprehend and account for space. These forms of space are often inculcated into official regimes of knowledge, such as geographies or urban plans. Third, space is experienced in an immediate way, the accumulation of personal interactions with the body and movement. Each of these processes is incorporated into the production of space. Lefebvre identifies a broad distinction between concrete and abstract space. Concrete space is the holistic imagined and lived nexus of all conceptualisations of space, realised through the '...gestures and journeys of the body' (Elden 2004:189) but also the mental projections and codes of space, how space is invoked and remembered (Lefebvre 1991). Abstract space is more formalised.
Important contextualising and orienting strategies such as history, trajectory and time are abandoned in favour of 'abstract space' a modelled, internally consistent technocratic space:

Abstract space is measurable. Not only is it quantifiable as geometrical space, but as social space, it is subject to quantitative manipulations: statistics, programming, projections - all are operationally effective here. (Lefebvre 1991:352)

Lefebvre (1991:353) identifies the tendency for abstract space, the modelled space, to become reified into 'concrete' space, to colonise, occupy, shape and order the symbolic, expressed, lived experiences and memories of concrete space. Apprehending 'real' space requires a process of recognition of the abstract as one expression of space, rather than a totalising or complete example of space:

Philosophically, to proceed thus turns a partial truth into an error precisely by positing it in the absolute...By rejecting a part of the content it gives sanction to and aggravates the dispersion of the elements of the real. (Lefebvre 1968:155)

Although Lefebvre's production of space revolves around a three-part structure, there are elements of it that resonate with Marxian dialectical materialism. That is, the intersection of the abstract and social space characterises Lefebvre's (1968) dialectical materialism his theoretical rubric that ultimately explains how spaces can come to be produced as a form of commodity or capitalist space. For Lefebvre, the partial reconciliation of abstract into concrete or social space is part of the commodity form as laid out by Marx is the dialectical materialism of space reflects the dialectical materialism of the commodity form:

...everything which achieves autonomy through the process of exchange (i.e attains the status of a commodity) tends to become absolute, a tendency, in fact, that defines Marx's concept of fetishism (practical alienation under capitalism). The Thing however, never quite becomes absolute, never quite emancipates itself from activity,
from use, from need, from 'social being'. (Lefebvre 1991:83)

For Lefebvre (1991:84) these 'Things' were defined by their characteristics, but also by their relationship to one another, an idea that resonates with Marxist notions of commodity value. Lefebvre discusses his idea of a dialectic of abstract and social space in relation to the Marxist idea of a tension between exchange value and use value in the commodity economy (Lefebvre 1991:351; Stanek 2008:75).

According to Stanek (2008) the key to understanding Lefebvre's interest in Marx's idea of dialectical materialism is the contradiction between exchange and use value. Marx's dialectic of materialism is based on irreconcilable characteristics of use value and exchange value, where there is a:

...contradiction between use value and exchange value, which characterizes every commodity and every act of exchange. In the act of exchange, the owner of one of the exchanged objects considers his or her object as deprived of use value (otherwise the owner would not exchange it) but endowed only with exchange value, while considering the object of the other owner as having only use value but no exchange value; an analogous view is held by the owner of the second exchanged object. There is a contradiction between the empirical fact of substituting the exchange and use values and the theoretical impossibility of combining both value forms in one commodity.... (Stanek 2008:72)

Further, Stanek (2008) maintains that Marx argued that money was developed to mediate this contradiction, to translate use value to exchange value, but importantly, money is a proxy of both, the two forms of value remain irreconcilable, the contradiction 'dialectically preserved and internalised in commodities' (Stanek 2008:72). According to Stanek (2008) Lefebvre references Marx's idea of the commodity as deriving its value only in relation to other commodities and its ability to be exchanged. In this way, commodities are defined as both unique and discrete (having qualities that all other commodities do not) but also defined only in relation to all other commodities. This is what Marx called the commodity form (Stanek
Lefebvre extends the logic of this dialectic to the production of space, arguing that spaces both reference all other spaces, as Stanek explains:

> Just like a commodity characterized by the general form of value, space for Lefebvre is defined by its form. Whereas the form of the commodity characterizes all commodities regardless of their specific features, the form of space is the most general relationship between locations that can be attributed to every location independently of the differences between them. (Stanek 2008:72)

The relationship between Lefebvre's concrete and abstract spaces, as outlined above, pivots on the form of spaces. Spaces are defined by their differences in relation to one another, so the whole (all the spaces) and the parts (discrete spaces) are both essential and irreconcilable. This is how, for Lefebvre (1991) the processes of ‘abstract’ space are oriented around the totalising logic of capitalism. Lefebvre’s theory of spatiality as a dialectic opens up the idea of space as an expression of spatially and temporally located capitalist processes, where the patterns of capitalist power are evident throughout the production of space:

> What we seem to have, then, is an apparent subject, an impersonal pseudo-subject, the abstract 'one' of modern social space, and - hidden within it, concealed by its illusory transparency - the real ‘subject’, namely state (political) power. Within this space, and on the subject of this space, everything is openly declared: everything is said or written. (Lefebvre 1991:51)

Further, as Stanek (2008:76) argues, there is a distinct connection between the logic of Marxist exchange and the generation of space in the capitalist economy in Lefebvre's work. Stanek (2008:72) illustrates Lefebvre's theory of space as follows:

> …Lefebvre sees abstract space as enabling the capitalist processes of production, distribution, and consumption. In the course of the development of capitalism, space itself was turned into a commodity - a concrete abstraction described by Marx as a 'sensual-suprasensual
thing' - becoming at the same time homogeneous and fragmented. Like the commodity that in its most developed and differentiated stage reveals its most universal characteristics, the space of the capitalist city manifests a fundamental dialectic between the processes of centralization and dispersion, inclusion, and exclusion. (Stanek 2008:76)

The connection between Lefebvre’s work and Marxist theory lies in the perception of space. In the same way that Marx thought that the exchange value of commodities (referencing the ‘silent’ others, as in, all the other commodities that it is held in relation to), Lefebvre talks about centrality. Capitalist space is produced in concert with the commodity flows and surplus values of exchange. Space shares the same form as the general value of commodities (Stanek 2008:73). In other words, the processes of capitalist exchange, disembodied and oriented around increasingly fetishised objects are spatialised; there is a connection between the meta-logic of capitalist exchange, and the ‘form’ (Stanek 2008:73) of urban space:

The analysis of the form of urban space as dialectical allows Lefebvre to sharpen his claims about the role of space in the processes of capitalist production, distribution and consumption. Whereas the contradiction between use and exchange values was shown by Marx to be the engine of the development of capitalism, Lefebvre enriches this picture by describing the contradictions inherent to space also as contributing to this development. The method of both Marx and Lefebvre is based on the rather counterintuitive assumption that the principle of capitalism is preserved throughout its whole development, becoming manifest in its most advanced and complex stage. (Stanek 2008:75)

Lefebvre’s ideas about the production of space illustrate and explain the shapes and structures that guide space-making in the period of late capitalism. It elaborates the relationship between invested actors and the construction of space in everyday life, illustrating the patterns and processes through which power, in particular, power oriented around the capitalist economy, is realised and reproduced. So, capitalism is a
mental ordering construct that arranges the 'order of things' in feedback or concert with constructions of the self and place. The meta-characteristics or trajectories and movement of things, such as buildings, planning legislation, cars, communication technologies and gathering places combine to inform, produce and reproduce a sense of capitalist space. Lefebvre’s work segues the abstract theorising of Marxism and on-the-ground placemaking, highlighting the links between the commodity economy and the imagination and reproduction of social space. Kipfer et al., (2008) concurs with the argument that there is a connection between a Marxian dialectic of exchange, and the construction and (re)creation of space. For Kipfer et al., Lefebvre’s work offers insights into the commodification of space beyond the basic level of buying and selling land. Lefebvre’s social space involves the interposing trajectories and interstices of imagined space, shaped and ordered by social processes and cultural tropes of movement, embodiment and flow. Kipfer et al., (2008) explains Lefebvre's theory as such:

…the very form of centrality and difference that is the urban for Lefebvre is also incorporated into the commodity form. Urban space itself is mobilized as a commodity and becomes the ultimate object of exchange: “The deployment of the world of commodities now affects not only objects but their containers, it is no longer limited to content, to objects in space. More recently, space itself has begun to be bought and sold. Not the earth, the soil, but social space, produced as such, with this purpose, this finality (so to speak).” As a consequence, space itself becomes the very general object of production, and consequently, of the formation of surplus value. (Kipfer et al., 2008:294)

Kipfer et al., (2008) use Lefebvre’s work to describe a meta-narrative of space that is ordered around the reifying logic of exchange, and therefore, commodified. Prigg (2008:57) also links Lefebvre’s ideas about exchange value, pulling them into contemporary discussions of sign value in the symbolic economy to illuminate a discussion of commodified place. For Prigg (2008) Lefebvre’s production of space is drawn into contemporary, post-modern discussions of sign value. Prigg (2008) argues that Lefebvre’s account of space provides a compelling theoretical rubric through
which to interpret the key characteristics of post-Fordism. As discussed above, the post-Fordist era is characterised by a proliferation of values associated with products and the creation and perpetration of the symbolic economy.

Under post-Fordism, consumption shifts from the relatively straightforward consumption of mass produced goods that are valued primarily for their use, to the consumption of numerous goods with similar (or identical) use values that retain a variety of symbolic values, developed through marketing and appropriated by consumers into their personal projects of distinction (Baudrillard 1983, 1988; Castilla et al., 2000; Harvey 1989; Jessop and Sum 2006). Baudrillard's work on late capitalism as a self-generating, self-energising form of consumption resonates, in particular, with Lefebvre's ideas about the creation of a ‘form’ of capitalism. That is, the creation of a ‘hyperreality’, a lifeworld characterised by the proliferation and eventual alienation of objects and sign values. While mindful that post-Fordism cannot be reduced to late capitalism or vice versa, Baudrillard's ideas are instructive for thinking about the common themes between the two ideas, especially between the nature of exchange under late capitalism and the development of the symbolic economy.

**Post-Fordism as a cultural form: a critical approach**

Baudrillard (1983) theorises the increase of sign values using Saussurian linguistics⁶ arguing that the relationship between signs, signifiers and signifieds was previously more homogenous as people relied more on verbal communication to construct meaning. Simply, a 'sign' such as a pair of shoes evoked a particular 'shoe-ness', part of a lexicon of meanings that are essentially language based. Yet, according to Baudrillard, the proliferation of media following the Second World War introduced a diverse range of potential alternative 'signifiers'. A sign became a vehicle for a range of meanings, instead of just one. Baudrillard argues that rather than representing an increasingly diverse society, this proliferation of meanings actually dictates a certain type of facile or transitory diversity. In this increasing range of meanings, the

⁶ For an elaboration and elucidation of Saussurian linguistics and its use in social theory, see Seidman (1996:209).
meaning of signs has become increasingly ambiguous, losing their connection with reality, to the extent that signs themselves come to be perceived as reality by becoming increasingly self-referential. Ultimately, signs lose their consensus and meaning. Baudrillard referred to this phenomenon as 'hyperreality' (Baudrillard 1983).

For Jameson (1991, 1995) consumption in the capitalist economy can be thought of in line with Baudrillard’s assertions about the proliferation of signs. Jameson (1998) argues that capitalist consumption has arrived at a period of hyper-consumption where authentic, individual expression is dissolved into a self-referential milieu of meta signs. Yet, he argues that the capitalist processes of exchange have reached a point of extreme reification, by which he means a point whereby the initial Marxist dialectic of exchange versus use value is transcended, and exchange value has become a super-charged quality, producing a realm of capitalist production and value creation that is over and above previous Marxist constructions of commodity value. According to Abbinnett:

For Jameson…[an] account of the commodity as a form which faithfully mediates between the rational-administrative powers of corporate finance and the homogeneous desires of the masses, is inadequate to understand the latest phase of capitalism. His claim is that the logic of reification set out by Adorno and Horkheimer has been superseded by the ‘consumption of sheer commodification as a process’ (Jameson, 1995, p.x). This modification of the relationship between culture and economy cannot, according to Jameson, be conceived in terms of the functional perfection of the object: the total reification of relations between the mass of consumers and corporate capital”. (Abbinnett 2003:92)

Jameson is concerned with the ‘shape’ of space as constructed through the commodity form, an idea that builds on Baudrillard’s seminal discussion of sign values. No longer is there a strong connection to the use value of objects, rather, a flattened, homogenous schema emerges where images are conflated and coupled. The energy of the process is in the movement or through-put of signs, rather than the signs themselves.
At this point, Baudrillard and Lefebvre’s ideas can be cautiously combined. Lefebvre argues that the production of space recruits a variety of diverse factors, including physical technologies but also conceptual logics, such as the form of capitalism. According to Lefebvre (1991) the perception of space is contingent on the technologies available at the time, technologies that shape and construct ways of viewing the world. The current period, alternately described as late capitalism, post-modernism or post-Fordism is strongly influenced by the technologies of the media, and the car. Here Prigg (2008) describes a self-referential reality in terms of the screen:

The play of signifiers divorced from meaning and reference takes the place of semantic depth. In this way, and akin to the screens of the electronic media, the dimension which was earlier defined by bodily imagination implodes. The screen is in several respects an appropriate metaphor for the new form of experiencing reality...Spatial and temporal 'orders of things' have dissolved into a movement of freely appearing occurrences from which one can expect little...Locating a place where the body can register itself is as difficult as finding 'spatial depth' in meaning and signification. In a flat world, meaning is produced and distributed in any location. The body, which emerges from this meaning, rests nowhere. Mobility is its primary characteristic. (Prigg 2008:59)

Vidler (2000) too, discusses a change in the perception of space with modernism, a cultural, symbolic shift that evokes and represents logic and scientific rationalism in the perception of space and place and represented in modern architectural forms (Dear and Flusty 2002). Vidler (2000) draws out the importance of film as a medium for the perception of space, arguing that film produces a new form of spatial interpretation that resonates through to the contemporary tropes of planning and architecture:

If, as Panofsky asserted, “the unique and specific possibilities of film” could be defined as dynamatization of space and, accordingly, spatialization of time.” then it was the lens of the camera and not any
distorted set, that inculcated a sense of motion in the static spectator, and then a mobilization of space itself. “Not only do bodies move in space, but space itself does, approaching, receding, turning, dissolving and recrystallizing as it appears through the controlled locomotion and focusing of the camera and through the cutting and editing of the various shots” And this led to the inevitable conclusion that the proper medium of the movies was not the idealization of reality, as in the other arts, but “physical reality as such”. (Vidler 2000:111)

Space, then, is not merely represented through film, but is constructed through film and contingent upon the technologies that bring it into being. Of course, the idea that space is constructed through, and between, technologies is now a well-attended idea of communications technologies that have 'shrunk' the perception of the world (Giddens 1990). Yet, Lefebvre’s (1991) work provides a particularly nuanced assessment of this idea, noting the perception of images received through another important technology in the production of space in the contemporary era - that of the car, where spaces are alienated and flattened by their speed:

…space appears solely in its reduced forms. Volume leaves the field to surface, and any overall view surrenders to visual signals spaced out along fixed trajectories laid down in the 'plan'. An extraordinary – indeed unthinkable, impossible - confusion gradually arises between space and surface, with the later determining a spatial abstraction which it endows with a half-imaginary, half-real physical existence. This abstract space eventually becomes the simulacrum of a full space (of that space that was formally full in nature and history). (Lefebvre 1991:313)

The building of cities to accommodate the car flattens the landscape and collapses space and compresses time as Harvey (1989) and Giddens' (1990) terms. Driving inverts the outside world into a pastiche of flattened images. Through the car window, the world appears as a constant rush of denatured visual images, lacking in depth but prolific in supply. The car, then, can be seen as televising the outside world.
Schivelbusch (1977) notes a perspectival homology between the cinema and highway travel, noting the proliferation of a new type of spatiality oriented around the consumption of an endless parade of images:

Panoramic perception, in contrast to traditional perception, no longer belongs to the same space as the perceived objects; the traveler sees the objects, landscapes etc., through the apparatus which moves him through the world. That machine and the motion it creates become integrated into his visual perception: thus he can only see things in motion. (Schivelbusch 1977:64)

In a similar vein, Inglis (2005) picks up on Baudrillard’s semiological work regarding the car, showing it as a technology complicit in the construction of a denatured, or de-centred space:

… the car-commodity plays a part in destroying an older and more apparently ‘natural’ environment, in favour of a wholly man-made context in which natural phenomena only appear as stylized parodies…The implication of Baudrillard’s comments on car design is that the prefix ‘auto’ in the word 'automobile' points not only to a vehicle that ‘moves itself, but also to an auto-referential symbolic form that creates its own universe of meaning at the expense of the functioning of other, more apparently ‘natural’, semantic systems…In this fashion, the 'natural' is more and more processed out of existence, replaced by a self-consciously artificial imaginary which has the automobile at its centre as the symbolic quintessence of dynamic force. (Inglis 2005:203)

Here, the car is a site for the production and ossification of a dynamic form of space, that resembles the broader patterns of a commodity oriented cultural axiom of everyday life. That is, the car represents the process of movement and the consumption of flattened spaces rather than the content of the spaces themselves. This idea becomes important to the imagination of Fordist spaces, in particular, suburbia, discussed shortly. Kristin Ross (1995) picks up on Baudrillard’s work on the car, to
argue that the car plays a significant role in the creation of spaces and places, emphasising the role of consumption working in concert with ‘car-spatiality’ as an ordering logic in the creation of spaces. Ross, (1995) in agreement with Baudrillard identifies the post-war period in France as an example of the beginning of the current period of consumption-oriented modernity. Ross (1995) traces how cars mesh with an idea of speed and transition found in consumption. For Ross (1995:22) the phenomenon of cars and urban areas is a historically contingent idiolect unto itself, positioning the private motorcar as the lynchpin of a constitution of spatiality, one that is becoming increasingly ubiquitous. Ross (1995) maintains that this epoch is largely oriented around consumption and goes on to make connections between the proliferation of private motor vehicles and this period.

By tracing the beginning of the age of the private car in France following the Second World War7, Ross (1995) argues that the car was not simply an extension to the realm of mechanised transport. Rather, cars substantively reordered the perception of spatiality, shifting the loci of background and foreground, abbreviating new articulations of places. Post-war modernity was characterised by a radically different set of understandings about the nature of space and place. This new spatiality is constructed and mediated through the prism of consumption, and this process is segued by the private motor-car.

According to Ross (1995:22) Baudrillard also identifies the proliferation of the car as a key operator in a fundamental shift in the perception of place. Indeed, for Baudrillard, the car is the epitome of ‘modernity’ the embodiment of all that is intransigent and novel in the contemporary society. Baudrillard maintains that cars alter the perception of space and place and that travelling at high speed in a car engenders a sense of removal from the outside world (Ross 1995:21). The perception of space becomes conceptually flattened, providing an idiom where the two realms (inside and outside the car) are distinct from one another with the outside being where everything is reconciled to a two dimensional picture. According to Ross, (1995:21)

7 According to Urry (2007) proliferation of cars in France following the Second World War inspired critical theories of space from de Certeau, Baudrillard and Lefebvre as French theorists tried to account for the radical reshaping of their lifeworlds in particular, to reconcile them to the new, American style of consumption as discussed by Ross (1995) above.
for Baudrillard this reformulation of time and space is suggestive of a sort of 'eternity' invoking a type of freedom, a personal perspective or space. Further, Urry (2007:274) notes that commuting, another characteristic of the new post-war suburban spatiality, reflects this ether realm, and the conceptual separation between the spheres of life - an inbetween-ness. As Lefebvre (1991) argues, the technologies and practices of a period are intrinsically part of the production of spatial logics. Urry observes that there is a connection between transport and the perception and cultural logics of suburban spatiality realised through the private car. Ross (1995) also notes the importance of the car in the perception of a suburban spatiality, especially in the imagination of suburbia following the Second World War. This idea resonates with the broader literature on subrubaneity that references a logic of transitionality and interstitiality, as outlined in Chapter Two. The growth of suburbs reflected the availability and popularity of cars, enshrining and reproducing social patterns based on car-transport, such as commuting, and, more subtly, cultural logics of transitional space. For Ross, cars ushered in:

...a revolution that permeated every aspect of everyday life: the automobile at this time became the centre at once of a new “sublime” everydayness, a new subjectivity (whose circumference, unlike that of domestic subjectivity, is nowhere and everywhere)...that saw the dismantling of all earlier spatial arrangements. (Ross 1995:22)

Cars generate and occupy their own peculiar regimes of spatiality. They are one important schema in a geography of overlapping and intersecting taxonomies of space, producing their own symbolic tropes of noncommittal speed, distance, passing by, and the reduction of relations to face value. Cars provide a characteristic of everyday life and spatiality, in particular: a preoccupation with speed and novelty, and the conceptual separation of the reflexive experience of places (before the car) and the objectification of places, where they are viewed as a speeding backdrop, rather than an extension of the person themself.

Spatiality, then, can be conceived in a whole new way when imagined through the spectre of the automobile. This idea coincides with Lefebvre’s (1991) broader idea that space and place can only be imagined in conjunction with the social and
technological arrangements of the time, and more specifically that the spaces of modernity are progressively abrogated from the body. The patterns of capitalism, of a proliferation of images defined by their speed and through-put rather than their values sui generis, are realised through spacemaking technologies such as the car. The key characteristics of car travel, for instance, come to characterise the conceptualisation of space, resulting in a flattening or homogenising of spaces, reconciling all places to a conceptual schema of exclusion. A shift occurs from places being created through praxis, where the key is the places themselves, to the creation of places where the organising legend is speed itself.

The idea that the car is contingent in the experience and generation of urban space fits with Lefebvre’s work where space, as socially produced - is epochal. Space reflects the social, political, technological and aesthetic characteristics of the period. Suburbia is positioned as one example whereby the logic of car transport frames and shapes the production of space. More broadly, Lefebvre argues that in late capitalism space is constructed in concert with the patterns and logics of market-based exchange, where objects reconcile a tension between use-value and exchange value. For Lefebvre, then, the processes of capitalism are coupled with other processes of space-making, produced through the technologies of the era, like mass communications, television or the car. This is what makes Lefebvre’s work so powerful as a tool for theorising urban space: he describes how space can be shaped and characterised through seemingly unrelated, but no less observable, processes. Lefebvre’s work to some extent can be seen as instrumentalising the ideas of theorists like Jameson and Baudrillard. Central here are their ideas about the shape of space positioned within a matrix that can be used to examine and account for the production of space in an urban setting. In other words, Lefebvre’s work ‘grounds’ conceptual notions of signs and space.

So far, these accounts of space-making, through modern technologies such as the car, are rather abstract and theoretical. Therefore, it is important to examine the social implications of placemaking realised through the types of space described above. The idea of a disconnected, (or flattened), alienated space constructed through the conceptual prism of the car is explored in more depth for its consequences in making the urban spaces of (Fordist) suburbia, which is the space in the Australian context that is subjected to the process of gentrification.
Space into place: mobilities

Urry (2007) claims that movement ‘through’ space is a political, cultural construct replete with its own hierarchies of power. Urry’s work resonates with Lefebvre’s (1991) ideas about the production of space as a transition between meaningful social constructs, (such as work, family, home, leisure), or as deviance. More simply, the ability to move through, and create, spaces, is a socially meaningful product unto itself. Emphasising the importance of movement in the social realm, Urry posits an entire sub-field of sociology based upon it: something he broadly defines as 'mobilities' (2007:18). For Urry, (2007:118) mobilities mingle the technological with the social technologies of movement, for instance, cell phone towers, trains and roads, with people, and their behaviours without privileging one over the other. Technology is contingent, constructed and constrained through use, and the same can be said for the social elements of mobility. Urry (2007) talks about the rise of the private car, and its implications for cultural perceptions of space, industrial development, and the environment. But, as Urry notes, the car is often examined in terms of its role in capitalism, either as an example of a mass produced consumer good or as an iconic industry requiring the organisation and consolidation of many different factors, such as roads, machinery, service agents, and access to fuel (2007:118). More commonly overlooked, he argues, are the social and cultural implications of the proliferation of the private car, or what he calls 'automobility' (2007:118). That is, how people consider the idea of being encapsulated in a space that is simultaneously moving, but also still (inside the car). For Urry the private motor car 'de-synchronises' (2007:124) space, enabling for a shift in the way people consider their ‘outside car’ environment. Automobility includes political ramifications that reference classic sociological questions of personhood. According to Urry, (2007:118) automobility:

...involves the fusion of the inner-directed self as in the notion of autobiography, and of objects or machines that possess the capacity for movement as in something being automatic or an automaton. This double resonance of 'auto' demonstrates that the 'car driver' is as a hybrid assemblage of human competencies and will, and machines,
roads, buildings and signs.

For Urry, the car is more than an object positioned against a backdrop of inert space. Rather, it is a cultural construct in itself, creating, recreating and interposing space and place as social processes, something he suggests is often overlooked in sociology:

In general, however, sociology has regarded cars as a neutral technology, permitting social patterns of life that would have more or less occurred anyway. Sociology has ignored the key significance of automobility, which reconfigures civil society, involving distinct ways of dwelling, travelling and socialising in, and through, an automobilised time-space. Civil societies of the west are societies of automobility. This is neither simply a system of production nor of consumption, although it is of course both of these. (Urry 1999:3)

Although Urry claims that the car has been undervalued in terms of its contribution to the imagination of capitalist spaces (1999), there have been important contributions within cultural theory. Foucault, for instance, suggests that architects are no longer the 'technicians or engineers of the three great variables - territory, communication and speed' (Dimendberg 1995). In other words, there are formulations of spatial perception that distribute placemaking and the perception of space that lie outside the realm of a single authority. Urry (2007) also cites ethnologist Marc Auge’s idea of 'non-places' (1995), in his exploration of the types of space and place redolent with the transitionality of the car in contemporary formulations of urban space. Auge’s (1995) ‘non-places’, refers to a peculiar spatial arrangement characteristic of supermodernity, and one that reflects the social interpretation of space denoted through media outlined above. According to Thornton (1997), non-places are redolent with in-between-ness, they are non committal locations where people increasingly live ‘less involved’ lives, where the multiplicity of meanings engenders a disconnection from spatiality, a sense that one cannot engage with place in a meaningful way at all. There are a:

...multiplicity of meanings, a magical superabundance of meanings in fact, and can lead literally anywhere in the world, but in all other
purposes that are normally filled in ordinary places (sex, belief, daily life, death, disease, deviance) are rigorously excluded. (Thornton 1997:633)

Non-places are super-ordinary, somewhat exempt from the constraints and restraints of everyday life and embodiment (Auge 1995). Auge’s (1995) accounts focus on the dominance of highways and by-ways, drive-thrus and carparks (Auge 1995:75-79; Thornton 1997:633). Non-places attain and maintain a sense of indeterminacy, they are interstitial, about ‘travelling through’. In ‘super modernity’ a proliferation and excess of time and space begets a polyphony of places. In other words, some places are re-construed as multiple sites for the proliferation of meanings. Auge (1995) further posits a similarity or resonance between consumption and the perception of place. Non-places pivot on two fulcrums - transport and commerce, negotiated through the impersonal communications of commerce. For Auge (1995) the abstract technologies of exchange produce: ‘a world thus surrendered to solitary individuality, to the fleeting and the temporary and ephemeral…’ (Auge 1995:78). For Urry, movement in cars propagates a stream of images as part of identity projects:

As bodies are subject to the 'new', so being subject to the new is elsewhere, on the move, in some other place that needs to be visited and immersed within. Newness in the twenty first century often involves moving and commodified bodies. (Urry 2007: 274)

Here, Urry makes the link between commodification, the shape or form of the commodity, and movement in cars. Another theme of interstitiality and movement involves the imagination of suburban space and place. Literary theorist Andrew McCann (1998:vii), makes a similar connection between the type of space outlined above, preoccupied by speed, novelty, ultimately expressed through consumption, and suburbia, in particular, Australian suburbia. Suburbia, he argues, is:

…central to broader discussions of what critical theorists call modernity - that is the Western drive towards the development of regulated and disciplined sociability within the infrastructures and relations of industrial capitalism…it represses the libidinal and the
aesthetic, normalises the functionalism of capital, disorganises residual community ties, and wastes scarce resources on an immense scale. (McCann 1998:vii)

McCann goes on to cite Lefebvre’s notion of intertwined space and social processes, arguing that Lefebvre's:

…theories of ‘abstract space’ and the ‘colonisation of the everyday’ all imply something like suburbia as the most tangible manifestation of a functionalised modernity and/or symbolic order. (McCann 1998:vii)

McCann extends the connection between the proliferation and reification of an idea of suburbia and Ross’ (1995) work on the development of suburban modernity, oriented around consumption. McCann cites Ross (1995) who:

…argue[s] that the emergence of the ‘everyday’ and analytical and experiential concept needs to be referred to its particular historical context. According to Ross the everyday is ‘elevated to the status of theoretic concept’ as a result of the ‘entry of capital in “style of life”, into lived, daily, almost imperceptible rhythms’. (McCann 1998:vii)

Coinciding with Lefebvre’s (1991) work on the production of abstract space in everyday life (changing with epochal dimensions, informed and encapsulated by the technologies of the time), McCann’s version of everyday suburban life takes consumption as its central orienting trope. Following Lefebvre’s idea that objects and processes can be ‘coupled’ and ‘decoupled’ to produce spaces, suburbia can be drawn as the locus for the intersection of cars as ‘space-making’ technology, propagating flattened, ‘de-natured’ ideoscapes, consumption as self-referential, depthless hyper place, characterised by the ‘through-put’ of images, rather than the meanings of the

8 A more recent theory of space and power, Actor Network Theory (ANT) builds on conceptualisations of Lefebvrian space, breaking down the traditional sociological axiom of agency and structure to incorporate or ‘couple’ (Luhmann 1995) seemingly inconsistent factors such as objects, processes, logics and aesthetics into strategies of space making.
images themselves. Suburbia, ordered around the car can, in Auge’s terms, be seen as being a ‘non-place’ or at least, spaces characterised by the car as a technology for the organisation of space. This is not to suggest that all suburbia is a 'non-place', rather, that non-places exist within the spaces of suburbia and these non-places are created through the movements and spaces of the car.

As outlined in Chapter Two, Australian suburbia is drawn as a transitional place, frequently discussed as interstitial, relegated, peripheral. Baudrillard, Lefebvre and others, such as Ross discuss their conceptualisations of car-produced space in post-War terms, that is, contemporaneous with the rapid growth and consolidation of suburbia in Australia and elsewhere. Thus, cars and transport can be seen as dominant organising strategies in the spatial arrangements of Fordist suburbia. By examining cars in terms of their broader implications for the shaping and construction of space and place it is possible to see consumption highlighted as an important organising trope in suburbia.

Armstrong (2005), writing about urban space in Australia cites the work of Australian artist Chris Cairns talking about the construction of time/space characteristic of outer suburban life, which is reflected in his photography:

I grew up across the border. Past outer Western Sydney where freeways, shopping malls, and petrol station fast food strips start to break down. Everything involves car travel – involves accepting the stillness and passivity of being a passenger – elongating your sense of place ‘til it is able to inhabit the journey itself. (Cairns 2005 in Armstrong 2005:11)

Armstrong articulates a mutually constitutive lexicon of movement and place evidenced in Cairns’ work:

Not only do the photographs and anecdotes demonstrate an empathy with these landscapes, they also convey the importance of movement and distance. The spaces are predominantly experienced by car, so a language of landscape needs to bring out how fluid spatiality can link
Armstrong’s statement resonates with ideas of a flattened, denatured space, including Auge’s idea of non-places, constructed through the car and Baudrillard’s (1983) idea of space as constructed through commodified media and the patterns of car mobility. Armstrong’s example is Australian based. Other theorists explore and delineate a link between the technologies that bring suburban space into being and consumption. Urry (1995) for instance, notes that suburbia retains a sense of the limitless appropriation of land and change, that new built environments provide a degree of freedom from previous social and political strictures. He notes that the early stages of suburban development provided a sense of ‘newness’, expressed through sprawl. The ‘breaking in’ of new land for development evinced a sense of individuality and freedom from the previous social and political constraints associated with war and austerity (Urry 1995). Suburban sprawl, as a monument to the post-war period of prosperity and growth, enshrined newness and the post-war Modernist architectural fashion of limitless perspective that came to prominence in the architectural discourse of modernism in the post-war period. The dictates of post-war Modernist architecture resonate with Baudrillard’s (1983) ideas about disembodied, ‘flat’ or denatured spaces, enshrining the purity and potentiality of endless change, recognisable through wide open spaces and heavily glassed buildings (the physical manifestation of limitless perspective). So, although most suburban housing is not built according to these Modernist architectural principles, the greatest period of suburban growth coincided with a period of Modernist architecture, and shares some of its overarching characteristics. Where Modernist architecture enshrines limitless change in telescoping glass and open 'scapes', suburbia enshrines it through homogeneity and an endless horizon of sameness. In other words, suburbia is a Modernist landscape where the entire built environment reflects a Modernist aesthetic (Blythe 2001). It is important to note that although much of the development in Mayfield took place before the modernist period, the central tenets of suburbia oriented around cars, sprawl and low density housing are relevant to making sense of suburban place more generally. I would argue that this spatial aesthetic extends to processes including the

9 Indeed, prominent Australian Modernist architect Robin Boyd (1960) criticised suburban housing as enshrining the worst aspects of domesticity in the built form.
ways in which cars, traffic and consumption spatially intersect to inform suburban space and the ways in which these forms are overlaid on already existing inner suburban landscapes. Silverstone (1997) draws suburbia as retaining homogenizing characteristics through the rubric of consumption. That is, the patterns and logic, or 'activity' (1997:8) of consumption ameliorates ‘depth’ in the suburb:

…buried not far beneath the surface of its apparent uniformity lie distinctions that depend on origin than on activity, distinctions that have lost their past and are defined only in the present... (Silverstone 1997:8)

Silverstone too, notes the influence of television as a technology for producing suburban space:

History is merged to the present. Geography is denied by an instant compression of space. Nothing is unavailable. When everything has value, nothing does. (Silverstone 1997:9)

Suburban space can be viewed as being constructed through the patterns of the car, and oriented around the logic of consumption. Following Lefebvre (1991) the patterns and logics of space can be said to intersect at many levels. The spatial arrangement of cars and traffic resonates with the logic of consumption in the project of modernity. The patterns of spatiality produced by, and through, the car mesh with ideas of consumption to construct a particular mode of space yet the image of space as a denatured or flattened space is also attended in the literature regarding suburban architecture and planning, in particular, the discourse of heritage. The link between placemaking, heritage and consumption lies in what Baudrillard terms hyperreality or the production of flattened, denatured spaces and places further shaped through the technologies through which we come to imagine the history or the past, such as television and film (Morley and Robins 1995:90). The previous chapter discussed the

---

10 It is important to note that although much of the development in Mayfield took place before the modernist period, the central tenets of suburbia oriented around cars, sprawl and low density housing are relevant to making sense of suburban place more generally.
idea of heritage as a pastiche of disembodied, denatured images, redolent of Baudrillard's notion of hyperreality (Hewison 1991; Lyth 2006; Zumkhawala-Cook 2008). In this reading of heritage, place and space are presented as sites for the proliferation of images, rather than locations where the 'sensibility' of these images might be established.

**Conclusion**

Lefebvre's holistic approach to the interpretation of space and place brings the interconnection between the symbolic logics that order and structure the creation of ideoscapes and the processes that engender, manifest and represent them. Synergies are identified between seemingly diverse realms as transport, movement, the production, consumption and valuation of commodities. They symbolic economy provides a useful prism through which the connections between consumption and commodification of place and space and the built environment can be interrogated.

More specifically, Lefebvre’s (1991) work on space and place is useful for thinking about the construction of heritage where heritage can be thought of as a strategy that is ‘coupled’ with technologies and narratives of place. Heritage resonates with suburban ideas of homogeneity that intersect with broader notions of urban place as a flattened or distanciated ideoscape, as discussed in Chapter Two. Of course, at one level, heritage discourses necessarily and explicitly commodify the built environment through the development of ‘character’ and its preservation in housing. But heritage commodifies place and space in more subtle ways, through the development and reification of 'hyperreal' places, conforming to the overarching logic of capitalism and exchange expressed through images of place that privilege the ‘through-put’ or flow of images rather than the constancy, depth and meaning of the images themselves.

Understandings of space and place have moved through a number of stages in the sociological and geographical imagination, broadly replacing a modern, Cartesian, subject/object axiom has been replaced by post-modern, subjective, diverse, and discrete readings of space. Yet, despite the eclecticism some broad themes remain. A Marxist concern with the (re)production of power in the creation of the city informs
the work of critical theorists such as Baudrillard, Jameson and Lefebvre who posit meta-narratives of placemaking, showing how the logics of capitalism organise the creation of dominant discourses of place and space. In particular, Lefebvre provides a description of the cultural expression of capitalism and develops a conceptual framework through which the patterns of capitalist space can be interpreted as part of the production of space. As Slater (2003:152) notes post-Fordism is characterised by cultural logics of capitalism, as described by theorists such as Jameson and Baudrillard. The cultural logics of capitalism are realised through the everyday production of space, through the mobilities of the car, to the creation of 'heritage places' that resonate with Baudrillard's (1983) notion of flattened, baseless and ultimately, commodified places.

Where Chapters One and Two provided the background and rationale for this research outlining the cultural elements of placemaking in the context of post-Fordism and the deindustrialising Australian city, this chapter built on the critical approaches to the production of space and place in an urban context. The cultural elements of Fordism and post-Fordism here drawn out and explored in relation to space and place, in particular, through the work of theorists such as Baudrillard, Lefebvre and Jameson. Viewing space and place as implicitly connected, expressed and represented with and through social, political and economic processes provides the tools to 'think through' ways-of-knowing deindustrialising places as being at the intersection of post-Fordism and Fordism. Focusing on the cultural characteristics of capitalism in particular enables an interrogation of placemaking processes involved in the conceptualisation of 'transition' between Fordism and post-Fordism. The next chapter develops a methodological rubric through research in the Australian suburb of Mayfield.
Chapter Four

Research Methodology

Framed by the shift from Fordism to post-Fordism, this thesis set out to examine official and unofficial discourses of place and transition as they are played out in a deindustrialising suburb. Drawing on the theories of Lefebvre and Baudrillard in particular, the thesis probes the tensions that emerge at the intersection of Fordist and post-Fordist imaginings and uses of urban space. It argues that deindustrialisation cannot be understood in terms of linear transition between the spaces shaped by a Fordist past and those imagined in a post-Fordist future. Rather, Fordism and post-Fordism, as real and imagined spaces, coexist in tension as part of a Lefebvrian triad alongside the idea and process of transition. This is a triadic space within which images of the suburb's future are negotiated and contested in the context of its present and stigmatised past.

Using qualitative methods I set out to investigate the social and cultural dimensions of ways-of-knowing place within the context of deindustrialisation. The focus of my investigation was the deindustrialising suburb of Mayfield, which is located within the regional Australian city of Newcastle. The research approach developed in response to general themes, mostly identified at the beginning of the research process. These themes were then elaborated and interrogated through ethnographic style participant observation and in-depth interviews. These two methods formed the basis of the research methodology and yielded the majority of the data. I also undertook a thematic and content analysis of secondary data, such as official statistics and policy documents, which yielded insights into 'official' discourses of place and space including the images mobilised by those with access to formal processes, such as art and heritage projects. I used a qualitative, multi-method approach as a means to apprehend the social and cultural processes and discourses of place in Mayfield. Beginning with a discussion of qualitative research principles, this chapter addresses each of these elements in turn and the development of the broad research themes.
This PhD research was supported by a scholarship funded by an Australian Research Council Linkage grant. The Chief Investigators were Deborah Stevenson, David Rowe and Kevin Markwell from the University of Newcastle and the Industry Partner was Newcastle City Council through its Mayfield Mainstreet Committee. The MMC is prominent in this thesis as an institutional 'gatekeeper'\textsuperscript{11} of images of the suburb. Newcastle City Council states 'The City of Newcastle's Mainstreet Program refers to community-based economic development initiatives based around specific commercial localities. The Program aims to revitalise and grow the economies of traditional strip shopping areas and currently operates for the City Centre, Darby Street, Hamilton, Mayfield, New Lambton and Wallsend. The City of Newcastle has established local Committees for each of the commercial centres. The Committees are elected from local business people and residents. The City of Newcastle collects a special benefit rate levied from commercial properties, and passes the funds on to the Committees to help stimulate their commercial centres. Major activities cover infrastructure and landscape improvements, special events and marketing'. (Newcastle City Council 2010b). Although the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee was involved in establishing the broad research parameters for the thesis research - that the study examine the opportunities and social implications of deindustrialisation following the closure of BHP in Mayfield - I was free to interpret this focus and develop my own research question according to my own research interests and in response to the research process. The connections with the Mainstreet Committee provided me with very good access to a range of local gatekeepers who were interested in the reimagining of the suburb and I regularly attended meetings of the Mainstreet Committee as an observer.

Scoping: developing research questions and themes

\textsuperscript{11} Here, 'gatekeepers' refers to interested residents and community members who contributed to the meetings of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee, community members who had been involved in already established heritage projects, such as the Heritage Walks, and also the Mayfield Arts and Culture meetings, which were held over a period of months in the offices above a local hotel. The Arts and Culture meetings in particular drew out local support for heritage based projects.
Developing a research question that interrogates the nature of space and place requires a reflexive, naturalistic approach that is 'non-manipulative, unobtrusive, and non-controlling' (Patton 1990:40), which means an approach that is responsive to the data. Because this research involved such a wide-ranging research question (social change and the perception of place are broad subjects), an interpretive and iterative research process (Glaser and Strauss 1967) was considered to be the most appropriate methodological framework. Glaser and Strauss (1967) support a research strategy that develops a meaningful dialogue between the interviewer and the interviewee. In an attempt to be as open-ended as possible this method positions the researcher and the interviewee as coming to terms with the understandings that both parties find meaningful. For instance, 'class' may emerge as an important theme in the research, however, if interviewees are simply asked if they consider themselves 'working class' or 'middle class', they may have different understandings from the researcher of what those categories mean. The aim of a responsive research process is to be alive to the polyphonic nature of these social definitions, and to establish a common understanding of phenomena through the research process. So, an open-ended question about social class might introduce a discussion about what constitutes the different categories of class, how they interact and overlap, and then establish how the interviewee associates with these distinctions. At this early point in the research process theory is used as a sensitising tool (Blaikie 2000), rendering the researcher more alert to prominent themes without determining them. Using theory in this way resonates with the ethnographic method that requires a constant reflexivity rather than the codification of social phenomena that in turn renders the research overly proscriptive. Although my research did not include an ethnography in the strictest anthropological definition of complete immersion in a totally foreign context, it did involve significant participant observation and two years of living in Mayfield actively investigating and responding to the social and cultural mores that contributed to a sense of space and place in the suburb, as well as my personal interaction with these ideas. In this way, my research method retained a strong emphasis on reflexivity as characterised by the form of ethnography described above. Further, Lefebvre’s (1991) production of space was influential in the construction of this research project. Lefebvre's tripartite structure recognises the intermediate, voluntaristic, intended and unintended aspects of ways-of-knowing place and suggests a sociological approach that embraces both the ‘top down’ and ‘bottom up’ approaches to making sense of
ways-of-knowing place. For Lefebvre, the distinction between theory and practice is somewhat otiose, as space is produced in, and through, the patterns, processes, technologies and objects of daily life. Lefebvre’s ‘dialectic’ refers to all elements of social life. It searches out tensions or cleavages between seemingly unrelated elements and positions them as the generators of social space through which power is realised and mediated. Shields (1999) notes:

…that while formal logic, exemplified by simple mathematics focused on the singular identity and differences between elements, dialectical logic focused on the relationships between elements and the process by which new states of affairs arise out of deep contradictions in the status quo. (Shields 1999:109)

Developing a research methodology that aims to interrogate the 'logic between elements' is an obtuse goal, but one that is central to my use of the theoretical framework described in Chapter Three. In my research, Lefebvre’s approach became useful as a ‘tool to think with’. In other words, its relevancy became apparent during the research process, following the establishment of some key themes. That is, both the research process and method progressed in an iterative fashion, with one informing the other. Keeping in mind the work of Lefebvre, my research recognises the various, sometimes complementary, sometimes diametrical, sometimes coincidental ways in which space and place are perceived and realised while at the same time seeking to identify broad themes within the research data that cut across conventional boundaries, such as institutional versus semiotic.

Although Lefebvre's (1991) work on the production of space became more apposite during the analysis stage of the research, his ideas did guide my research methodology. Lefebvre (1991) is concerned with the structural elements of place, as well as the voluntaristic, physical and technological aspects. Further, Lefebvre (1991) begins his conceptualisation of place and space with a strong focus on the participatory nature of place and space. Assessing place in the context of deindustrialisation and post-Fordism required a research methodology that would respond to organised, structured strategies for knowing place and space, accounting for the actions of vested actors, organisations, institutions and processes (such as
deindustrialisation), but also enlighten and investigate the more subtle cultural aspects of place, such as how people interact with space, conceive of, and connect with, spatiality, and delineate the intentional from the contingent and interstitial. My focus on the principles of the ethnographic method, realised through participant observation, demonstrates the strong emphasis on the participatory elements of this research.

**Developing and investigating the research question**

I began the research process with an open-ended, guiding theme: an examination of placemaking in the context of deindustrialisation in an Australian suburb. Through a combination of theory, reading, participant observation (living in Mayfield and talking to residents) and also an analysis of secondary data (official statistics and reports) I adduced some general themes that characterised the knowledges of place at work in Mayfield. Early in the research process a broad cleavage between the official discourse of heritage and unofficial practices of placemaking became apparent, and I investigated the dimensions of these two themes using a multi-method approach. The multi-method approach reflected the diverse range of processes and practices involved in the imagination of place in Mayfield, responding to the intersection of 'top down' versions of place (such as heritage projects) and 'bottom up' practices, such as loitering and skateboarding. The multi-method approach was flexible enough to allow for variations in the way that the knowledges of place were expressed. For instance, ethnographic style participant observation was highly useful for making sense of unofficial practices like skateboarding, whereas in-depth interviews were more useful for obtaining insights into the organised, official discourses of place, notably heritage. Yet, the beginning of the research process, the identification and development of themes, was significantly guided by participant observation. Accounting for my role or 'voice' in the 'text' is a good place to begin a description of the 'on-the-ground' research process.

Sociological approaches to community research differ but one idea has solidified in the methodological literature: writing the researcher ‘into the text’. That is, with the widespread (but by no means uncontested) adoption of post-modern research methods
comes the idea that completely objective research is impossible. Sociological research will always reflect the broad sociological characteristics of the researcher - their class, ethnicity and gender, but also more subtle experiences, such as their history and cultural precepts, including their metaphysical understandings of space or embodiment (McNeill and Chapman 2005:6). As outlined above, my multi-method approach included a strong focus on participant observation, which was significantly informed by the ethnographic method. Anthropological approaches to social research embrace the difficulties in representing the researcher and the 'researched'. Geertz (1988:9) cites two main themes in ethnographic research: ‘signature’, (or the presence of the writer in the text), and ‘discourse’ (the rhetoric or logic that structures the accounts). For Geertz, it is impossible to ‘write oneself’ out of an ethnographic account of a social world, as the account will logically contain the assumptions, tropes, education and background of the researcher/author. In other words, for Geertz (1988) the received method for 'making' ethnography lies in the relationship between the emic and etic in fieldwork.

The signature issue, as the ethnographer confronts it...demands both the Olympianism of the unauthorial physicist and the sovereign consciousness of the hyperauthorial novelist, while not in fact permitting either. The first brings charges of insensitivity, of treating people as objects, of hearing the words but not the music, and, of course, of ethnocentrism. The second brings charges of impressionism, of treating people as puppets, of hearing music that doesn’t exist... (Geertz 1988:10).

Ethnographic research traces the way the ethnographer comes to imagine themselves within a novel context, thus highlighting the culture itself. In this way, the ethnography will always reflect the experiences of the author/researcher, yet can still provide a regime of insight into the social understandings and expectations of others. Geertz's position is apposite for a range of qualitative social research. Approaching the broad research theme to understand the processes and complexities of placemaking in a deindustrialising Australian city, my first concern was political. I wanted to avoid letting explicit narratives of change become overly determinative. That is, the processes of deindustrialisation, particularly in the context of post-
Fordism, are often shown to entrench social disadvantage, especially when accompanied by neo-liberal style politics that hold a tendency to privatise the means of social mobility, such as health, education and welfare (Amin et al., 2002). In addition, gentrification, as a process identified at the very inception of this project, follows well-recognised patterns of social disenfranchisement, as poorer residents make way for wealthier middle class home-owners (see Chapter Two). Focusing on these ‘big’ narratives of deindustrialisation could have obfuscated attempts to interpret and unravel the ways in which urban space was perceived for residents from different backgrounds and circumstances, hindering an understanding of place in both its formal and informal (accidental) guises, and more particularly, the ways in which images and ideas of place resonated with the intersection of Fordist and post-Fordist processes. So, although these important concerns are addressed in the research, during the research process I tried to avoid them becoming overly prescriptive, perhaps ‘blinding’ me to other ‘ways of knowing’ the suburb, ways which were ordered along broad sociological lines of class, ethnicity and gender, but were not necessarily limited to these distinctions.

There is a tension between ethnographic-oriented research methods, such as participant observation, and more formal methods, such as semi-structured or in-depth interviews (Heyl 2001:372). Participant observation has grown increasingly popular for its use as a subjective research tool within a sociological domain that is increasingly concerned with subjective accounts of social research, while interviews are rooted in older, positivist approaches to social research (Heyl 2001:373). Yet this is not to suggest that interviews must necessarily be prescriptive. Narrative approaches to sociological research recognise the authorial content of interviews (Agger 2007:238), and as Gubriam and Holstein (1995) note, interviews are a meaning-making exercise, where the researcher and the interviewer are involved in a mutual process of referencing meanings both explicit and implicit as both parties search for mutual references within which to locate their experiences and narratives. It seemed to me that in-depth, open-ended interviews would be a good way of finding out about the knowledges of place at work in Mayfield. In 1979 Spradley described the 'ethnographic interview' as an idea that has influenced data collection (Madden 2010). Madden (2010:73) notes Spradley's 'asymmetrical turn taking' as a key characteristic of the ethnographic interview, where the interviewee provides the
majority of the interview, with the interviewer prompting them with open-ended questions and encouraging them to talk. This technique is characteristic of my approach to interviews, where I would engage the participants in very open-ended discussions and encourage them to talk and explain terms or references (often ones I felt I knew putative answers to already), in order to establish the nuanced and subtle readings of placemaking in Mayfield. Further, in-depth, ethnographic-style extended interviews produce narratives. There are many ways to interrogate narratives, for instance, Setha Low (2003), draws on Daiute (2000) to develop a straightforward method to inform an analysis of neighbourhood residents’ ideas of space in a suburban context. This method highlights the underlying meanings of statements and also positions the speaker:

...Daiute (2000) suggests that there are five ways to interrogate a narrative: (1) as reporting an event, (2) as evaluating the event, (3) as socially positioning the speaker, (4) as a critique of the event, and (5) as otherwise unarticulated discursive goals of the interviewees. (Low, 2003:401)

This approach renders visible themes and messages that might otherwise be invisible to both the researcher and the interviewee. In short, the semi-structured ethnographic interview process utilised in my research reflects the grounded, iterative approach to research, by formulating open-ended, broad respondent-led questions that recognises a mutual process of meaning construction.

Following approval from the University of Newcastle ethics committee, in-depth interviews were carried out at the beginning of the research process in conjunction with the ethnographic fieldwork, as part of a 'ground clearing' effort that would attempt to establish the broad themes that would shape the research to come. I conducted interviews with representatives of relevant institutions such as Newcastle City Council, with residents who were involved in community events and organisations and, later in the research process, with more targeted residents, for instance, gentrifiers and skaters. In total I interviewed thirty people in-depth and on the record, five of whom were interviewed in their official capacities or as members of local organisations, where the rest were residents of the suburb (see Appendix 1 for
I spoke to many, many more people than thirty of course and overheard countless conversations. All the interviews were taped on a small dictaphone and then transcribed.

Undertaking a multi-method approach that relies heavily on ethnography and interviews poses the question of what are 'interview' data and what are part of conversations with neighbours, friends, shopkeepers, dog walkers etcetera, much of which was equally important to understanding space and place in Mayfield. I took detailed field-notes of these interactions, normally at the end of the day, as part of a research diary. A division became clear between the data gleaned through participant observation and the interview data, in that the interview data reflected more edited elicitations of space and place in Mayfield, reflecting how residents and stakeholders spoke about their suburb, their considered ideas of how they wanted to see the place. Whereas the participant observation data demonstrated how Mayfielders organised and structured their movements within, and in conjunction with, the places and space in Mayfield. The juxtaposition or cross-fertilisation of the two was particularly telling, illuminating the making of dominant-discourses through the way the suburb is talked about by some residents, set against how it is used and invoked in everyday life. In terms of the interview data, I decided that specific content reproduced in the thesis would arise from interviews for which I had gained consent. I also noted the gender and a rough approximation of age for the interviewees (see Appendix 1), and also their residential status.

Only two interviews took place outside Mayfield, both at the (close-by) university, because it was considered easier for participants who were students (see Appendix 1 for locations of interviews and community events). Other interviews were conducted in public spaces mainly due to the method of recruitment. Initially I printed fliers (see Appendix 4) describing the research project and inviting participants to contact me. These were posted in the window of the local library, two bus stops and two shops on the main street, Maitland Road. However, another research student who had conducted research in the local area warned me this technique could yield responses from one group of residents in particular who was particularly keen to be involved in local projects, especially those regarding heritage, a placemaking theme that had already emerged as important in Mayfield. Although I was of course interested in the
views of these residents as 'gatekeepers' of local knowledge and as proponents and architects of a particular discourse of 'historical heritage', I wanted to avoid overly prejudicing my data in the service of their opinions, to the exclusion of other 'voices' in the community. So I recruited most of the interviewees either by directly approaching people in the street (outside the main supermarket was a popular venue) or at community events. I also used 'triangulation' (Blaikie 2000:262) to establish a meaningful degree of representation in the data, but more of this below.

Some interviewees were recruited through the 'snowball method', which refers to the selection of respondents through referral by other interviewees (Soriano 1995:40). For instance, my next-door neighbours, one of whom had lived in Mayfield eight years and the other his entire life, had a barbeque at their house and mentioned the study to their guests who were quite interested in the project. I organised three interviews with people who came to the barbeque. Another ‘snowball’ developed from a friend with a dog, who told me that there was a gathering of locals at Islington Park on weekday evenings. Islington is a suburb directly adjacent to Mayfield East, and the park is a popular ‘off leash’ area for Mayfield residents to take their dogs (see Appendix 2 for map). This contact yielded quite a diverse range of people in terms of background but importantly, many of the dog walkers were owner-occupiers in Mayfield. The snowball method is commonly used as a way of obtaining research participants with similar characteristics (Soriano 1995:40) so I was quite surprised by the variety of respondents referred to me.

I also attended a number of community events, including a permaculture workshop (2005) and Harmony Day in 2006 (see Appendix 1 for details), where I took copious field notes and conducted opportunistic unrecorded and recorded interviews. In particular, I attended many meetings of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee, a group comprised of local business people, residents and run by a co-ordinator provided by the Newcastle City Council. The activities of the Mainstreet Committee were particularly important to the research theme as the committee was a 'gatekeeper' of images and presentations of Mayfield. Although funded by the Newcastle City Council, the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee is a community operated organisation aimed at 'improving' Mayfield through a variety of means such as the development of the streetscape, commercial tenancies, community events and addressing local issues.
The committee is comprised of local businesspeople and interested local residents. It is chaired by a local businessman, and co-ordinated by a contractor to the Newcastle City Council. The co-ordinator's position was the only paid position on the MMC. During the period of my research, the MMC retained an office above shops in Maitland Road (the main shopping strip in Mayfield), which is where the meetings took place, and where the co-ordinator had an office. The MMC gains almost all its funding from Newcastle City Council. Each meeting attracted between five and 12 members and normally most MMC members came to meetings. The MMC met every second Wednesday at 5:45pm, normally starting proceedings at 6pm. I also attended three meetings of the Mayfield Arts and Culture Committee which was a group of local residents and representatives from the Newcastle City Council interested in developing arts and cultural initiatives as part of the suburb's broader regeneration plans. In 2006, I was even a judge on the panel of the Miss Mayfield Pageant.

I hoped to access the views of a wide range of Mayfield residents. At the inception of this research members of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee bemoaned the presence of a highly visible group of homeless people who liked to 'hang out' in some of the suburb's most prominent public places. Through an interview with the Manager of MayCare a community outreach and 'drop in' centre I gained some insight into the issues facing homeless people in Mayfield, but also gained access to drop-in coffee mornings on Wednesdays and Fridays. Further, the MayCare Centre offers English as a second language discussion groups on Thursday nights, and attending these sessions enabled me to access some of the newer Mayfield residents, recent immigrants to Australia. I also gained access to a group of people for whom English was a second language but who had been living in Australia for quite some time and came to the MayCare sessions designed to assist newer immigrants integrate into Australian society. I did not specifically ask respondents to nominate themselves within broad categories of class and ethnicity, although two specifically talked about their experiences as new immigrants (both from Sudan), and six others, who were second generation Australians, mentioned a southern European background, some of them in relation to a large migration of people from that area following the Second World War to work in the local BHP steel works. Overall, though, the majority of the research respondents were of Anglo-Australian descent. Although traditional delineations of class, gender and ethnicity were evident 'structuring' factors in the
interview data, so too was the distinction between home-owners and renters, as noted by Stevenson (1999) who carried out social research into neighbouring in the suburb.

Processes, method and challenges

As discussed above, this research process did not involve an ethnographic approach in the strictest sense of the term, yet developing research themes and examining elements of place and transition in Mayfield, especially the unofficial discourses such as loitering and skateboarding, involved participant observation that was strongly influenced by the ethnographic method. A large part of my research relied on the process of 'learning to be local', by which I mean living in Mayfield and participating in daily life in order to interrogate and explore a sense of place in the suburb. Through this process I aimed to glean an understanding of the complexities of placemaking within the community. Further, ethnographic/participant observation was part of a broader theoretical approach, where the research themes and directions were formulated as part of an iterative process of reflexive engagement with the data. As a research method, participant observation strongly inspired by the ethnographic method, enabled significant opportunities for gathering data in a social research context.

The ethnographic method is increasingly popular in contemporary sociology as a way to combat positivistic and overly prescriptive research methods (Heyl 2001). Much literature exists about the ethnographic method as used in 'home' contexts, that is, where the researcher carries out social research within a familiar community (Skeggs 1997). It is, for instance, a popular approach within community studies (Bell and Newby 1972). In Australia, community studies have recently come to embrace the cultural, textual and understandings of place and space (Stevenson 1999). Recent cultural studies of life in the Australian suburbs include Newton (1999), Hogan (2003) and Redshaw (2006). These studies draw in complex multi-variables, such as interview data, media images and social practices (including participant observation) in order to describe and account for the social dynamics that organise and mobilise definitions and ideas of community. Moreover, these cultural accounts of community reference the kinds of insights ethnographic method yields, aiming to document
shared ideas and values about 'what it means' to live in a place. As Geertz (1988) argues, the underlying topos of any ethnography is the gradual establishment of social knowledge and proficiency in a novel context. In other words, ethnography traces the processes of a newcomer learning to be local and highlights the values and understandings about what it means to be local in the process. I saw my research in similar terms, a gradually increasing proficiency in understanding what it means to be a Mayfielder, augmented and informed by interviews and analysis of secondary data along the way. There is a difference between simply 'learning to be local' as any newcomer might, and learning to be local with a view to producing social research (Atkinson and Hammersley 2007:4). The latter requires critical reflection on social institutions, cultural themes, confluences in the structures of meaning-making, all of which are combined, along with secondary sources and extant literature, to develop a reflexive research method.

The growing popularity of the ethnographic method has lead to variations. Atkinson and Coffey (2002) argue that some ethnographic accounts include interviews and intentional data collection, without participant observation. The concern here is that the resulting ethnography may reflect some of the pitfalls of more positivistic research methods, for instance, overly privileging the researcher's perspective. This is not to suggest, though, that ethnographic research is completely undirected. Atkinson and Hammersley (2007) note the importance of informed practice. Although ethnography is about in-depth participation, or what has been called 'deep hanging out' (Geertz 1998), nascent, guiding themes or hunches can be identified in order to both indicate potentially meaningful social data, but also, to ensure a criticality in the collection process, recognising an attempt at representation and veracity. Atkinson and Hammersley (2007) describe the attempt to gain representative data through a guided process of ethnographic research:

The initially exploratory character of ethnographic research means that it will often not be clear where, within a setting, observation should be begin, which actors need to be shadowed, and so on. Sampling strategies will have to be worked out, and changed, as the research progresses. Much the same is true of the use of interviews. Here, decisions about whom to interview, when, and where, will have
to be developed over time, and the interviewing will normally take a relatively unstructured form, though more structured or strategic questioning may be used towards the end of the fieldwork. Furthermore, as already noted, the data will usually be collected in an unstructured form... (Atkinson and Hammersley 2007:4)

In terms of my research, the ethnographic/participant observation method took many forms of 'guided hanging out' over and above simply living in the suburb. For instance, the viability of the council-run swimming pool was under review during the period of my research, and became a good focal point for exploring narratives of Mayfield's perceived mistreatment or neglect from municipal authorities, especially in light of the fact that the Mayfield swimming pool was donated to Mayfield residents by BHP in 1966 to compensate for the loss of a local river-front swimming 'beach' due to land reclamation for expansion of the steelworks.

Ethnographic participant observation enabled me to delineate the different categories of space that characterise local knowledge. For instance, the area outside the local Woolworths supermarket is a place where certain types of behaviour are considered appropriate and others are not. The area is sometimes used by drinkers who favour it for its accessibility to the bottle shop inside the supermarket, but also its sociable characteristics as a meeting and gathering place. The presence of the drinkers was considered a problem by some residents, and by the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee who discussed and investigated 'solutions' to the use of the area in this manner. This area outside Woolworths became a key focus in the research, especially in terms of examining how people used the spaces and places Mayfield. An understanding of the local spatial distinctions: legitimate and illegitimate, private versus public, and transitory versus static, added elements that informed and contextualised the interview data. This approach, combined with semi-structured interviews yielded a 'thick' description of life in Mayfield and formed the basis of the research themes and the ongoing, reflexive research strategy through which to explore them.

**Secondary sources**
The main research methods used in my research for this thesis were in-depth interviews and ethnographic style participant observation. Yet, I also utilised secondary sources of data as part of the multi-method approach. As mentioned above I approached living in Mayfield as research in itself, initially limiting my exposure to, and reliance on, secondary sources of information about the suburb to maximise my initial sensitisation to local 'ways-of-knowing' the suburb. Of course, during the course of the research it became important to consult formal sources of information regarding Mayfield. I developed a socio-economic profile of the suburb based on data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, examined relevant planning documents of the Newcastle City Council, learned about the history of the suburb through books, online sources, such as a repository of documents located at The University of Newcastle, and media articles regarding the suburb and Newcastle more generally (for a full list of documents I analysed regarding Mayfield see Appendix 5). The research process also involved talking to Council employees about cultural planning especially regarding processes of (re)imaging the suburb in the wake of the closure of BHP, attending community focus groups (one on the main forms of research informing Council policy) and also documenting the relationships between key actors involved in placemaking in Mayfield.

My analysis of official data sources can best be described as an analysis of secondary sources. For instance, in Chapter Five contains details of sales data for Mayfield's housing stock obtained from NSW Department of Housing, covering the period following the closure of BHP. The sales data included averages for New South Wales and so I collated Mayfield's quarterly sales data for the years 1999-2003 and compared this data to the average. I took a thematic approach to other secondary data sources seeking to identify key ideas in research documents. Krippendorf (2004:110) argues that thematic analysis can be useful for identifying key ideas in small amounts of material, by which he means identifying categories that are relevant to the material, but not necessarily able to be generalised across a variety of different material. Krippendorf (2004) recommends the identification of categories, while being guided by general principles, such as audience and instrumentality, or asking how the material positions or constructs meanings of and for the reader. For instance, as the themes of gentrification had emerged as significant I undertook an analysis of the *Mayfield Marketing Plan* (APP. Corporation Pty. Ltd 2003) whilst keeping the theme
of gentrification and regeneration in mind. I identified key words associated with regeneration or gentrification, and then counted these words, as well as noting the elements of the document that dealt with development more generally which I then examined this information in terms of the broader literature on gentrification. Similarly, I examined two brochures that described Mayfield's 'heritage', identifying themes, and looking especially for elements of the brochures that positioned the reader in terms of heritage.

Secondary data was important to developing the background of the thesis, especially in quantifying Mayfield's characteristics in relation to the research themes that emerged. Certainly, Council planning and policy documents were informative and important but they were not as important to the research process as the interviews and feedback from community members – some of whom were involved with the City Council’s development plans through organisations such as the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee. As the research process unfolded, the interview and participant observation data proved more rich and indeed, more telling, and yielded insights into why Mayfield was changing/developing/gentrifying in particular ways, the institutional aspects of the research formed more of a backdrop to the ‘Mayfield story’. In other words, the secondary data augmented a developing 'picture' of Mayfield as positioned between Fordist and post-Fordist ways-of-knowing the suburb, framed by the central idea of a suburb in transition.

**Triangulation**

It is important to glean an understanding of how accurate or representative research data are. Triangulation, or locating data in terms of corresponding data is a useful adjunct to the multi-method approach. There are many definitions of triangulation in the literature concerning research methodologies, and two broad distinctions exist between what Turner and Turner (2009) refer to as 'hard' or 'soft' triangulation. The former holds triangulation as a formal research method in itself, the second positions it as an adjunct to a multi-method research approach. Blaikie (1991) draws a distinction between triangulation within a particular research method, for instance, the development of a range of questions regarding a particular social phenomenon within
a single research method, such as a survey, as distinct from triangulation that involves the use of several methods used concurrently to render biases visible and check the veracity of themes. The development and use of this version of multi-method triangulation has revealed that although the technique may in fact help establish and solidify themes it does not categorically defend against bias (Fielding and Fielding 1986). Triangulation may reveal more information about a particular idea or theme, but of a different type, which may or may not be reconcilable to the theme or issue in question (Oppermann 2000). Keeping these ideas in mind, this thesis uses triangulation as a part of a multi-method research strategy, providing additional information, or 'thicker' descriptions of Mayfield as a place in transition.

Early on in the research process I had to think about the point at which I had gathered enough information, the point at which anymore questioning would only yield more of the same results, or saturation. Due to the broad and diverse nature of my research themes; examining transition in the context of the intersection of Fordist and post-Fordist imaginings of place in the context of deindustrialisation, achieving total data saturation of all aspects of place, from all residents, was beyond the scope of a PhD or indeed any single study. Nevertheless, the data reflects the ideas and understandings of a diverse range of Mayfield residents, broadly covering the key sociological categories of ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender and age. And although there were many confluences in the responses of like-situated groups, there was also considerable divergence within these groups owing to more subtle influences on their appreciation of place. Some groups were quite homogenous, and I achieved saturation relatively quickly; for instance, home-owners whose opinions on heritage and its role in the gentrification of Mayfield coalesced around key ideas. Other groups were more heterogeneous in their conceptualisations of the suburb, in particular the homeless or transient ‘socially excluded’ group' demonstrated variations in their ideas about the suburb. The thesis is therefore not a definitive account of all Mayfield residents’ ideas. Rather, it examines what Mayfield means in the context of deindustrialisation. It examines the ways in which a wide range of residents and gatekeepers construct their understandings about the place in transition. These are key aspects of the complex formal and informal strategies and processes that create a suburb. Saturation in this case means establishing a realistic account of life and place in Mayfield that
resonates well with the experiences and understandings of those who live there and those who have assumed some responsibility for defining its future.

The combination of semi-structured interviews and ethnographic participant observation proved fruitful for this research. It enabled me to engage in mutual processes of meaning-making, and to identify and establish some of the key themes that structure and organise the idea of Mayfield as a place in transition within the broader context of deindustrialisation. Semi-structured interviews enabled me to unpack broad 'official' themes in the perception of the suburb, while the ethnographic/participant observation method triangulated residents' accounts of everyday life in the suburb, providing an account that highlights how Mayfielders talked about their suburb, but also, how they used and interacted with its spaces. Moreover, secondary sources, such as policy documents and official statistics provided a broader context within which residents experienced their suburb and imaginings of a future after industrialisation. In terms of community research this approach realises the strength of 'taking ethnography home' (Skeggs 1997), where insights are gained through the cultural processes of discovery and adaption. The use of interviews, ethnographic-style participant observation and the use of official data provided a robust and guided data collection technique, yielding the findings presented in the upcoming chapters.
Chapter Five

The post-Fordist city in transition: Mayfield, Newcastle

Chapter Two of this thesis explored and explained the processes of deindustrialisation in the spectre of post-Fordism, noting in particular the changing profile of two Australian cities, Newcastle and Wollongong, both of which were built on heavy industry, especially the production of steel. Wollongong and Newcastle are now part of a global 'rust belt' of cities experiencing the decline and obsolescence of their industrial cores. More specifically, the changing profile of Newcastle's workforce locates it within the shift from Fordism to post-Fordism. In 1971 39.6 percent of Newcastle's workforce was employed in manufacturing compared with 9.6 percent in 2006 (Newcastle City Council 2009:1). In 1999 the BHP steelworks, once the largest employer in Newcastle closed after a long period of downsizing. BHP played a significant role in the formation and history of Mayfield (see Figure 5.5 for location of BHP). Being located in the suburb, not only did the BHP steelworks employ many residents, sometimes several generations of (almost always) men, but it was also at the centre of ideas about Mayfield as a working class suburb. BHP became a cultural mnemonic for ideas about place and space in Mayfield and key to its stigmatisation as a dirty, polluted suburb. BHP played a symbolic, as well as physical role in the trajectory of Mayfield, and so too did its closure. The closure of BHP signalled more than a shift in the economic structure of the suburb, it signified the possibility of a shift in the perception of Mayfield as a place. The closure was positioned as an opportunity for Mayfield to gentrify by capitalising on, in particular, its pre-industrial housing stock and heritage. The cultural elements of gentrification, including shifting ideas about space and place, especially in relation to history and heritage, is important to making sense of the processes of deindustrialisation in an Australian context.

Mayfield presented as an excellent case study through which to explore and examine the processes of change and transition within the broader context of post-Fordism. If post-Fordism is represented by and through the patterns and processes of the symbolic economy, how is it played out with and through the industrial landscapes of Fordist
suburbia? This chapter introduces the suburb of Mayfield in general, and as a deindustrialising place more specifically, including the institutionalised strategies of change in the suburb.

**Mayfield from the Nineteenth Century**

Newcastle began as the conglomeration of many small settlements in the Hunter area, mostly oriented around coal mining (Suters Architects/Newcastle City Council 1997:6). The Hunter Valley region has many viable deposits of high quality coal, a factor that plays an important role in the trajectory of Newcastle (Docherty 1983). Prior to the development of industry in the early twentieth century, Mayfield was a small settlement based on agriculture positioned as it is on the fertile flats beside the Hunter River. Many of Newcastle’s early market gardens were located in Mayfield and the area became desirable as a place to live for some of the local businessmen, including the Arnott family (Appendix 2), a high profile family which started a large Australian food company (Australian National University 1969:53)\(^\text{12}\). Recognising the benefits of the country lifestyle and distance from polluting industry many of Newcastle’s wealthier and more prestigious families built large houses in Mayfield and the suburb was sparsely populated until the development of heavy industry in the early twentieth century (Docherty 1983).

In 1911 the Broken Hill Proprietary Company (BHP) chose Mayfield as the site for a large steel mill, mainly because of easy access to coal via the Hunter Valley and the proximity to the port of Newcastle. The plant was officially opened in 1915 by the Governor General Ronald Munro Ferguson\(^\text{13}\) and introduced an increase in workers who needed affordable housing close to their workplaces. Consequentially, most of the suburb of Mayfield was built in the period between the 1920s and the mid 1950s (NIHA 2009), which is the period of Fordism. The housing built in this period was

---

\(^{12}\) The presence of the Arnott family and their 'grand' home in Mayfield is a popular fact with residents in the suburb, and frequently referenced in heritage documents about Mayfield.

\(^{13}\) A digitised version of film of the opening ceremony is available on the website of the Newcastle Industrial Heritage Association (NIHA 2009) available online: http://www.niha.org.au/ retrieved September 2010
more spacious and on larger blocks of land than much of the earlier housing elsewhere in Newcastle. Whereas previous Newcastle housing such as terrace housing and small wooden dwellings had been cheaper and situated around businesses and/or coal mines, Mayfield's housing, built in the inter-war period, resembles a more contemporary image of suburbia - relatively large, detached houses on blocks big enough for vegetable gardens. This housing remains the predominant housing form in the suburb. With the majority of Mayfield's housing being built over a relatively short time frame much of the suburb conforms to formal planning patterns, including residential blocks of land large enough to accommodate driveways and of course, the streets themselves being designed to accommodate access by car. Obviously, though, there is no standard model for the development trajectory of all cities across Australia with each having its own location and needs. Yet, as discussed in Chapter Two, suburbia is prominent in the shaping of Australian cities, both historically and in the present. The history of urban settlement in Australia is relatively 'new', so unlike older cities overseas most settlement took place in Australia during the twentieth century. Further, the period of Australia's most rapid expansion in population coincided with the period of industrial Fordism. Mechanised transport was a key characteristic of this expansion, enabling larger houses on bigger blocks and later consolidated by the adoption of the private car. Mayfield conforms to this pattern, with a rapid development of suburban housing in a short period as a response to the establishment of BHP in the suburb.
Figure 5.0 Map: Mayfield

Figure 5.1 Map, Mayfield, Newcastle, NSW. Mayfield is bordered by the railway track to the south and the Hunter River to the north.
By the 1920s and 30s Mayfield was no longer a semi-rural or market garden area, but a large suburb housing workers from the adjacent industrial areas who were oriented around work in the suburb. One interviewee and long time Mayfield resident (in his eighties) recounts that he did not travel into Newcastle until he was a teenager. According to him, Mayfield was considered quite 'separate' from Newcastle. Around this time (largely in conjunction with the improvement in transport) the centre of Newcastle city consolidated its position as the business and political centre of the region and established some of the more sophisticated shops in the area (Docherty 1983). Where adjacent settled areas, such as Waratah and Hamilton were oriented around commodities industries, for instance, a large soap factory and bakeries, Mayfield came to be dominated by the steel fabricating factories located on its northern border (NIHA 2009). In 1923 the tram line between Mayfield and Newcastle was electrified (Newcastle City Council/Suters Architects 1997:32), greatly improving transport between the two areas, and Mayfield began to house more residents who worked outside of Mayfield (the line was later removed in 1952). These improvements in transport, especially in the inter-war period further changed Mayfield into a suburb housing people who worked not only in Mayfield but also in Newcastle and other areas as well. However, Mayfield's fortunes still predominantly relied on the factories that lined the banks of the Hunter River with BHP employing over 5000 people in 1921 (NIHA 2009). A war-time boom, followed by an increasing demand for consumer goods after the Second World War meant BHP again increased its capacity and employed 12000 people by 1945, twenty percent of whom were immigrants many from southern Europe (NIHA 2009). During this time, Mayfield hosted one of many hostels for new migrants (see Appendix 2 for location of hostel). With the concentration of industry beside the river and adjacent port, Mayfield became established as one of the larger (and eventually the largest by population) suburb in the Newcastle area. Mayfield not only housed many employees of the local industrial plants but also maintained numerous smaller businesses servicing auxiliary industries.

Today Mayfield is the largest suburb in Newcastle, with a population of around 12000 (ABS 2006). Just under eighty percent of Mayfielders self-identify as being born in Australia (higher than the Australian average of 70.9 percent (ABS 2006)), with the
next largest ethnic minority being British at 2.2 percent. The age of Mayfield's population is the Australian average, with the median age of 37 (ABS 2006). Mayfield's average income and employment levels are important in the image of the suburb as disadvantaged. As noted by Vinson (1999) 'unemployment' statistics alone do not adequately demonstrate levels of deprivation in a suburb, as they often exclude under-employment and poorly paid work, failing account to account for the 'working poor'. A combination of Mayfield's official employment figures combined with income data yields a more accurate depiction of poverty in the suburb. In 2006, 10.9 percent of Mayfield residents over fifteen years old were listed as unemployed (compared with the Australian average of 5.2 percent (ABS 2006)) and the median weekly household income was $676, compared with $1,027 in Australia (ABS 2006). This unemployment rate is a significant drop from 17.4 percent reported in 2001 (ABS 2006). Further, in the Newcastle Local Government Area the Inner North and Mayfield Planning Districts have the highest proportion of people receiving Newstart (social security) payments (Newcastle City Council 2010:107). Levels of employment contribute to socio-economic profile of a place, as does housing data. In 2006, almost 40% of Mayfield's occupied residential dwellings were rented, compared with the Australian average of 23.3 percent (ABS 2006). In 2006 rental rates for the three Mayfield census areas were 37 percent for Mayfield, 39.1 percent for Mayfield West, and 39.1 percent for Mayfield East, as compared with an Australian average of 23.3 percent (ABS 2007). Further evidence of Mayfield's low socio-economic profile is access to private transport. In 2001, 24 percent of Mayfield residents had no access to a car, compared with the NSW average of 12 percent (ABS 2001).

Presently, the northern-most riverside suburbs of Newcastle (of which Mayfield is by far the largest, but also including Wickham, Maryville, Islington, Mayfield West, Tighes Hill and Carrington) are bound by a railway line to the south and the Hunter River to the north (see Figure 5.1). The rail line links Mayfield with Newcastle CBD and the university in the west and on the southern edge of the suburb limits the road access to the suburb to three crossing points. The result is that Mayfield is slightly 'removed' from the rest of Newcastle in terms of access. The most notable difference between Mayfield’s main street, Maitland Road, and other shopping strips of Newcastle suburbs is the length of the shopping district, which extends 2.3km from Selwyn Street at the eastern end to Tourle Street in the west. Maitland Road, as the
name suggests, extends all the way to Maitland, a town approximately thirty kilometres west of Mayfield, contributing to the idea of Mayfield as a thoroughfare.

Figure 5.2 Maitland Road shopping strip, Mayfield

There are informal divisions along the street: the easternmost section up to Ingall Street contains 'bulky goods' and hardware retailers, light industrial (a surfboard shaper, boat sales and repairs, a glass repairer and auto electrician). Further west is a higher proportion of food retailers (Chinese takeaway food, butcher, fish and chip shop) and also a small 'precinct' of arts related businesses: a large antique dealers, art gallery and interior design studio, all oriented around a large historic building: 'The Coliseum' located on the corner of Corona Street and Maitland Road.
Travelling further west along Maitland Road there is a section of smaller shops including two opportunity shops, a Centrelink (social security) office and a second hand book exchange. Further west still, is a Woolworths supermarket, which sits largely on its own block surrounded by a large (street level) carpark. The next block between Woolworths and Hanbury Street (a major street linking Mayfield to the rest of Newcastle on one side and also the main arterial road over the river on the other) is a built up area of shops and services including banks, ATMs, a medical centre, a fruit shop another opportunity shop and a large shoe shop. The shopping area extends further still, changes to larger shops more oriented toward driving customers, including petrol stations, tyre shops, two hotels, a drive-thru bottle shop and a large second hand white goods warehouse. The majority of commercial activity is concentrated around the shops between Havelock Street and Hanbury Street, an area that can be roughly divided between shops that are accessed from the footpath, and those with parking around them. There are three main shopping precincts fronted by carparks, a strip mall of shops including a McDonald's restaurant and RTA (Roads and Traffic Authority) office, and two supermarkets: Woolworths and on the adjacent block, a Franklins (see Figure 5.1 for map). According to the *Mayfield Marketing*
Plan (APP. Corporation Pty. Ltd 2003:12) many Mayfield shoppers/residents who have access to cars often drive out of the suburb to do their shopping, especially to larger shopping malls in the suburbs of Charlestown and Kotara (APP. Corporation Pty. Ltd 2003:12). Further, a member of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee expressed the opinion that Maitland Road's shopping area caters to foot traffic in response to Mayfield's lower socio-economic profile (residents/shoppers without access to cars). In his opinion, this contributed to the presence of low-quality 'junk' shops. According to the Mayfield Marketing Plan, Mayfield's low socio-economic profile was also the reason for the relatively high number of entertainment venues in Mayfield, such as hotels (Mayfield Marketing Plan 2003).

**Mayfield: transitional suburb?**

The closure of the BHP steelworks was positioned as severing the links with negative aspects that had characterised Mayfield as a polluted, stigmatised place in the discourses of the suburb and the city. It quickly became clear on conducting my research that Mayfield was viewed as an undesirable place to live by many in the suburb, its stigmatisation noted in the Mayfield Marketing Plan (APP Corporation Pty. Ltd 2003:3) also. Interviews with long-term residents of the suburb revealed a theme of transitionality oriented most prominently around the idea that the suburb had the opportunity to change following the closure of BHP - the idea that the suburb was undergoing a process of change and transformation. There was, however, a second, more established image of Mayfield as a transitional place, where Mayfield was talked about as somewhere to live until housing in a better area was affordable or available. Many older interviewees, for instance, emphasised Mayfield's history as a 'landing' place for new immigrants to Australia following the Second World War. As the research progressed I came to believe that this common thread in interviews was more than an interest in the suburb's history. For many interviewees it was an important framing concept in their narratives of the suburb. As Confino (1997) notes, history is often cannabalised for the elements that enable people to tell cohesive and compelling stories to themselves and others about their trajectories in a place. 'Pommy town', the section of housing built to house skilled workers brought to Newcastle from Britain, and the former migrant camp at the western end of the suburb
on Maitland Road, both emerged, unprompted, as 'ways' to talk about living in Mayfield. Pommy Town comprised 71 houses located between Vine, Usk, Avon and Bull Streets (see Figure 5.4). It was built by Lysaghts, a large engineering company that brought approximately 120 skilled machinists and fabricators (and their families) from Britain to address a shortage of skilled labour in available in the area (Claridge 2000).

Figure 5.4 Map Pommy Town, 120 houses built between Vine, Usk, Avon and Bull streets

Six interviewees brought up either the migrant camp or Pommy Town as examples of Mayfield's immigrant history, a typical comment being;

    Well, of course Mayfield was always a place for people to land, you know to move through. (Interview, Reg, 2005)

Mayfield, according to Reg, was a good place to be while people 'got on their feet' (Interview 2005) and could then move elsewhere. None of the interviewees who mentioned the migrant camp or Pommy town had ever been residents of either.
Further, long-term (which I considered to be longer than twenty years) residents' accounts often centred on their children's successes in getting out and raising their own families elsewhere in Newcastle:

Yes well we lived here for a long time, when the kids were little, [and] been here since I guess (laughs) but they’re living in other parts of Newcastle…I think our general plan is to go be near…to end up living, moving to somewhere closer to them. Maybe a unit or something. Much as I love me garden! (Interview, Bob, 2005)

The accounts of two interviewees of their tenure in the suburb seemed unusual as they talked about living in Mayfield for a relatively short time but then admitted that this was actually decades. As above, a tendency to defend Mayfield as a place to live emerged in the interviews. Some residents recognised that conditions in the suburb had changed, but not necessarily for the better. Some were nostalgic about Mayfield's industrial history, emphasising the problems with living in the suburb presently. For instance, Vi talked about Mayfield's high crime rate and social problems, but then added:

Of course they had their problems back then, there was all the pollution of course, and it was hard to get by. (Interview, Vi, 2005)

The idea of Mayfield as a place to move through rather than settle in was not limited to long-term residents. One recent immigrant from Sudan described his experiences in the suburb as positive overall. He liked living in a suburb with some degree of ethnic diversity as well as a sense of cohesiveness. Interestingly though, he expressed the sentiment that he would be moving his family out of the suburb as soon as he could afford it. I asked him why and he said that it was just because Mayfield was 'not really a place to permanently settle'. He also talked about his efforts to help other refugees and new immigrants settle into Australia and that this process was replicated with Mayfield being regarded as an interim measure (often for a couple of years) before moving to somewhere else in Newcastle. Clearly, the idea of Mayfield as a stigmatised place was relevant for quite a few research participants. As discussed
above, some home-owners spoke of the stigma associated with living in Mayfield, talking defensively about their decision to buy a house emphasising the suburb's affordability rather than its desirability. Discussion of Mayfield as stigmatised emerged in the testimonies of local residents, especially those with longer histories in the suburb. There was also the tendency to centre talk about the suburb on those who were leaving:

There are a lot of people who I know because I’ve lived and worked there for years and they’re leaving, they’re, they’ve been there for generations and they are, sometimes three generations and they are leaving, you know. They love the suburb and have always have, but they’re saying that its getting too bad and its time to get out. Often these are the older ones. (Interview, Dan 2005, member of Mayfield Mainstreet Committee)

A discussion with a second generation Mayfield resident now in his forties with children highlights possible reasons for this theme. His opinion was that the stigma attached to Mayfield prevents people from making a commitment to the place. This opinion emerged in various guises again and again, for instance, a woman from outside Mayfield who works in the suburb periodically said:

My son won’t even come with me to do anything in the suburb, even if I am going to do things he wants to do. He says it’s the people. (Interview, Jan 2005)

Another local:

There’s a stigma attached to living here, something Mayfield’s always had, that people think of it as a dirty place…with poor scummy people. (Interview, Norm, 2005)

It was clear that Mayfield retains an enduring image as a run-down, industrial suburb, with endemic poverty and the concomitant social issues. The idea of Mayfield as a
transitional place emerged many times. Mayfield was talked about as somewhere that was not ‘safe’ enough to provide a platform for local social networks:

I think yeah well I think its to do with the perception of Mayfield and the high crime rate and so that’s less inclined to talk to your neighbours doesn’t have an ‘out in the street culture’ everything’s behind white picket fences. (Interview, Mick 2005)

Many interviewees talked about high profile instances of crime in the neighbourhood. It appeared as if residents were keener to make acquaintances outside the suburb in order to maintain a greater sense of safety in this respect. That is, there was a strong emphasis on friends and connections, like sporting affiliations or schools outside Mayfield.

A further contributor to Mayfield's stigmatisation is that the presence of large houses and low rents have contributed to a higher than average number of boardinghouses in the suburb. Concerns over elevated levels of crime concentrated in these houses resulted in the Newcastle City Council's Boardinghouse Report, which was integrated into the broader Mayfield Social Strategy Plan (Newcastle City Council 2003:1). The 2003 Mayfield Crime Prevention Plan mentions the elevated perception of violent crime (unknown assailant) in the suburb as being out of proportion with the reported crime statistics for Mayfield. The Crime Prevention Plan (Newcastle City Council 2003) does however, note higher rates of domestic violence in Mayfield compared to the rest of Newcastle. This is particularly acute given that the Hunter Region has one of the highest domestic violence rates in the state of New South Wales (Newcastle City Council 2003:4). Yet the perception of Mayfield as the site of common non-domestic violence was expressed repeatedly during my research in the suburb aided in particular by several high profile homicides. In August 2004, two men assaulted and decapitated another man in their 'Maitland Road townhouse' (Gordon J. Newcastle Herald April 8 2006). The local police canvassed residents in my street for information that seemed to further elevate the profile of the crime. Then, in January 2005 a Mayfield woman murdered her flatmate with a small sledgehammer in her 'Maitland Road townhouse' (ABC News January 21 2005). In July 2005 another man was murdered with a broken bottle in the street outside the Mayfield Ex Serviceman's
Club, which is a highly visible area of Mayfield (Ryan S. *Newcastle Herald*, 20 August 2009). During my research, these violent crimes were frequently mentioned as evidence of Mayfield's social problems.

Mayfield was often talked about as a stigmatised suburb, demonstrated with residents' narratives emphasising short tenures and the suburb's unsuitability as a place to settle long term. Further, the suburb's low socio-economic profile was a focal point for opinions about crime and the dominance of heavy industry, especially pollution, in the suburb contributed to the stigmatisation of Mayfield. It was in this context that BHP - the symbol and cause of the suburb's stigmatisation - closed in 1999.

**The closure of BHP: Mayfield in transition?**

The sheer size of the BHP steelworks secures its position as dominant in the imagination of Mayfield as a place, as in Figure 5.5 below:

![Figure 5.5 Map: Satellite image of Mayfield showing the BHP steelworks](image)

14 The area from Tourle Street in the west, to Elizabeth Street in the east was occupied by either BHP facilities and buildings or associated factories and facilities, such as a large coal loading area (pictured opposite Walsh point reserve). Many of the buildings and facilities were demolished in 2004 (Newcastle Industrial Heritage Association 2010).
Mayfield’s relationship with BHP has been both positive (BHP brought employment to the area) and negative (prompting tensions over pollution and industrial relations). The BHP plant significantly contributed to the perception of Mayfield as a working class place with a long history of industrial pollution, an image that interested parties sought to dispel following its closure (McGuirk and Rowe 2001). After several significant downsizings in response to rising production costs and increasing competition (NIHA 2009), BHP finally closed in 1999. The downsizing and eventual closure of the steelworks was associated with deindustrialisation unfolding as part of the broader economic processes of post-Fordism (Stevenson 1998).

Despite being closed, BHP continues to inform not just the economic trajectory of Mayfield but also remains a touchstone for perceptions of the suburb both for outsiders and residents representing ways of knowing Mayfield as a place. The BHP plant represented monolithic heavy industry and pollution, as well as a strong working class heritage. Its importance for the creation and reification of a local heritage discourse is represented through the monumentalisation of the plant's closure. Public events following the closure, including speeches and poetry from ex-BHP employees and local heritage enthusiasts helped ossify images of BHP as located in the past. Of course, the BHP works had been informing perceptions of Mayfield for over eighty years, yet its closure offered an opportunity to 'freeze' appealing elements of the plant's history, a process which sanitised some of the more deleterious aspects of BHP's presence in the suburb (McGuirk and Rowe 2001). The closure of BHP formed the basis of a campaign through the media, but also adopted by residents and local council, as well as other stakeholders such as real estate companies to ‘reinvent’ or reinvigorate Mayfield. The closure of BHP can be seen as a clear starting point in the discourse of Mayfield as a changing or regenerating place. In the media, the closure symbolically severed ties with the

---

15 The economic decline of BHP is detailed in Newcastle Industrial Heritage Association (2009) *The Beginning of the End.*

16 One of the key arts projects representing the closure of BHP was the *Ribbons of Steel* festival, comprising workers’ accounts and photos as well as sculptures and dance performances by artists. For a comprehensive summary of the projects involved in the *Ribbons of Steel* Project see, Newcastle Trades Hall Council 2010
suburb’s industrial past (Mcguirk and Rowe 2001; Mansfield 2005; Stevenson and Paton, 2001). Prior to 1999, the impending closure was largely viewed in negative terms, with attention focusing on its negative economic and social impacts, including not just job losses but also the multiplier effects of these losses to local businesses, schools and, more subtly, the cohesion of the Mayfield community itself. However, according to McGuirk and Rowe (2001), this viewpoint changed significantly in the immediate run up to the closure and in the period that followed, the closure came to be positioned in the media as a positive development, a watershed for the suburb. For instance, this radio interview on ABC's The World Today program with Mayfield Resident's Group member, Pat Flowers:

National Program host, John Highfield: Well, not everyone in Newcastle is mourning the closing. Last Saturday, when the trademark steam flume belched from the huge stack for the last time, Pat Flowers and her colleagues in the Mayfield Residents' Group were cheering, not grieving. They've lived alongside the pollution danger for many years and they've always found that company managers seemed to have an excuse for inaction on their problem. I asked Pat Flowers to tell me about the moment when her frustrating thirty-year battle for a better lifestyle started.

Pat Flowers: Oh, I think it probably happened in 1969 when I had three children at one of the local schools and, as I was driving past, I suddenly realised I could not see two metres in front of me because of the black cloud of pollution. And I thought this is absolutely ridiculous, it cannot happen, there's a school there - in fact, there are about five schools in the area - and I thought what are they doing to these kids? I've got to do something about it. (John Highfield, ABC 30 September 1999)

A new discourse emerged following the closure of the BHP steelworks inferring that Mayfield had been ‘held back’ by its associations with heavy industry, through pollution and a low paid low skilled workforce living in close proximity to the industrial plant (McGuirk and Rowe 2001). The closure of BHP as the last 'bastion' of
heavy industry in the area would supposedly ‘free up' Mayfield for gentrification. The idea of Mayfield as being on the cusp of a post-BHP gentrification cycle was expressed to me numerous times by residents and also those involved in the planning and redevelopment process, such as Newcastle City Council employees and the chairperson of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee, during the research process.

The mythic element of BHP's closure can be seen in the steelwork's recent history. Although the closure was positioned as severing the ties to heavy industry, the profile of the plant had dwindled in the period prior to its closure in 1999. According to several long-term residents, Mayfield's serious air pollution that contributed to its reputation as a dirty place was significantly cleaned up by the late 1970s. A common story recounted by many of these residents describes how local women would check the wind direction before hanging out their washing, as the coal smoke in the suburb would turn their clean sheets black. Second, the increasing affordability of cars meant workers at the steel plant could live outside of Mayfield and travel to work. Third, BHP, like other manufacturing plants in the area, followed the worldwide trend of taking advantage of new technologies in order to mechanise production and downsize their workforce (NIHA 2009). BHP undertook its first major round of redundancies in the early 1980s and continued as steel making was no longer the labour intensive process it had once been. Although at its peak in the late 1970s BHP employed up to 12000 (the largest proportion of the local population at 25 percent) a succession of layoffs in the 1980s and nineties brought that number down to 1500 by the time that plant closed (McGuirk, Rowe, 2001). And finally, as one interviewee and former BHP worker recounted, the work force became increasingly highly skilled, and consequentially better paid, enabling employees to move to suburbs with higher amenity values, such as Hamilton, Kotara or Lambton. The opinion that BHP workers were increasingly skilled and choosing to live in more affluent suburbs was expressed in interviews for this thesis, which highlighted the changing nature of the works' labour force in the 1980s and nineties. By the time BHP closed down effectively marking the end of large-scale heavy industry in Mayfield, the steelworks' involvement in the suburb was relatively small (Mansfield 2005:181). What remained, however, was the image of Mayfield as a dirty, noisy, working class suburb (Stevenson 1999).
The idea of the closure of the BHP plant as a positive factor in Mayfield's development was operationalised as part of public programs to improve or redevelop the suburb, capitalising on the closure of the BHP plant as a start point for the suburb's gentrification. Ironically, it is the heavy industry associated with companies like BHP that mutually formed the basis of an emerging heritage discourse in the transition of Mayfield. As Cushing (1999) wrote of the closure of BHP in 1999, the relationship between the suburb and the company was often fraught and tenuous, noting the tendency for 'real voices' to be overlooked in preference to a more palatable image of the company. Cushing's work (1999), suggests that the values of 'hard work', 'mate-ship' and unionism that were enshrined in Mayfield's heritage discourse were forged against a backdrop of exploitative and dangerous working conditions from a monolithic company disconnected from the local community. Ten years following the closure, Cushing's work appears prescient. For example, in 1999 artist Julie Squires' sculpture, Muster Point (below) was unveiled to commemorate the closure of the plant.

This sculpture is very large (the size of a small house), and sits at the old Industrial Drive entrance to the BHP site, opposite George street (refer to map in Appendix 2). Yet, although an internet search reveals many listings for the sculpture, none actually describes the term Muster Point which according to one interviewee, refers to the time when many men would gather at the beginning of each day to hear if they would be employed for that day. The artwork can be viewed as part of a process of monumentalising the cultural history of BHP, part of a number of regeneration
strategies that came to the fore in Mayfield following the closure of the steelworks. Against the backdrop of Mayfield as deindustrialising, adjusting and (possibly) regenerating in the wake of the closure of BHP are several regeneration strategies supported and facilitated by the Newcastle City Council (NCC) and residents’ groups. As part of Mayfield's regeneration cultural activity was regarded as a panacea to the decline of industrial means of production. The Newcastle City Council's guiding cultural policy document, Cultural Policy for Newcastle, (Newcastle City Council 1999) incorporates both the 'cultural' and the economic strategies of municipal planning:

Newcastle values its economy and will encourage quality employment opportunities through facilitating cultural enterprise, which will contribute to the economic vitality of the region. (Newcastle City Council 1999)

Newcastle City Council, like other Councils in New South Wales, has adopted the Mainstreets Programs initiated by the NSW Department of Planning in 1989 (Martin 1996). The Mainstreets Program aims to reinvigorate strip shopping, especially in response to the profusion of large, suburban shopping malls (Mayfield Mainstreet Committee website 2010). The Mayfield Mainstreet Committee (MMC) is the most important working group regarding Mayfield's regeneration and many of the suburb's plans and initiatives involve the MMC. A committee within the Newcastle City Council, the MMC is comprised of local business people and property owners. In my experience, the MMC also welcomed input from local residents with particular expertise. As explained in Chapter Four, the MMC was established by the Newcastle City Council in response to a request from the Mayfield Chamber of Commerce to '...counteract the emerging dominance of regional shopping centres' (Mayfield Mainstreet Committee website 2010). Additionally, members cited the general improvement of Mayfield's shopping precinct as beneficial to the development of the suburb. The Committee comprises thirteen members, three of whom are Newcastle City councillors. At the time of my research the MMC was chaired by local businessman Ivor Davies, and had a Treasurer and a (paid) co-ordinator, Kathie Heyman. The MMC met fortnightly on a Wednesday, in offices above the shops on the corner of Victoria Street and Maitland Road. Most committee members were from
the local business community and, for the period of time I attended, most of the members did not live in the suburb. The meetings normally dealt with two main themes - matters arising, and the general Mayfield Mainstreet project, which is a campaign to improve the presentation and economic viability of Mayfield's main shopping area, Maitland Road. Matters Arising included issues such as resistance to another supermarket on Maitland Road and the increased access to the sale of alcohol that would result, graffiti or tagging, and planning for Christmas celebrations/decorations on Maitland Road. Outcomes of the MMC included two guided ‘Heritage Walks’ brochures, revitalisation work on Maitland Road, discussions and submissions over licensing for the sale and consumption of alcohol, the painting on the wall of the local McDonald’s restaurant depicting the industrial heritage of the suburb, and numerous community events, ranging from permaculture workshops to ‘Harmony Day’, which was a gala celebrating ethnic diversity in the suburb.

The Mayfield Mainstreet Committee was pivotal in establishing the image of Mayfield as undergoing a transition from a suburb dominated by heavy industry to a gentrifying place. Two official reports dealing with Mayfield feature the idea that the suburb as gentrifying - the Discussion papers for the community plan 2006 - 2010, (2010a) by Newcastle City Council, and the Mayfield Marketing Plan (APP Corporation Pty. Ltd 2003) commissioned by the MMC in conjunction with the Department of State and Regional Development both provide an analysis of Mayfield housing trends and projections, and suggest that, prompted by the closure of BHP, gentrification in Mayfield is underway. For instance:

In the Mayfield PD [planning district], the population increase from 1991-2001 is mainly a result of the development of Warabrook. The Mayfield PD has been attractive for people on low incomes due to lower housing costs and good accessibility to public transport. The area included a number of affordable boarding houses, however, this type of accommodation has been significantly reduced over the past several years.

However, the Mayfield PD over the past 5 years has seen the onset of
change in the form of gentrification, and a marked rise in real estate prices, particularly since the closure of BHP in 1999. There is a noticeable change in the general appearance of the area with the increase in houses being renovated indicating that gentrification is well underway in Mayfield. Consultation has indicated that a number of people are coming from Sydney and buying houses in Mayfield, particularly within the last 12 months. The gentrification process could reduce the amount of affordable housing available within the area as sale prices and rents rise. (Newcastle City Council 2010:151)

This quote from the Newcastle City Council's Discussion papers for the community plan 2006 - 2010 (Newcastle City Council 2010a) demonstrates the strength of the idea of Mayfield as gentrifying following the closure of BHP. For instance, the report notes that the population is not actually increasing because of there has been growth in the Planning District that includes Mayfield. This is largely due to the growth of Warabrook, a new suburban development to the west of Mayfield (see Appendix 7 for map of region). It also references the increases in house prices since the closure of BHP. The increasing prices of Mayfield houses following the closure of BHP was mentioned to me numerous times during the research by a range of proponents including Newcastle City Council's Cultural Planning Officer and the Co-ordinator of the MMC, both of whom told me that they had doubled since the closure. Yet quarterly sales reports from the New South Wales Department of Housing (NSW Department of Housing 2010) for the period 1999-2003 show the increases in Mayfield's house prices to be between one and eight percent on average per year which was consistent with growth in the rest of New South Wales during the period (NSW Department of Housing 2010). The Report goes on to point out that there has been an increase in commercial occupancies and a '...noticeable change in the appearance of the area' (2010:151) yet fails to account for broader economic factors during this period that could have had an impact on Mayfield's development trajectory. This Report largely reflects the opinions of participants of focus groups who typically represent those with the greatest 'stake' in the image of the suburb as gentrifying. From my observations, the subjective assessments about aspects such as 'changing appearances' seem overstated. There does appear to have been a gradual 'improvement' in the appearance of the shopping precinct largely as a result of the
efforts of the MMC, but definitive signs of gentrification, such as house renovation, and an influx of wealthier residents are more elusive.

Gentrification is also a feature of the *Mayfield Marketing Plan* (App. Corporation Pty Ltd. 2003) a report commissioned by the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee (MMC) contracted to Sydney-based consultancy (APP Corporation Pty.) to formulate a plan for Mayfield’s development. The plan focused, in particular, on the main street of Mayfield, Maitland Road. For the Mainstreet Committee, the redevelopment and regeneration of the mainstreet is central to the notion of Mayfield as a suburb on an upward transition. As such, much attention has been paid to the regeneration of Maitland Road including improving street lighting, installing large planter pots and employing a caretaker to clean up and maintain the streetscape.

The *MMP* divides the Maitland Road businesses into three categories: everyday needs, including groceries, filling prescriptions and more infrequently purchased items such as shoes; second, ‘bulky goods’ businesses (such as specialist tyre shops, electronics supplies and hardware); and finally, entertainment venues such as hotels, cafes and fast food outlets. Further, the *Mayfield Marketing Plan* makes a distinction between all shops on Maitland Road and the Woolworths supermarket, also on Maitland Road. Woolworths is located on its own block and as a result the Report claims that:

…Maitland Road does not present as a continuous retail strip. The central area of Mayfield (the Woolworths block) has no on street parking, and no active street presence, effectively dividing Mayfield into three precincts (APP. Corporation Pty. Ltd 2003:12).

Woolworths attracts many Mayfield residents and shoppers from outside the area, according to the Co-ordinator of the MMC who had interviewed the manager of Woolworths about the viability of the supermarket. Indeed, Woolworths Mayfield has twice the turnover of comparable supermarkets in Newcastle (APP Corporation Pty. Ltd 2003). However, most of these customers have cars and travel outside the Mayfield area for the rest of their shopping, such as bulky goods, clothes and luxury items which are rarely available in a supermarket or in Mayfield more generally (APP
Corporation Pty. Ltd 2003). According to the *Mayfield Marketing Plan*, the rest of the shops on Maitland Road cater to customers who walk or take the bus, rather than those who drive to the shops (APP Corporation Pty. Ltd 2003:23). This observation was supported by the Co-ordinator of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee (Interview, Aug 2005) who cited discussions with shop owners about their clientele and means of transport. The MMC Co-ordinator expressed the opinion that the shops on Maitland Road catered to those on low incomes, especially those without cars more than in other suburbs in Newcastle. As noted above, in 2001 24 percent of Mayfield residents had no access to a car, compared with the NSW average of 12 percent (ABS 2001). According to the *Mayfield Marketing Plan*, Mayfield's low socio-economic profile was also the reason for the relatively high number of entertainment venues in Mayfield, such as hotels (APP Corporation Pty. Ltd 2003:23).

One view of the future of Mayfield’s main street, proposed by the MMC, positions it as an auxiliary to other suburban shopping areas in Newcastle that provide 'destination shopping'. Identified in particular was the (assumed) increase in the number of employees from the growth in industrial parks on the large site previously occupied by BHP. This version of Mayfield's Mainstreet development is oriented around essential services, such as food, dentists, banks and doctors. In this view, retail, or more importantly, non-essential 'leisure' retail, remains the domain of the large suburban shopping malls on the outskirts of Newcastle. Yet the *Mayfield Marketing Plan* (APP Corporation Pty. Ltd) proposes a more traditional view of gentrification, encouraging development of Mayfield's shopping area as a boutique, destination shopping experience, in line with Darby Street in Cooks Hill which is a gentrified inner city suburb. Art galleries and cafes feature prominently in this version of development. It is this image of Mayfield's main street that became enshrined in the subsequent Newcastle City Council Development Control Plan (2005), featuring explicit encouragement of cafes and restaurants near the 'cultural' precinct of Corona Street, capitalising on the Coliseum antiques dealer and already existing cafe, and the pedestrian friendly 'closed' Corona Street, as well as incorporating wide 'set-backs' to enable footpath dining.
Figure 5.7 showing the five main 'renewal' corridors centred around Maitland Road, Newcastle (NCC DCP 2005:1). Precinct 2 is aimed at enabling restaurants and 'cultural' amenities.

So, although there is some variation in the opinions about the way in which Mayfield's Mainstreet should improve and develop - the *Mayfield Marketing Plan's* gentrification model versus the MMC's more conservative image that capitalises on its already existing strengths - it is evident both coalesce around the idea that the suburb is in a period of change or transition. Examining the MMP within the broader context of the perception of Mayfield as positioned for post-BHP gentrification highlights a bias toward a particular form of regeneration. For instance, the MMP makes reference to the fact that Mayfield has, for the last thirty years been one of the predominantly working class, poorer suburbs in Newcastle (MMP 2003:3). It notes the changing profile of Mayfield residents since the closure of BHP in 1999, citing an increase in the number of '...owner-occupiers moving into the area, house renovators and younger couples and families' (MMP 2003:3) owing largely to the availability of affordable family-oriented housing and the proximity to the city and beaches. Yet, the statistical data from 2001 and 2006 (ABS 2006, 2007) presented above shows almost no change at all in the ratio of rented owner-occupied housing, with levels remaining
at just under forty. So, although this statistical data does not absolutely exclude the possibility that Mayfield is seeing a significant trend toward gentrification immediately following the closure of BHP it does not confirm it.

**Mayfield Arts and Culture Committee**

At the beginning of 2005 the newly formed Mayfield Arts and Culture Committee had its first meeting. This committee was formed as an adjunct of the broader MMC was headed by the Mayfield Mainstreet Co-coordinator and with the assistance of the Chair of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee. The role of arts and culture in Mayfield's Mainstreet Committee directly references the idea that there is a close connection between the development of a symbolic economy (capitalising on the artistic and cultural elements of place) and economic success. It is worthwhile detailing some of the activities of the MACC as it provides an insight into the roles of 'gatekeepers' in the processes of reimaging Mayfield as a place in transition. The Arts and Culture Committee recognised that simply 'doing up the shops' was not enough to provide the kind of regeneration desired in the suburb, and that novel arts initiatives would add another element to the effort to rejuvenate the suburb.

It's about celebrating what we've got, there's something...like the Tighes Street bikeway, it's got a mural, and we need to have more arts and culture in the suburb, to really show its going ahead. (Mayfield Mainstreet Co-ordinator, presenting at Mayfield Arts and Culture meeting, Stag and Hunter Hotel, Hanbury Street, Mayfield, April 2005)

The MACC meetings were held in the evenings, upstairs in a local hotel, and were attended by about twenty people each time, with a core of about seven or eight of the same people attending all the meetings. The first three meetings of the MACC were positioned as 'agenda setting' by the Co-ordinator in that they were sessions in which residents and other interested people could put forward ideas about possible art projects to rejuvenate the suburb. The attendees included council representatives, the manager of the community centre and 'drop in' cafe, a Mayfield businessman and property owner, a teacher from the local school and some local youths who had been
involved in the skate-park project (see Chapter Seven). The meetings also included several artists, musicians, and, at two meetings, circus performers. The first meeting involved ‘brainstorming’ or getting participants to suggest possible ideas for improving Mayfield. This produced a number of suggestions, ranging from public art works, to an ethnic food festival, a community garden, putting more trees along Maitland Road, a circus performance on Maitland Road, establishing a local choir, producing and marketing a Mayfield wine, planting Valencia orange trees along Valencia Street (a street that runs off Maitland Road), a photography competition, and placing small ‘history panels’ of local shops on the door or windows of the buildings.

At the next meeting attendees were encouraged to develop these suggestions further. Some problems were highlighted at this stage, such as the difficulty in closing off Maitland Road because it is a four lane arterial route (emphasising the importance of Maitland Road as a thoroughfare), and the possibility of theft and vandalism in the area. The date of the third meeting changed several times because the Chair wanted to get as many people as possible to participate. In the event however, there was the usual turnout of approximately twenty people who were given a number of stickers to place beside which of the ideas they considered to be of a high priority. During this process, the Cultural Planner for Newcastle City Council (who had not attended any of the previous meetings) informed the group that a useful strategy for organising these items was to put them into one of two categories: ‘animation' or 'community building’. She said that 'animation' referred to ideas that made the area look, smell or sound better, whereas 'community' dealt with the items intended to foster, build and improve relations and contribute to a sense of belonging in the area. These distinctions caused confusion and resulted in a quick and well-supported move to discontinue their use. However, the Co-ordinator, whilst admitting she could not see the point in the Cultural Planner's distinctions, continued to follow the pattern. When the 'stickering' was complete the Co-ordinator quickly divided the items into categories of animation or community. This was something of an arbitrary process, with the Co-ordinator quickly writing an ‘A’ or ‘C’ next to each item, which were only questioned if someone mentioned the category out loud, at which point the Cultural Planner from the council, who could not see the very cluttered whiteboard due to poor vision, would inform the group as to which category this could go in. The involvement of the Cultural Planner represented the formalised institutionalisation of
attempts to reimage Mayfield and the idea that the arts could be central to this process. The proposed interventions into Mayfield's presentation were appropriated by the Cultural Planner as an attempt to capitalise on them as part of a broader attempt at a particular type of regeneration.

Although the categories of animation and community were seen as somewhat obtuse by the participants they highlighted an important distinction within the official discourses of cultural planning as discussed in Chapter Two. Dividing the suggestions into either ‘community’ or ‘animation’ fits into the broader realm of cultural planning where cultural edifices and programs are viewed as growth engines, or appealing representations of a place to be consumed (Evans 2001:141). The aims of the MACC meetings highlight both the politics surrounding the construction of images of place and also demonstrate the idea of culture as key in the valuation of place, especially as part of attempts at regeneration. For instance, the suggestions of the MACC were wide ranging, responding to the Co-ordinator's expressed openness about the types of arts initiatives that would be pursued, in the end it was the suggestions which fitted with the theme of Mayfield as a place with 'heritage' that remained dominant (largely through the efforts of the Co-ordinator, who would only mention the 'benefits' of ideas that related to heritage, leading to their prioritisation). In other words, the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee was already involved and supportive of a heritage discourse in Mayfield as part of the regeneration of the suburb, and so was selective of initiatives that reflected this theme. Despite the determinative nature of this process it was clear that the MMC and the Newcastle City Council's Cultural Planning officer both believed that artistic projects were important to the reimagining of the suburb and its spaces and places could be conspicuously incorporated into explicit processes of meaning-making.

Positioning Mayfield as a suburb on the path to gentrification following deindustrialisation is expressed through the organised strategies of development. In particular, these strategies are mostly oriented around the main shopping district of Mayfield - its 'mainstreet', especially focusing on the development of the suburb's shopping precinct, as the site for the integration of cultural economic generators, such as 'arty' shops and cafes. From an institutional perspective, those involved in Mayfield’s strategic planning processes, such as the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee
and the Newcastle City Council positioned Mayfield within a broader discourse of
gentrification in similar city-adjacent, working class Australian suburbs. As a result of
its large, 'period' housing, in close proximity and easy access to the city, Mayfield
came to be talked about as being at the beginning of a period of rapid and sustained
gentrification. At one meeting of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee in 2005,
members discussed Mayfield's gentrification as 'authentic', not 'tacky' like the
redevelopment of suburbs in Sydney and Melbourne. The NCC Cultural Planning
Officer also mentioned this idea, suggesting that Newcastle's 'working class' heritage
was key to 'solid' gentrification. Both parties seemed to be referencing the idea that
heritage or 'keeping in touch with the past' was important in the regeneration
strategies of Mayfield. The idea of heritage as key to the creation of a dominant
discourse of regeneration and gentrification is examined in the upcoming chapter.
Although the idea of Mayfield as gentrifying occupies a key position in the
imaginations of those involved in the strategic planning initiatives, there are
numerous irruptions between the 'official' discourses of transition and change oriented
around gentrification, and the everyday construction of images of deindustrialising
Mayfield.

Conclusion

Mayfield is a large suburb that was dominated by the presence of the BHP steelworks
on its northern border for most of the twentieth century, contributing to the perception
of the suburb as both working class and polluted and transitional. The closure of BHP
was mobilised by well-franchised members of the community such as members of the
Mayfield Mainstreet Committee as an opportunity to improve the suburb and for
gentrification. The closure of the plant in particular was emphasised as symbolically
'severing the ties' (McGuirk and Rowe 2001) with heavy industry and negative
aspects of the suburb's past. Mayfield was positioned as transitioning from industrial
to post-industrial and attempts to reverse its negative image with ideas of what might
secure gentrification in the suburb were central.
Chapter Six

Mayfield: a place in transition?

Deindustrialisation, as a process associated with post-Fordism, is changing the social, economic, demographic and cultural characteristics of western cities and their suburbs (Amin 1994; Cooke 1995; Jessop and Sum 2006; Harvey 1989; Koch 2006). Cities established around heavy industry are experiencing decline as their economic means of production shifts offshore. As discussed in Chapter Two, gentrification has been viewed as one panacea for the negative consequences of deindustrialisation in rust belt cities (Johnson 2009:25; Lees 2000; Stevenson 2005), opening up new forms of economic development oriented around the cultural or symbolic economy and housing speculation. In Australia, the city of Newcastle, New South Wales is undergoing changes associated with rust-belt deindustrialisation (McManus 2005). In particular the closure in 1999 of the Broken Hill Proprietary (BHP) steelworks on the northern edge of the suburb of Mayfield signalled a 'turning point' for the suburb and the city of Newcastle more generally. BHP was a key component both physically and symbolically in the imagination of the city and its closure shaped narratives of change especially in terms of the way Mayfield was viewed.

As discussed in Chapter Five, a popular discourse of Mayfield as gentrifying emerged following the closure of BHP despite evidence, such as housing data, that questioned whether the process of gentrification is occurring. This chapter examines attempts to secure gentrification in the suburb, probing in particular the mobilisation of the suburb's history where elements of the suburb's past are extracted, sanitised and reified into a theme of 'heritage'. Although the suburb's industrial heritage was identified as important in Chapter Five, it was Mayfield's pre-industrial heritage that was used as a reference point for the development and capitalisation of the suburb's housing stock, which is central to the image of the place as gentrifying. This chapter goes on to identify underlying insights into the positioning of heritage as a popular and durable discourse of transition and change to reveal a tension at the intersection
of Fordist and post-Fordist spatial arrangements. Heritage is positioned as a strategy of participation in the symbolic economy through the development of an aesthetic of place. As discussed above, participation in the symbolic economy and the commodification of place and space more specifically, is a key constituent of post-Fordism.

## Making a heritage discourse in Mayfield

The rebranding of Mayfield, as it has come to be known amongst the ‘gatekeepers’ of Mayfield’s heritage discourse (Markwell, Rowe, Stevenson 2004) began in earnest following the closure of the BHP steelworks. As discussed in Chapter Five, the closure of BHP as the last significant symbol of heavy industry in the area would symbolically free Mayfield from its previous associations as a polluted working class suburb ‘opening it up’ for gentrification. Mayfield's heritage housing was positioned as a 'hidden treasure', a pre-existing resource only ready to be revealed with the removal of heavy industry that had dominated the suburb. More specifically, Newcastle City Council and the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee, both gatekeepers of the values and images comprising a heritage discourse were interested in re-branding Mayfield in this way, with the aim of improving the image and economic circumstances of the suburb. Heritage was positioned as a strategy to:

...re-image and revitalise Mayfield and to sever its symbolic association with heavy industry, pollution, disadvantage and marginality. (Markwell et al., 2004:461)

The heritage discourse was to give some tangible expression to the idea that Mayfield was on the cusp of rapid gentrification in line with similar suburbs elsewhere (Markwell et al., 2004). As discussed in Chapter Two, heritage, or the creation of organised, edited images of a place's history for the purpose of mobilising and guiding change in an area, is a popular theme in the regeneration of rust-belt urban areas (Baum 2002; Cooke 1995; McManus 2005; Stimson 2001). In the period following the closure of the BHP steelworks in Mayfield, a well-organised discourse of heritage that capitalised on elements of Mayfield's history emerged as part of efforts to 're-
brand' the suburb. One regeneration project, the MMC's 'Heritage Walks', highlights the dynamics of the heritage discourse and illustrates the official themes, shared values and understandings associated with heritage in the suburb. The Mayfield Heritage Walks are two brochure guided walks tracing a ‘historical path’ through Mayfield, highlighting points of interest such as the houses of past gentry, BHP managers, historic schools and churches. The Heritage Walks achieved a high level of participation from the local community in conjunction with the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee who organised them (Appendix 6 for the full brochures).

Figure 6.0 Page from Mayfield Heritage Walk: *Mayfield, The Toorak of Newcastle?* showing locations of 'grand' homes.

Mayfield's Heritage Walks aimed to contribute to the improvement of the suburb by shifting the images of change associated with it and fostering a sense of 'belonging' to the area (Markwell *et al.*, 2004:458). The Newcastle City Council, through the MMC, provided the support and mandate for the research and production of the two brochures that linked various Mayfield sites with information about them. Recently, a decision has been made to provide audio-tapes to accompany the walks. The brochures were developed by a team of researchers from the Cultural Industries and Practices Centre (CIPs) at the University of Newcastle. Following the release of the brochures, the authors of the walks also published a refereed journal article reflecting upon the process of placemaking and ‘creating’ heritage in the context of cultural
planning and urban re-branding (Markwell et al., 2004). As will be discussed in more depth below, the Heritage Walks project enshrined favourable images of Mayfield, arresting tropes of placemaking and ‘concreting’ a sense of extracted, disconnected heritage, firmly positioned in the past. The aim of the Heritage Walks was to highlight elements of Mayfield’s past in a form that could contribute to dislodging the negative associations and images of the industrial suburb, and contribute to Mayfield’s positive regeneration:

The development of the Heritage Walks in the Mayfield area was seen as a means to achieve a more positive image...In particular it was conceived as an intervention that sought a symbolic reclamation and reconstitution of Mayfield, which had acquired a reputation as a blighted dormitory suburb...The project, therefore, set out to revive Mayfield’s complex histories and to offer alternative readings of the past, present and future. (Markwell et al., 2004:458)

The research behind the Heritage Walks was a collaborative effort, involving members of the local community in a process intended to engender a greater sense of community involvement and ‘buy in’ than simply relying on the sole authorship of the CIPs group of researchers (Markwell et al., 2004). The Heritage Walks identified and solidified two main themes in Mayfield’s history. The first walk, *Mayfield: Toorak of Newcastle?* focuses on the image of Mayfield as a suburb for the pre-BHP gentry when wealthy business owners settled their families in large mansions beside the Hunter River, amongst the market gardens and fertile river flats away from the noise and pollution of their industries further south, in the mid to late nineteenth century.

The second Heritage Walk, *Mayfield, Living the Life* references Mayfield’s establishment as an industrial suburb at the beginning of the twentieth century, invoking images of working class life and emphasising British migration to Australia. This period was the time of the majority of Mayfield’s population growth, and most residents of the suburb at the time would have known it as relatively poor and dominated by the adjacent industry oriented around the BHP steelworks.

*Mayfield: The Toorak of Newcastle?* conforms most closely to the brief provided by the MMC, celebrating the 'grand' or wealthy history of Mayfield, represented
especially in the large Victorian style housing in the suburb. The second Heritage Walk (*Living the Life*) was not included in the MMC's original brief and was developed in response to community consultation. The elements of Mayfield's history represented in *Living the Life*: the daily lives of workers at BHP, immigrants and 'struggling' families represented in more modest homes around the suburb, was not a priority for the MMC, indeed, when I interviewed the Co-ordinator of the MMC she was keen to stress the grandeur of Mayfield's earlier, pre-industry period in the Heritage Walks. *Mayfield: Living the Life* does include some descriptions of the hardships faced by former Mayfield residents and new immigrants during the time of heavy industry in the suburb. Yet, the opinion of three interviewees (Vi, Bob and Reg), is that this Walk does not adequately discuss the poverty and economic marginality of those employed on the lowest 'rung' of the local industries where BHP in particular operated with the most 'flexible' approach to labour, often requiring workers to find other work outside the suburb (frequently in the area's coal mines, some distance from Mayfield, at a time when cycling and walking were the most common modes of transport). A thematic analysis of the Heritage Walks reveals that they draw on two main themes in Mayfield's history. First, they capitalise on the positive elements of the suburb's history, emphasising the idea of the suburb as a once wealthy, semi-rural and attractive location for the homes of some of the region's wealthiest business identities. The second theme resonates Mayfield with a proud working class history, tapping into the iconic image of the Australian 'battler', a hardworking, self-motivated modest Australian driven by family values (Hamilton 2006; Sekiya 2008). The idea of struggle, especially financial struggle, is particularly important to the ideology of the battler, emphasising the drive for the acquisition of material goods and home ownership (Hamilton 2006:26-27).

The placemaking projects in Mayfield also demonstrated the centrality of heritage as discourse of transition. Early in 2004, the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee recognised a problem with graffiti in the suburb. Many high profile public buildings, such as a bank and the side wall of the McDonalds restaurant, both on Maitland Road, as well as the fences and gates of private residences, were being continually spray-painted with (seemingly meaningless) 'tags'. The MMC Co-ordinator recognised that graffiti 'zones' had been successfully utilised in other cities in Australia where they encouraged and showcased highly stylised, well-developed pieces of graffiti as local
Moreover, these artworks were less likely to be tagged. The Co-ordinator's idea, therefore, was that a graffiti mural should be painted on the side of the McDonald's restaurant would prevent more tagging. Members of a local graffiti collective agreed to this suggestion. Led to believe that they would have free reign for the final design, the artists planned a graffiti style artwork that reflected the guidelines given to them by the local Council representative - the Mayfield marketing credo: *Mayfield: Soul, Guts and Spirit*. Their draft illustrations represented several popular tropes of Australian graffiti/street art, including bright colours and satirical artwork. Just prior to painting (in early 2006), however, their blueprint was vetoed by the Co-ordinator of the MMC who instructed them to paint a collection of the suburb's 'grand old houses', as well as montages of the types of industry that had previously formed the basis of Mayfield’s economic base. Ultimately, the wall was painted according to the 'heritage' values of the suburb as defined and condoned by the MMC. The heritage themed mural was seen as a 'safe bet' (according to the MMC Co-ordinator) presenting mainstream, acceptable images of the suburb that meshed with broader patterns of heritage-based reimaging and gentrification. The dominance and acceptance of the 'heritage' mural rather than the graffiti artists' preferred design featuring more 'urban' or stylised work demonstrated the mainstream acceptability of heritage as a guiding theme in the discourses of Mayfield as a changing place.

Although heritage was deliberately positioned as a dominant discourse in the development of projects like the graffiti mural and the heritage walks, its appeal was not entirely manufactured and 'pressed onto' residents. Residents had existing ideas about Australian heritage that the official discourses developed by institutional interests mobilised and reinforced. In other words, Mayfield's heritage discourse accesses popular and durable notions of Australian history, in particular, traditional, predominantly Anglo-Australian, colonial images (Hage 2000). For instance, when I began interviewing residents in 2005, a sculpture had recently been erected at the former site of the tram terminus on the corner of Hanbury and Maitland Road on the main street at the centre of the suburb (see Figure 6.1)
Figure 6.1 Terminus sculpture at intersection of Hanbury and Maitland Road, Mayfield, by Newcastle artist Dallas Bray.

According to the Mayfield Mainstreet Co-ordinator the consultation process prior to the commissioning of this artwork had caused dissent amongst some in the local community who felt it did not adequately reflect the 'history' of the suburb. Also, three attendees at a meeting of the Mayfield Arts and Culture Committee in 2005 relayed their dissatisfaction with the project. In their opinion, the resulting interpretive artwork represented 'elite tastes'. Indeed, public consultation regarding the sculpture had resulted in a popular call for a statue of Mr Glass, a pharmacist who owned and ran the chemist on the main street of Mayfield:

Well, it was a big hoo-haa getting the thing up and running, there was everyone…but then we all wanted a statue of Mr Glass…He’d been there (in Mayfield).he was the chemist. Been there for ages – really. And then we get this thing (the new art work) and it’s, I mean it’s nice, they got the local kids to paint on it and everything…was a big deal. But it’s just not, I mean some people reckon it looks like a hand, and it’s kind of um messy, you know, it doesn’t really look finished. I don’t like it. I’m not even sure what it’s supposed to be…when you
come into Mayfield, well, it’s one of the first things…you see. It’s right there, and it’s supposed to be something about the suburb, to say something about us here. But it’s just this ugly thing. (Interview, Glenys 2005)

Thus, the sculpture led to a sense that some, perhaps many Mayfielders were being overridden by more 'sophisticated' tastes, with art projects geared toward the interests of those engaged in the 'arts community'. All interview respondents who talked about the Terminus sculpture (six in total) expressed similar views: that the sculpture was located at a prominent location yet did not represent an appropriate or desirable image of the suburb. In fact, the only proponent of the sculpture that I heard was NCC’s Cultural Planning Officer who argued that the artwork had fulfilled its role as a talking point in the community, helping residents discuss, define and galvanise their ideas about ‘what is art’, which is quite a different task from telling outsiders something about the suburb. The politics over the sculpture demonstrated the difficulties in managing power relations in the presentation of place. The NCC Council Cultural Planning Officer argued that the main reason for the interpretive statue was to avoid having '...yet another homage to a dead white guy'. (Interview December 2005) thus perpetrating the patriarchal and colonising themes often monumentalised in Australia (Hage 2000; Stevenson 2003). More broadly though, the discord over the statue highlights the accessibility and popularity of 'old fashioned', or traditional colonial images, which are seen as ubiquitous and readable. Anglo-Celtic, colonial images of place and space are comprehensible and popular.

Official discourses of transition in Mayfield in response to deindustrialisation pivoted on heritage as being a resource for gentrification and reimaging. The institutionalised projects described above reflect an organised, edited heritage discourse that is being mobilised to shape perceptions inside and outside of the suburb. There were, however, other attempts to intervene strategically in the perception of Mayfield as a post-industrial place, especially with a view to its regeneration through the development and preservation of heritage housing. Like the Heritage Walks and the ‘Graffiti Wall', these efforts also retained elements of exclusivity, accepting, condoning and capitalising on some images of the suburb to the exclusion or subordination of others. Certainly, these efforts to capitalise on the perceived historic value of Mayfield's
housing stock were less organised than the Heritage Walks, but they formed a popular and durable discourse of placemaking especially with a view to gentrification in the suburb, noting that the Walks were intended by the MMC primarily to showcase Mayfield's heritage housing.

Mayfield's housing stock is a key referent in the idea of the suburb as gentrifying, mentioned in official documents and relayed by those involved in the creation of place transition discourses. Further, as demonstrated by the controversy over the Terminus sculpture, heritage, or more specifically, a particular form of heritage based on readable, historical images, is a popular and durable discourse. In other words, although heritage-based gentrification in Mayfield was strongly supported through the actions of interested community organisations, it 'tapped' into and capitalised on readily accessible ideas about heritage and history, the visible, relatively homogenous period housing of the suburb. Mayfield's housing plays such a key role in the imagination of the suburb as gentrifying that it is important to describe and categorise its characteristics before discussing its role in the formation of a heritage discourse.

**Heritage housing in Mayfield**

As discussed in Chapter Two, when discussing Australian heritage housing it is worth noting a peculiarly Australian understanding of a lack of history (Veracini 2007, Meinig 2004:26) that references an absence of a historical trajectory in relation to the key cultural referent of England (Meinig 2004:26). Houses that reference English styles go some way to ameliorating this sense of ‘newness’, whilst reinforcing an underlying ‘lack’ of history, the idea that this is a facsimile of history or heritage. Further, the importance of heritage as a unifying theme extending beyond the level of individual houses and therefore increasing their value is popular in mainstream media. For instance, the Sydney Morning Herald (15/02/2011) cites the increasing desirability of housing included in local government heritage precincts:

The managing director of Wakelin Property Advisory, Monique Sasson Wakelin, says Australians are fond of heritage properties and, over many years, have consistently paid a premium to buy or rent
them. She is one of a growing group of market watchers who believe moderate heritage overlay controls have a positive impact on property values. "There is a lot of evidence to suggest [inclusion in a heritage overlay] actually enhances the value of a property," she says. "Whether you are an investor or homeowner, a heritage overlay means people can't come into the street and put up neo-gothic monstrosities in a row of consistent Victorian cottages. It protects the character and architectural integrity of the neighbourhood." (Tolhurst, C, Sydney Morning Herald 2011)

It is clear then, that there is something about the nature of heritage housing that is more important than the styles of the houses as they were originally planned and built. In this way, the discourse of heritage has in some senses democratised the housing stock and its regeneration in Mayfield, making older larger houses and smaller workers’ cottages appeal to the same socio-economic cohort, albeit at different prices. In other words, the value and desirability of 'heritage' houses, irrespective of their specific era pivot on tropes of preservation and restoration, history and character, rather than the original differences in the status of their original owners.

Mayfield's architecture reflects its historical trajectory. Its earliest housing stock featured large, 'grand' homes, built of timber and/or brick, in the Victorian, Queen Anne or Federation style of the time (1880s-1910s). The development of transport around the turn of the century saw the earliest worker's houses being built near the main road, Maitland Road, which hosted most of the shops in the suburb and a tram-line (Docherty 1983). These houses are among the smallest in the suburb, often semi-detached, and built relatively cheaply of wood and serviced by night-cart lanes. However, these properties account for a small portion of Mayfield's houses. Most of Mayfield's housing was built during a period of population expansion following the opening of the BHP steelworks in 1915, up until the Second World War (Docherty 1983). Many of the first houses of this period were small, sometimes semi-detached wooden gun-barrel style houses. As the suburb became more established through the 1930s, 40s and 50s, however, the housing grew in size, reflecting suburban styles of family oriented, detached housing, with separate bedrooms, lawns and car-spaces. According to local amateur historian Gionni di Gravio (Interviewed April 2005) these
houses were larger than the so called 'gun-barrel' housing, but were still built modestly from wood rather than the brick that was used in new housing in say Melbourne and Sydney. Evidence of these houses' modesty can be seen in the pared down, simple layout - rectangular with often just one setback for a porch (see Figure 6.2) especially in relation to architectural styles popular in Australia at the time.

Apperly et al., (1994:206) note the popularity in Australia of the Californian Bungalow architectural style in the early 1920s through to the War. However, houses built in this style were normally built out of brick unlike their American counterparts, which were commonly built in timber. So although Mayfield's modest bungalow-styled homes reflect the American model more faithfully in some ways, i.e., being built from timber with brick porches this was more likely a concession to material costs rather than adherence to the Californian archetype. According to Whitelaw (2010) the single brick porch attached to a wooden building is an unusual feature in Australian architecture of the period that is highly concentrated in Newcastle. Many of the brick porches of Mayfield were subsequently enclosed to provide additional living space (see Figure 6.3). This was one of the key modifications discussed by 'gentrifiers' interviewed for this project.
Figure 6.2 showing brick facade porch

Figure 6.3 built-in brick porches

Although most of Mayfield's housing was built during the inter-war period due to the large influx of workers to local heavy industries. There were a small number of
houses built to accommodate Mayfield's wealthier residents. Bella Vista (see fig. 6.4) was completed the year before the opening of the BHP plant to house the company's general manager Essington Lewis (New South Wales Heritage Register 2007).

Figure 6.4 “Bella Vista”, Crebert Street, Mayfield (photo: Sharn Harrison, New South Wales Heritage Register 2007)

Also, earlier homes built in the period 1860-1910 speak to a past when Mayfield was home to much wealthier residents than those who populated the suburb following the introduction of heavy industry (Docherty 1983) (see Fig. 6.5). Architecturally, these pre-BHP houses are in the styles of the Victorian/Federation period more specifically, featuring Federation Queen Anne, Federation Bungalow, or Victorian Filigree style houses (Apperly et al., 1994:21).
Many of Mayfield's 'grand' houses are located on what is known locally as ‘the Hill’ a ridge running along the northern edge of Mayfield West. These houses have the best views in the suburb (and sea-breezes as well).

Mayfield’s heritage housing stock is a key focal point in the discourse of Mayfield’s regeneration. Council representatives, interested locals and residents of Newcastle more broadly identified Mayfield’s stock of period housing as a key asset for the suburb and its housing was often mentioned in the interviews as a guarantor of gentrification. Further, there was a corresponding assumption that the preservation of this housing almost guaranteed gentrification that would address some of the more pressing social concerns in the suburb. The Cultural Planning Officer for Newcastle City Council, who was involved in some of the regeneration strategies in the suburb talked about Mayfield's gentrification as follows:

> With Mayfield...it was...how the established residents were dealing with the major changes that were happening, you know, like gentrification that was going on, and the fact that the real estate agents were popping up everywhere and house prices had quadrupled in 18 months\(^ {17} \) to two years...the fact that Carrington has already gone through major gentrification so that anecdotally we had the information that lower income and those families were moving into Mayfield cause the housing stock was cheaper but then of course over the next two years we were working we were seeing that a movement, cause they couldn’t afford it, and the rental properties were now being bought for um families. (Interview, NCC Cultural Planning Officer, 2005)

\(^ {17} \) As noted in Chapter Five, Mayfield's housing data does not reflect 'runaway growth' often referenced by those interested in supporting the image of Mayfield as undergoing strong and fast gentrification.
The Mayfield Mainstreet Co-ordinator (also involved in Mayfield's regeneration strategies) concurred with this statement:

It's gonna go [gentrify] alright, it just can't not with the housing.
(Interview, MMC Co-ordinator 2006)

Both these statements were said with enthusiasm. Gentrification was positioned as a somewhat inevitable process because of the housing stock, and that although there were social consequences to this gentrification for the suburb's poorer residents, they were positioned as almost irrelevant given the power of gentrification to transform. Another Mayfield resident testifies to the ubiquity and persistence of the idea that Mayfield is an increasingly gentrifying suburb:

Umm, I think there’s more people coming back to inner city living, people who might not have lived here before. You know they might say buy a house, buy an old house. There’s a lot of renovators, a lot of renovators who come [and do up the house] and then sell it to make money, but a lot of people from put down rents [who rented in Mayfield] who [buy] and renovate and stay. And there’s a lot of that in our street. And so in that sense I suppose it changed, but its changed since the BHP went. (Interview, Denise 2005)

Another Mayfield resident:

Certainly, I felt that myself and also a wider sort of feeling amongst the town’s feeling. I hope and think that Mayfield is next in line after Wickham which is going ahead now, gentrification, so um, yeah I think definitely my own feeling of that has been you know that it will really go ahead in that way. (Interview, Mick 2005)

Often local residents from outside Mayfield expressed their enthusiasm for Mayfield’s 'beautiful old villas and houses' when they found out that I lived in the suburb. Upon closer questioning however they revealed that for them this was the only appealing aspect of the suburb. Although the style of housing appealed to them,
they chose to live elsewhere because of Mayfield’s poor reputation, oriented around low-income housing, visible substance abuse and general negative perceptions associated with its industrial past.

Gentrification in Mayfield as elsewhere involves the renovation and or preservation of housing. Mayfield’s gentrifiers tended to talk about the process of renovation in relation to other Australian urban areas, where houses were perceived as renovated and ‘turned over’ more quickly than theirs. Many home-owning interviewees who positioned themselves as part of the suburb’s gentrification talked about their tenure in the suburb in longer terms than what they perceived was the Australian norm:

Yeah, well, I know it’s all the rage to you know, buy one house and do it up and then buy another and blah blah, but it’s not really for us. We’re here for the long run I think. (Interview, Marianne 2005)

…we thought initially we’d just buy here for the shorter term, but that was a few years ago now (laughs). I guess we, I didn’t think about it I suppose. Greg’s got the business, and things just went from there….We’ve been doing up the place, not that you’d know to look at it…The kids are pretty settled, I think. It’s getting better. (Interview, Sheri 2005)

This statement was characteristic of self-identified home-owner/gentrifiers, who were keen to ‘do up’ their houses but intended to stay in them for a long period of time. Most of these interviewees mentioned that they had stretched their resources to purchase their house, noting that time and money were the biggest constraint on their ability to renovate their properties. So Mayfield’s ‘heritage housing’ was talked about as being attractive for its ‘potential’ and all of the self-identified gentrifiers who were interviewed for this project said they intended to stay in the suburb for what they perceived was longer than residents in other gentrifying areas in Australia. The intended residence in the suburb for all the people interviewed was longer than ten years. Mayfield, for them, provided the opportunity to buy family sized houses in a very competitive housing market. The idea of Mayfield as a suburb with affordable housing suitable for renovation was popular with those involved in Mayfield's
regeneration, including the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee, local real estate agents, and Newcastle City Council's Cultural Planning Officer. Importantly, Mayfield's houses were positioned as good purchases because they had ‘heritage value’ or ‘character’, which translated as the potential to increase in financial value over time, especially with improvements. It was this combination of ‘family sized’ detached housing and ‘reasonable’ pricing that real estate agents in the suburb often cited as making the suburb ‘ripe’ for gentrification. Moreover, the affordability of Mayfield's housing was often mentioned defensively, as if to say, ‘we would not have bought here if we could have found a suitable family house elsewhere in Newcastle’. Many residents alluded to Mayfield’s stigma as a poor or undesirable suburb and this was an enduring theme in the local discourses of the suburb for homeowners as well as renters. Although many of them referred to the fact that it was ‘not as bad as it used to be’, for many homeowners there seemed to be a definite tendency to defend their choice to buy in Mayfield. Housing ‘character’, although often referred to ‘one day this house could be amazing’ was not necessarily the key motivator in their decision to buy in Mayfield. Perceived affordability, combined with heritage features provided good value for money, reflected the classic pattern of gentrification in Mayfield.

Despite the popular view that gentrification would improve the lives of Mayfield residents, there were some residents who spoke to me of concerns for the suburb’s more disenfranchised residents as a consequence of gentrification. As discussed in the Newcastle City Council's Crime Prevention Plan, Mayfield (2003:1) Mayfield had a very high rental population compared with the New South Wales average. It also had a number of boardinghouses that provided accommodation for some of the most socially at-risk people in the area, as borne out in the ABS figures cited in Chapter Five. These boardinghouses were originally established during the industrial period to house itinerant workers and apprentices in adjacent industries. For instance, the Director of MayCare, the community centre that provided an outreach and advocacy program (funded by the Mayfield Baptist Church), attended the meetings of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee. Her input was oriented around providing and maintaining services to the community centre’s clients, most of whom in her opinion could be characterised as socio-economically disadvantaged. Her concerns reflected common criticisms of gentrification in the literature discussed in Chapter Four, where residents on fixed incomes, renters and those with special needs are forced out of an
area due to decreasing housing affordability. Another member of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee and an owner of one of the motels in the suburb cited a recent increase in Centrelink 'guests' at the motel. These motels provided emergency emergency accommodation for families who would otherwise be homeless\(^\star\) (MMC meeting 2006). According to the motelier, this increase was related to the decline in low-cost, short-term accommodation in Mayfield. Further, the director of MayCare said that Mayfield's most disadvantaged residents were already moving to adjacent suburbs, such as Jesmond and Waratah, because the rents were cheaper.

As discussed in Chapter Five, Mayfield's housing market underwent a period of growth in value in line with the New South Wales average. It is reasonable to expect that an increase in house prices in the area resulted in a corresponding increase in rental prices, which affected the suburb's most financially insecure residents. The perception amongst some Mayfield residents interviewed for this research was that gentrification was forcing some of the suburb's poorest residents to move elsewhere. Five interviewees who were home-owners in the suburb expressed relief at a drop in the number of people 'hanging around' in Mayfield's public spaces a decline they attributed to gentrification. Two interviewees used the term 'cleaning up' in reference to gentrification as a process that made it more difficult for residents who loitered (or were perceived as loitering) in the street. Those who were most likely to leave the suburb as a result of rising prices understandably had a different opinion of the process of gentrification. This issue is discussed in depth in Chapter Seven, below.

One interviewee, a Mayfield resident who was living in a share house and struggling financially expressed his concern over Mayfield's perceived gentrification. Specifically, he cited the renovation of Mayfield's heritage housing as a concern as his house was an old, multi-room dwelling - an ex-boardinghouse. He said he felt threatened by the increasing desirability of larger houses like the one he lived in, which he perceived were being bought for renovation, forcing people like him out of the area. As an ex-manual labourer living on a Centrelink sickness benefit following

\(^{\star}\) Centrelink administer government social security payments such as unemployment and sickness benefits. Centrelink also pay for emergency accommodation for those at risk of homelessness, sometimes utilising motels to ensure that residents can remain in an area until their housing situation improves or other arrangements are made.
an industrial accident, he identified strongly with the idea of Mayfield as a working class suburb, a place where no matter how economically disenfranchised he became, he could ‘fit in’. He referenced the irony of living in a 'grand' old villa, instead of one of the old workers’ houses which were originally built for people like him but which had increasingly become out of his reach as they were being purchased and often renovated by more affluent families. The idea that gentrification was compromising Mayfield's working class history for those who had lived in the suburb for a long time was expressed by many respondents. As Markwell *et al.*, (2004) note in their reflections on the heritage walks:

…long-standing residents of suburbs like Mayfield are also frequently proud of their communal struggle against deprivation, and do not wish to see it papered over with images of pre-industrial fine houses and the newly renovated facades of gentrification. (Markwell *et al.*, 2004:470),

Five interviewees with long tenures in Mayfield, the oldest of whom was in his mid eighties, expressed mixed views on the heritage projects in the suburb because of their documentation of what they considered important elements of the suburb's history, but also the glorification BHP's role in the suburb. One of these interviewees whose (now deceased) husband had worked at the BHP steelworks said:

> It was hard work, very hard. Dangerous...there (was) nothing good about it. There were fights and...and you had to fight for conditions. The accidents were just dreadful. (Interview, Bertha 2005)

Another interviewee, a male resident of a share house recounted a similar idea suggesting that gentrification (in his terms: 'rich people buying up these old houses and doing them up') in Mayfield was 'a bit of a joke', especially the romanticisation of Mayfield’s working class history. He pointed out that conditions in Mayfield in 'the early days' were difficult (for him, the 'early days' referred to the period following the Second World War), citing Mayfield’s poverty and endemic racism that he felt characterised neighbourhood dynamics at the time. The lionisation of working class
values enshrined in heritage housing is discussed by Gadsby and Chidester (2007) and detailed in Chapter Two above.

The idea that Mayfield’s gentrification was alienating its working class residents (or those who identify as such) was expressed by almost all of the interviewees whose housing circumstances were the most financially precarious. For the two residents quoted above, the romanticisation and sanitation of Mayfield's history as a working class suburb was ironic. The construction of a heritage discourse as the objectification and reification of 'working class' aspects of the suburb's history signalled a shift, change, or divorce from the history itself. In other words, the romanticisation, glorification and monumentalisation of the hardships of Mayfield's industrial history positioned it as a symbol or proxy of life in the suburb, a model or image, rather than a contemporary expression of everyday life in Mayfield, a topic to which this chapter will return as part of a broader discussion of the construction of a heritage discourse in Mayfield.

Investigating housing aesthetics and values

The reification of Mayfield's history introduces a discussion on the values and understandings associated with so-called heritage housing in the suburb: how home owners talked about and valued their houses; the principles that guided their aesthetic ideas about desirability; what was considered appropriate renovation and/or preservation; and how they situated their houses as repositories of ideas about place and space in the suburb, especially with respect to the idea of Mayfield as gentrifying.

As mentioned above, the key determinant of desirable housing for home-buyers in Mayfield was not just heritage or age (and therefore perceived amenability to gentrification), but also affordability and house-size (large, detached, family-oriented homes). Houses that resembled their original architectural state as closely as possible were considered the most desirable.

An interview with two Mayfield residents, both women in their late 30s, and both relatively recent home purchasers, revealed some of the key ideas involved in the construction of housing value in the suburb, especially regarding heritage and
gentrification. The women were discussing the merits of their respective choices of house. Two years previously, the first woman, Kath, and her husband had purchased a brick, Federation style home. Kath's intention was that they would, as their finances permitted, gradually ‘improve’ or restore the house, complete with appropriate landscaping. The second woman Marianne and her partner had recently bought a weatherboard house. She estimated her house to be newer than Kath’s Federation style home, perhaps built in the late 1920s. The house appeared to have been built originally as a modest worker’s cottage, with a small verandah in the front and a small yard behind, but unlike Kath's, it had been extensively altered with the addition of extra rooms and some of the main walls removed, especially in the living areas of the house, to make it more open plan. Kath thought Marianne’s house was a poor choice (to purchase) because it would require a lot of work to restore it to its 'original condition'. The conversation was clearly a disagreement the two women had had before. Marianne tried to explain her reasoning to Kath, in particular noting that her house’s altered nature was one of the elements she appreciated the most about it. Their discussion spoke to the different ideas of heritage housing and character, and indeed gentrification, in the suburb. Of Kath’s house, Marianne said:

> I don’t like all those formal houses that look like they’ve never been lived in, you know. This one looks like its got a bit of character and its relaxed…Like someone lived in it. We’ll probably change it too.

(Interview, Marianne 2005)

To Marianne, Federation style houses were intimidating in their formality, their rigidity. She found the 'mixed up' (her words) nature of her house aesthetically pleasing and contrasted this with the austere and sterile Federation houses further up the street (like Kath's). Marianne liked her house because it reflected a long line of occupants, each of whom had modified the house according to their needs and the fashions of the time. For instance, she noted the conservatory added in the back of the house to which Kath pointed out that conservatories had been a passing 'fad' in the 1980s. In Marianne's view, the idea of a house completely preserved as a representation of a historical period, such as a Federation style house, was unappealing and intimidating:
I don’t like some of the places people are getting now and doing up...they’re so kind of formal, just don’t look like anyone has lived in them. (Interview, Marianne 2005)

Kath on the other hand said that the 'finished-ness' (her words) was precisely what she liked about her house, citing a clear and uniform style to the architecture, where everything matched. According to Kath, deviations from this original condition as in the case of Marianne’s house detracted from the character value of houses.

Two versions of housing value became clear through this discussion. First, Kath's version, where a house's value was attributed to the preservation of its original architecture. Second was Marianne's version of desirable old housing having numerous alterations and dis-junctures representing the various stages of its trajectory as a family home. In the first version, the past was revered and represented. The second version demonstrated that a house can be constantly altered and made more comfortable, possibly reflecting an improvement in the economic position of the householder. Both women were discussing their houses in terms of heritage especially as it related to the broader theme of gentrification in Mayfield.

Kath's sentiments about desirable housing positioned her 'better preserved' houses as more valuable than Marianne's, revealing a pervasive sense that houses which were restored (instead of renovated) were closer to the ‘middle class’ values of housing (the term ‘middle class’ was used by several of the respondents themselves). In other words, Kath’s house was more middle class than Marianne’s despite the fact that both houses cost roughly a similar amount of money. Marianne’s house was located on a much larger block of land that, according to both women accounted for the similarity in price, despite the relative difference in perceived ‘value’ between the two properties. Although both houses were discussed in terms of their gentrification potential, one was deemed to be more valuable than the other. Preserving one’s house in line with ‘heritage' values and aesthetics reflects the tenets of the heritage discourse more easily than Marianne's house, which showed signs of ongoing modification. Of course, improving or capitalising on an existing home, in any form, increases the value of the house, and can therefore be viewed as part of the gentrification process. Yet, the discussion between the two women highlights some of
the key precepts of the heritage discourse, oriented around homogeneity, perfection, restoration and authenticity. The women's discussion resonates with Bridge's (2001a) work that maps the nuances of housing aesthetics and values in the context of the Sydney real estate market, especially regarding gentrification. 'Victoriana', according to Bridge (cf. Jager 1986) is an important aesthetic in the interplay and negotiation of cultural and economic capital (in the Bourdieusian sense). Importantly, Victoriana is not a fixed set of values, rather it is a site for appeals to cultural capital. Bridge (2001a) notes that in the example of inner city Sydney housing sales Victoriana shows:

Too much 'authentication' cannot be tolerated. Distinction does not mean exclusivity in terms of removal from view, but rather the opening up of the dwelling as a display case for good taste. This includes a sense of transcendence: the ability to balance history and solidity with modernity and movement (Bridge 2001a:96)

Another interviewee, Bob, lived in Sydney and was trying to help his daughter choose a house to buy in Newcastle. He was interested in properties in Mayfield because, according to him, the suburb had a number of cheaper houses that retained the 'right' characteristics: detached with good structure, large lawns and room for cars. I interviewed Bob and his daughter who had found a house she felt met all her criteria: large, requiring some simple renovations, relatively cheap and situated on a large block with off-street parking. However, Bob informed her that this house would not suit because it 'would not do up well'. The house was built in the 1950s and was simply designed and had basic aluminium windows which were probably not original. The only prominent architectural feature was a flat, sloping roof with wide eaves to keep the midday sun off the windows. What prevented this house from being ‘do- uppable’, according to Bob, was its age, or lack of age. When I questioned him further, he revealed that he viewed houses built prior to the 1940s as valuable because they were generally of a 'Victorian' or 'Federation' style, resonating with what Blythe (2001) refers to as 'era bias' (discussed in Chapter Two) despite the fact that his 'labels' were not strictly accurate as many of these houses were built later than these periods. These older houses were in his opinion more amenable to renovation, specifically, to preserve their 'original' features. His categorisations did, however,
highlight the appeal and desirability of the idea of Federation or Victorian housing. It is important to note that the Federation and Victorian periods reference a period of Mayfield's history prior to the industrialisation of the suburb as presented in the official heritage discourse through projects such as the Heritage Walks. The 1950s house Bob's daughter was interested in was too new for preservation with a view to a large increase in house value.

![Figure 6.6 A ‘grand old’ house in Mayfield showing the popular heritage style](image)

The politics regarding the preservation of Mayfield's older houses can be seen as a form of era bias. Real estate advertisements for houses in Mayfield cite heritage features including, 'Federation style', 'original features'...[such as]...'French doors and antique fireplaces' 'period style', 'character', or 'Art Nouveau fretwork', (see Appendix 8 for details of real-estate advertisements including references for the terms listed here). It became clear during the research period that houses that were considered to have most heritage appeal were largely unmodified, as highlighted by the discussion by Kath and Marianne above, retaining the original characteristics of the house.

As noted by Confino (1997) edited versions of heritage or history are useful in the imagination or perception of places. Mayfield's heritage housing was talked about as
representing a favourable aspect of living in the suburb; for instance, almost all the interviewees who talked about Mayfield's housing referred to the 'old' houses as beautiful and, when asked to elaborate, talked about the lives they imagined were lived in the houses. A common statement was that the neighbourhood was once a place where children could wander around the streets and visit and play safely with one another. Below is a typical comment from a (female) Mayfield resident/home owner:

I think it's just the idea that they [children] could roam around freely you know, in and out of people's backyards...less fences...in the street.

(Interview, Bertha 2005)

As a resident of Mayfield myself it was particularly clear that this was not a characteristic of contemporary neighbourhood life. In the street where I lived, most residents with young families were renting their houses and all of these families moved out in the two years I lived there. One of my neighbours told me that they simply did not get to know many of the people who rented houses in the street, as their tenures were often short19.

**Constructing heritage in Mayfield**

Mayfield's heritage discourse, both expressed in its housing and official projects, resonates with more general criticisms of heritage and place, laid out in Chapter Two. As Gable and Handler (2003) note, heritage discourses implicitly reflect the power structures they emanate from, reproducing patterns of social capital through control. Gadsby and Chidester (2007) suggest that there is a significant power dimension to heritage housing in particular, as housing represents the histories of those with access to property ownership. This is something which certainly holds for Mayfield's housing, as those who are most disadvantaged by a suburb's regeneration, whether this is attributable to gentrification or more simply to the gradual increase in property values in the suburb, are those in the most financially precarious housing situations. Certainly, Mayfield's housing conforms to Relph's (1987) observation that heritage is

19 The social implications of home ownership versus renting in the perception of Mayfield residents is discussed by Stevenson (1999) as outlined in Chapter Two.
often positioned as an engine of gentrification, and Zukin's (2009) contention that gentrification is frequently a strategy for rejuvenation following deindustrialisation. Further, Mayfield's heritage projects and the discursive support of heritage housing resonate with Shaw's (2005b) work on Australian gentrification, which argues that heritage, and in particular, heritage housing, can be used as a dominant discourse that excludes or delegitimises other readings of place, especially in the service of gentrification.

Mayfield's heritage discourse can be viewed within the rubric of post-Fordism, especially the post-Fordist construction of space and place. Mayfield's 'officially' sanctioned and well-franchised heritage discourse is positioned as key to the commodification of place under post-Fordism on two levels. First, it encourages gentrification as part of efforts to stimulate growth and regeneration in the area, as part of attempts to ameliorate the impacts of deindustrialisation. This is well within the purview of post-Fordist regeneration strategies and represented by the development and capitalisation of heritage housing. Secondly, and more subtly, the heritage discourse seeks to alter the semantic meanings associated with the suburb.

Housing is central to the commodification of place in Mayfield. It is positioned as key to the rejuvenation or gentrification of the suburb, especially in the spectre of the suburb in transition, shifting from industrial Fordism to post-industrial or post-Fordism. Mayfield's homeowners value, create and realise the desirability of their houses through engagement with the heritage discourse. The heritage discourse uses images of pre-industrial Mayfield as a resource for the reimagining of the suburb following the closure of BHP. In other words, the promotion and preservation of Mayfield's heritage housing is a recognition of the image of Mayfield as being 'unsaddled' from its industrial past, revealing the always-present but previously undiscovered 'hidden treasure' of its pre-industrial history. This 'hidden treasure' is central to constructing a more prosperous future for the suburb in the wake of deindustrialisation. The emphasis on Mayfield as gentrifying defuses the negative consequences of deindustrialisation following the closure of BHP (such as job losses) displacing the trajectory of heavy industry and its impacts from the suburb's future. Of course, this is a difficult and contested project, and elements of Mayfield's industrial past resist removal, such as alternative readings of history and place from long-term
residents and those with experiences working and living with heavy industry in the suburb, and the physical reminders of the suburb's Fordist past, such as its suburban, working class streetscapes. So, although the heritage discourse can be viewed as attempting establish images of Mayfield as 'non (rather than post) industrial', the suburb retains strong connections to its Fordist, industrial past. Mayfield is positioned as a suburb in transition, and this transitionality opens up a discursive space or site for contested images of place and space, and attempts to assert images of the suburb's past as a resource for its future.

The heritage discourse commodifies Mayfield's places and spaces through the promotion of its housing resulting in an increase in property prices, yet it also commodifies the places of Mayfield (it is hoped) in more subtle ways. As discussed in Chapter Two, heritage is often mobilised in discourses of urban regeneration, especially in the period of post-Fordism, where the processes of everyday life are becoming commodified and spatialised, with the incorporation of 'place' into the symbolic economy. In keeping with the idea of the creative or symbolic economy as an economic generator in the period of post-Fordism, heritage in Mayfield was positioned as a resource for the production and reproduction of identity symbols, drawing its housing stock into a process of social distinction. Further, the idea of heritage as a collection of images resonating with Baudrillard's work on hyperrealities positions the heritage discourse as part of a construction of place as site for the proliferation of disembodied, self-referential images. As discussed above, Lyth (2006), Wakely (2003), Lyth (2006) and Hewison (1991) all describe the processes of heritage or history-making as projects located within the broader context of Baudrillard's hyperrealities, where images are increasingly disconnected from reality and reconstituted as proxies of themselves in projection of reality. In these versions history is gradually being replaced by a form of heritage that fosters a complete disconnection from the placemaking of everyday life, in favour of a discrete, edited product (Zumkhawala-Cook 2008). In the same vein, Lyth (2006) describes heritage as an artefact that resembles the form of readable histories and images, but it is actually a hollow image oriented around novelty. In this way, dehistoricised images of place are arranged without reference to contextual meaning, decoupled from everyday life, fixed in a form of inertia. For Mayfield, this enables heritage as a site or locus for the concatenation of irreducible images of Mayfield's past and future, as a way of
knowing or guiding development in the suburb. In this way, heritage reveals the discourse as oriented around a mélange of timelessness - referencing an abstract history, disconnected from everyday life, a discrete period bracketed by the closure of BHP. At one level, of course, emphasising Mayfield's pre-industrial heritage gains traction because it lends a sense of permanence to a suburb with a history of high population turnover, due to the presence of heavy industry in the area. Yet, at a deeper level, Mayfield's heritage discourse resonates with the idea of heritage as a hyperreal space where the suburb's pre-industrial history is extracted and reworked through activities such as housing preservation to neutralise images of Mayfield as an stigmatised industrial place. The preservation of heritage housing in Mayfield emphasises the creation of a timeless, fixed and inert, hyperreal space, decoupled from everyday life, as does the idea of Mayfield's heritage as 'uncovered' rather than manufactured following the closure of BHP. It emphasises a connection with the past that was a hidden treasure, or 'always there', covered up, rather than newly created. In other words, the heritage discourse does more than remind residents of the characteristics of Mayfield's pre-industrial past, it propagates the creation of sites that are vessels for a range of images, rather than emphasising the images themselves. In this way, images of Mayfield's pre-industrial past can be conflated and hyphenated into an image of Mayfield's future. In this way, Mayfield's pre-industrial past can be projected onto its post-industrial future despite the incongruities involved in the transaction. The pre-industrial and post-industrial periods are rendered knowable to one another as a means by which the suburb's industrial, Fordist history may be decoupled, negated or neutralised.

**Conclusion**

This chapter explored the dimensions of a heritage discourse as part of a broader attempt to foster gentrification in the transitional suburb of Mayfield. It highlighted the creation and reification of the discourse as a strategy of participation in the symbolic economy for some home-owning residents, for whom the heritage discourse was site for the creation, manipulation and editing of ideas about their own identities within the suburb. Both the idea of gentrification as key to economic regeneration, and participation in the symbolic economy are interlinked elements of post-Fordism,
as discussed in Chapter Two. In this way, the heritage discourse was key in the imagination of Mayfield as a place in transition, moving from Fordist to post-Fordist ways-of-knowing the suburb, hallmarked by the closure of BHP. Yet, there were challenges to this post-Fordist formulation of place and space. The heritage discourse excluded the opinions and practices of some of the suburb's least franchised residents, their images and practices that were implicit in the imagination of Mayfield as a place. These residents used the spaces and places of Mayfield in alternative ways that did not fit with the heritage discourse. As mentioned previously, this research explores a tension between Fordist and post-Fordist 'ways of knowing' Mayfield, especially in relation to its imagination as a deindustrialising place. Chapter Seven examines the spatial dimensions of these unofficial placemaking strategies, or ways-of-knowing Mayfield, revealing them as representative of the suburb's legacy as a form of industrial suburbia, redolent with the spatial arrangements of Fordism, as opposed to those that are post-industrial and post-Fordist.
Chapter Seven

Mayfield: A Transitional Space?

In Mayfield, deindustrialisation framed the image of Mayfield as a suburb in transition and mobilising the suburb's heritage emerged as central to the idea that the suburb was gentrifying. Heritage was an official 'way-of-knowing' place, organised by the suburb's most powerful stakeholders, positioned as a means to decouple the images of Mayfield's stigmatised (Fordist) industrial past from its (post-Fordist) future. Mayfield's heritage discourse was created in the positive: that is, defined by what it included, capitalising upon the suburb's heritage housing to rejuvenate the place and to ameliorate the negative consequences of an industrial past and deindustrialisation. Yet dominant discourses are also defined by what they exclude and seek to control, and in Mayfield's case there were elements of place and space that did not mesh with the image of the suburb as gentrifying. The heritage discourse invoked images of Mayfield's past as a genteel place. It emphasised the characteristics of the suburb's housing through a bifurcated narrative of movement and stillness where housing preservation was characterised by fixed and immobile notions of space and place. Even more broadly, the heritage discourse was imagined as part of broader linear processes of gentrification and transition. Examining social practices in Mayfield that evoke movement, immediacy and contingency, elements that contravene the edited, ossified and disembodied tropes of the heritage discourse enables a more nuanced understanding of Mayfield's putative transition.

In this chapter, the unofficial placemaking strategies and practices of some of Mayfield's most disenfranchised residents, their alternative 'ways of knowing' the suburb and attempts to control them are examined through the rubric of mobilities. What is revealed is a durable tension between 'Mayfield as a place in transition' and alternative readings of the suburb, Mayfield comprised of transitional spaces, revealing strong links to its Fordist, industrial past. Rather than a linear progression,
Mayfield's transition is complex and contested, representing vested interests and agendas, and interwoven with the spaces and places of the suburb's history. The chapter begins with an examination of loitering in Mayfield's public spaces and its relationship to discourses of gentrification in the suburb. It then moves to consider street-skating and efforts to contain this activity through the establishment of a skatepark. Beginning with Lefebvre's notion of the production of space, the research findings are interpreted with regard to the literature on mobilities and Auge's (1995) non-places. In this way these alternative practices and ways-of-knowing are identified as part of a broader theme of transition. Through the prism of mobilities, the practices that constitute Mayfield's unofficial discourse of transition are positioned as practices that are redolent with the spatial logics of the suburb's stigmatised industrial past. The chapter concludes by illustrating the key themes underpinning these unofficial ways-of-knowing Mayfield, and their implications for the imagination of the suburb as a transitional deindustrialising, gentrifying place, ultimately highlighting the tension at the intersection of Mayfield as Fordist versus Mayfield as post-Fordist place, a tension that lies at the heart of the processes of transition as it as practiced and lived.

Loitering and skateboarding are ways-of-knowing Mayfield, oriented around Mayfield's interstitial, transitional zones and focused on the intersection of activity, practice and movement. These unofficial uses and understandings of Mayfield's interstitial places and spaces antagonise the underlying themes of heritage-based gentrification.

**Loitering in Mayfield's public spaces**

It became clear that the image of Mayfield as gentrifying allowed for and condoned some uses of space while seeking to control or eliminate others. Soon after I commenced my research I noticed one group of Mayfield residents who routinely contravened the image of Mayfield as gentrifying. These residents occupied many of the suburb's most public places, sitting or lying on grass verges and seats and in carparks. Often engaged in public drinking and, less often, visible drug-taking, especially glue sniffing, the area surrounding the Woolworths supermarket was a particularly popular area for this group who I will refer to as 'loiterers'. Frequently
dirty, unkempt and half asleep, or having loud, animated conversations with others (and sometimes themselves) the loiterers were considered by the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee to be a serious problem in the area. Meetings of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee often involved some discussion about how to 'deal with' the illicit activities taking place in some of Mayfield's most visible public places.

I don't even know how we're going to deal with them [the loiterers outside the supermarket]...doesn't seem like they're going anywhere...[it's] a real image problem. (Dan MMC Meeting August 2005)

Six of the meetings I attended discussed possible ways of 'dealing' with this group, with meeting participants expressing resignation at their inability to address what they viewed as the problematic uses of the spaces around the supermarket, in particular. In response to an application in 2006 from a local business owner to establish another liquor outlet on Maitland Road the MMC cited already existing 'problems' with public drinking in the suburb, especially in and around the main street and the carpark and spaces surrounding the Woolworths supermarket. Even a cursory observation of everyday life in Mayfield reveals that a collection of green plastic seats outside the Woolworths supermarket on Maitland Road was one of the busiest gathering places in the suburb. During the day these seats were almost constantly occupied and provided the focal point for a lot of other activity along the street - from the banal, such as waiting for a taxi, to the more involved, including drug and alcohol use. As discussed in Chapter Five, the supermarket catered to both foot traffic and shoppers with cars, including a large number of shoppers from other areas of Newcastle (MMP 2003). The Woolworths supermarket is dominated by a large single level carpark (see Figure 7.0) that dictates the entry to the shop.
Although the supermarket attracts many pedestrian customers there are no clear crossing points or pathways into the shop, and some of the most obvious pedestrian access points are blocked off by small gardens, which had well-worn little paths walked through them. The message was clear: the outside of the supermarket was for cars. And yet, despite the overwhelming dominance of the car in the landscaping and architecture of the supermarket, there was a very busy social scene outside it that was undertaken by residents who usually had no access to cars. The seats in the front of the supermarket hosted a wide variety of people who adhered to shared, but subtle, patterns of use. For instance, I observed one group of older Croatian men who regularly gathered together on the seats around the middle of the day on various weekdays while their wives or daughters carried out their shopping inside. However, it was the activities of the 'loiterers' in particular that caused considerable anxiety for the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee and for some residents I spoke to who claimed that the presence of people 'hanging around' had a negative impact on the perception of the suburb.

'It's not like they're actually doing anything...wrong you know, they're not...I mean, if we could get the police to come to deal with it, but they're good [the police] but they know they're limited in what
they can do unless there's something [illegal] actually happening.
(Dan, MMC Meeting participant Aug 2005)

The size of the group of people who sat around the outside the supermarket varied between two and fifteen, and appeared to be dependent on the days of the week. One member of the MMC suggested the number of those loitering in the spaces surrounding the supermarket was directly related to the day people received their Centrelink (social security) payments. The majority of the group sitting on the chairs or on the ground during the day was men, although I witnessed four women who were 'regulars' as well. The group was sometimes referred to as 'the homeless' by others who used the space (such as local residents and supermarket shoppers I talked to), as well as members of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee. Discussions with members of the group revealed, however, that most of them were not homeless, although their accommodation was often tenuous. The four 'drinkers' I spoke to all lived in share accommodation that they were not happy with. The outside of the supermarket was, therefore, a good location for socialising and preferable to going/staying home. During the research, it became clear that the area outside the supermarket suited this group for a number of other practical reasons. The supermarket contained a bottle shop and so provided a logical meeting place for those who liked to drink during the day. There was also a public telephone near the seats that was used for drug dealing. The drugs, normally cannabis or, less often, heroin or methamphetamine ('ice') were left in the change slot of the phone and picked up by pre-arrangement. Alternatively the telephone was used to call dealers who then drove through the carpark to drop off the drugs to the waiting customers. The supermarket also participated in a work scheme that employed previous substance abusers and some of the 'trolley collectors' were friends of those who sat outside the supermarket. There was a constant flow of people going in and out of the supermarket and this traffic contributed to the area's sense of transience. Although the activities of the 'loiterers' were highly visible, most customers appeared to ignore them as they walked in and out of the supermarket.

The seats, their location and positioning, were well suited to 'passing' conversations because they lined the wall of the supermarket facing the carpark, which meant that conversationalists had to turn around to face one another if they wanted to talk face to face.
During my research it seemed that the kinds of conversations undertaken on the seats were quite incidental and non-committal, with participants looking out at the cars rather than each other. As the eaves of the supermarket were quite narrow they were actually very hot for about eight months of the year and so the 'loiterers' tended to move around the supermarket during the day, following patches of shade or finding areas that were protected from rain. The use of these spaces was key to making sense of their unsuitability for incorporation into the official gentrification discourse of the suburb. At one level, of course, public drinking, loitering and drug use are easily positioned as counter to the image of gentrification. Yet the loitering, public drinking and drug use in Mayfield's spaces revealed more about the subtle and nuanced ways-of-knowing the suburb. For instance, the heritage discourse enshrines, memorialises and ossifies images of the suburb into a discrete, disembodied pastiche of history with an emphasis on stillness. Viewing loitering through de Certeau's (1984) ideas about the construction of place and space positions it as counter to this image. As discussed in detail in Chapter Three, Lefebvre's (1991) and de Certeau's work on urban spaces
draws attention to the idea of the construction of urban spaces through praxis and movement. de Certeau's work is concerned with accounting for the spatial representations of power where power is arrested in scapes, or formulations of space ossified into dominant concepts of place. For de Certeau (1984) the aim of meaningful interaction in the city is the representation and actualisation of the self through interaction with the environment. Specifically, he describes strategies and tactics to conceptualise the process of making urban spaces, where strategies refer to the mainstream, dominant perceptions of space that shape and constrain the types of actions or movements that unfold within them and tactics are the uses of these spaces, that is, the integration of the experience of the spaces through use and interpretation (1984:106) in this case the gentrification discourse. de Certeau's work is particularly apposite for illuminating subversive ways-of-knowing place such as loitering where spaces are conceived of outside the dominant forms. In de Certeau's version, place and space are immediately and personally constructed, retrieved and evoked through personal interaction. de Certeau's (1984) ideas have been particularly influential in the study of protest spaces, examining the contingent ways in which people interpret and reformulated the explicit intentions 'designed' into spaces. Mayfield's loitering spaces resist definition. For the loiterers, the spaces come into being through their use, with little regard for the original or intended patterns of use suggested by their design. The key characteristic I observed in these places was their sense of unplanned use: they were the places 'in-between', created for the car and brought into being as locations for drinking or just 'hanging out'. The area around the Woolworths supermarket highlighted this most clearly. Two sides of the shop were dominated by the carpark and the back of the shop by a busy service entrance. The western side adjacent to the side-street was the location of large steel rubbish bins. Although there were no seats on this side of the supermarket, the bins and a tree planted on the verge provided some shade and along with the seats in the front of the shop the area was a popular place for the loiterers.

Behind the supermarket was another popular ‘loitering’ location that undermined the image of Mayfield as a gentrifying suburb - Alexandria Park.
Figure 7.2 Alexandria Park.

This small park was ‘connected’ to the supermarket in many ways but created in the spaces of the road. Supermarket employees used it for their work-breaks, and many of the people who ‘loitered’ on the seats out the front of Woolworths moved to the shady areas in the park in the middle of the day. Activities such as alcohol consumption were a little less constrained in this less visible space, and I often saw people sniffing glue there. The park appeared to be neglected by the Council maintenance workers in comparison with other parks in the area. It was mown less often and accumulated rubbish, some of it large items such as blankets and mattresses which were thrown into the storm-water drain that bisected the park. There were no rubbish bins there and the picnic tables were fixed in the sun rather than in the shade (as is the case in other parks in the area) possibly either to increase surveillance and discourage illicit behaviour or more simply, through poor design.
Other features of the park marginalised it in terms of its use. It had no clear ‘entrance’ and the main, most obvious access point was simply a curb beside the road, and there was no footpath between the road and the park. There was footway access at one end of the park but it was blocked by large guard-rails and there was only a small gap around the side of them, which often turned into a muddy trench after rain. The park presented as more of an unstructured verge between the road and the drain, rather than
as a park in itself. Finally, during the time I conducted research in Mayfield I never heard the park referred to by its name: Alexandria Park. It was simply known in relation to Woolworths (as in, 'behind Woolworths'). The only mention of the park in the interview data was by one resident who referred to it as 'useless' ground, because of mine subsidence. Neither was it viewed as a priority by the MMC, which did not mention it in meetings despite the fact that the park hosted some of the activities the members of the MMC were most concerned were having a deleterious impact on the image of the suburb. It seemed clear in the meetings of the MMC that Alexandria Park was far enough away from highly visible areas where loitering took place, such as around the front of the supermarket, to go unnoticed. There was also a border between the park and the surrounding houses created by a large fence, and the wide drain and therefore the activities there were not viewed as affecting the adjacent residents' houses. As the park 'faced' the loading bay of the supermarket it was dominated by trucks arriving, unloading and leaving. The park, with its poor (accidental) design and maintenance, appeared as an 'unintentional' or interstitial place, something which reflected in its use where illicit activity or simply 'hanging out' could go on relatively un-noticed as it did not conform to any given theme of the place. In other words, the lack of intentionality, of design and purpose meant the park was considered an inconsequential place where behaviours could take place that might contravene more proscribed notions of place and space in other areas in the suburb. Importantly though, the park was created and relegated by its surrounding roadways.

Further away from Maitland Road was another 'in-between' place also created by the roads that shape industrial Mayfield, the grassed verges abutting the main road, (Figure 7.4 below) Industrial Drive, on the northern edge of the suburb that separated the residential section of Mayfield East from the industrial area that used to contain BHP.
As in the case of the supermarket carpark and Alexandria Park, these verges were dominated by traffic, this time cars travelling on Industrial Drive. The trees on the verge were low-hanging which made walking through them quite difficult. The large grassed verge areas (approximately four metres wide) formed a visual barrier between the road and the housing and were further separated by considerable height at many points. The verges seemed almost clandestine, secreted away from passing drivers by leafy, low-hanging trees. Examining the small tracks, worn areas of ground and the collections of ‘rubbish’ along these verges it became clear that these areas were frequented quite often by people sitting under the trees. There was also a sense of unobtrusive surveillance in these places: from the position under the trees passing drivers would see very little of people on the verges. Standing on the verges I felt like I was ‘peering’ out at the traffic or the houses. There were also worn patches in tree branches where people had been sitting, and old chairs placed in key vantage points. There was another element to these verges - they provided a sense of safety for those using them. One could easily walk through the area and remain unseen but feel ‘secure’ in the knowledge that this was in fact a very public place because there were
thousands of people driving past. Closer observation revealed the many users of the area, from drug users to teenagers looking for somewhere to hang out with their friends, to the homeless. From my observations, there appeared to be approximately fifteen regular users of these verges and many more who were occasional users. Possibly the verges appealed to those who were often under forms of ‘legitimate’ surveillance in other places in Mayfield, public drinkers with few options in terms of places to drink and socialise would often drink on the street. The verges provided a place where these people could survey others - they could relax into ‘invisibility’ and observe others in what was actually a very public place.

The supermarket carpark, Alexandria Park, and the grass verges on the edge of Industrial Drive were linked together by the importance of cars and once dominant spaces of heavy industry. As described in Chapter Five, Mayfield was primarily built around the requirements of BHP and associated industries with the vast majority of its development unfolding in relation to the steelworks. Consequentially, Mayfield is laid out according to the patterns and aesthetics of planning at the time. It was built following the dictates of the suburban form of Fordism and industrial modernity that structured and organised places around industry and transport routes such as road and rail. The area in front of the Woolworths supermarket was organised to facilitate people passing though in cars, dictating the kinds of interactions people could have in the spaces that were not occupied by cars. For instance, people could sit on the seats and look out at the carpark, spectating on people coming-and-going in their cars. The car-activity was the central theme of the scape. Alexandria Park had similar characteristics: with no real foot access and positioned as auxiliary to the streets around it, the park's main focal point was the supermarket loading bay opposite it, and, of course, the cars driving past. Finally, the use of the verges alongside the aptly named Industrial Drive was strongly influenced by the cars passing by, which positioned the verges as both public and private spaces, and it is worth noting that Industrial Drive lies on the land once occupied by Mayfield's prominent market gardens. Thousands of people passed by the 'sitting' locations every day, but they were rendered distant through movement. The dominance of cars in the forming of these places contributed to a sense of impermanence and transience to those who used them. The places were constructed as neither here nor there, redolent with contingency, inconsequential spaces where the normally proscribed spatially
constrained norms were more relaxed and contingent, ordered around the constant movement of traffic from one place to another, where the space in between was constructed in the negative. These interstitial places and spaces in Mayfield were often the ones that were occupied by some of the suburb's most transient and disadvantaged residents. They were suburban and industrial rather than post-industrial, Fordist rather than post-Fordist, representing Mayfield's past rather than its future, and its 'users' represented the suburb's past as stigmatised and marginalised. In other words, these car-spaces had implications for the types of practices that took place in these locations. Mayfield's loitering places were 'passing through' places, places where circumscribed, edited notions of place and space, such as the idea of Mayfield as a gentrifying suburb, were in tension.

The idea of places as interstitial, meaningless sites oriented around the dominance of moving or passing through resonates with the literature on mobilities discussed in Chapter Three. In particular, Ross (1995) explores and develops Baudrillard's ideas about the construction and perception of urban space through the technology of the car. Ross (1995) discusses the cultural symbolism of cars and space, positioning cars as a technology of spatial production that 'inverts' the technologies of the media. The movements of cars produce images of the world outside the car akin to the images presented on film or television. For Ross (1995) driving in a car is contingent in the production of flattened, denatured or distanciated spaces. In this version of urban space and place, cars generate and occupy their own peculiar regimes of spatiality. They are an important trope in a cartography of overlapping and intersecting notions of space producing their own symbolic regimes of disembodied speed, transition and distance. Using this idea, car-spaces become a site for the through-put of images, rather than the interpretation of the images themselves. Urry (2007) cites the proliferation of the car as contingent in projects of the self, shaping experiences of the 'outside' world. Urry's (1999, 2003) work also examines the production and objectification of urban places and spaces through the technology of the car, developing the idea of car-spaces, positioning the car as crucial to understanding the cultural dimensions of space as perceived by people who construct it through movement in transport technologies. As discussed in Chapter Three, Auge (1995) takes this idea further, arguing that not only do cars construct spaces for those who travel in them, but also for those outside them. He argues for a praxial notion of space
and place, that is, that personhood and space are mutually constitutive, these spaces shape and guide the types of uses and experiences of them. For Auge, the consequences of high-speed transport that hyphenates or distanciates movement from stillness is realised through 'non-spaces', which are governed, oriented and organised around the logic of cars. In other words, the focus is on the implications of non-places both for those directly experiencing the flattening or inverting of images through the speed of transport, and the creation of the places themselves.

For Mayfield's car-places, the places primarily organised around cars, it was the use of these non-places by residents without access to cars that had the most significant implications for the suburb's perception. Mayfield's loitering places were spoken about by residents as 'out-of-the-way' places, yet for two of them (located around the Woolworths supermarket) it was their prominence that was the cause of most attempts to deal with the activities that took place in them. Auge's (1995) work helps explain why such prominent spaces should be talked about as out-of-the-way. Auge (1995) argues that non-places are redolent with transitionality, their key organising agenda is neither here nor there. In this way, some of Mayfield's most disenfranchised residents experience and produce the suburb as a transitional place in ways that are different to the transitionality presented in the official discourses of Mayfield, oriented around the idea of the suburb as moving from one set of spatial arrangements (Fordist industrialism) to post-Fordist. In Mayfield, the supermarket carpark, the grassy verges beside Industrial Drive, and the park behind Woolworths were all strongly influenced by the movements and agendas of cars. All three areas were structured around cars, and talked about as interstitial, inconsequential places by their users, such as shoppers at the supermarket, or loiterers that sat on the seats outside the supermarket. The 'loitering' spaces of Mayfield that were constructed in homage to cars reflected the kind of baseless or meaningless facade of images that cars propagate, which in turn impacts on the ways in which 'loiterers' use them: as if the illicit behaviours undertaken in these spaces are less meaningful than in other places. In this way Mayfield's interstitial places are markers of the suburb's transitionality and identity as a stigmatised transitional 'passing through' place, its 'negative' spaces being neither here nor there resonating with the spatial logics of industrial Fordism (McCann 1995). Again, transitionality is key to making sense of place and space in Mayfield, but this time, unlike the heritage discourse, it is mobilised through the themes of interstitiality.
and contingency in the construction of Mayfield's loitering spaces, themes that contravene the dominant, official discourse of Mayfield as a gentrifying place. Both ways-of-knowing Mayfield, the official and unofficial are oriented around the idea of transitionality. In the official version, Mayfield is viewed as a suburb in transition, but in the second, unofficial version, Mayfield is a transitional space for passing through. That is, Mayfield's loitering spaces comprise an unofficial discourse of placemaking in the suburb, where places are brought into being in an immediate and contingent way, something that transgresses the discrete, distanced and ossified discourse of Mayfield as gentrifying realised through the mobilisation of heritage.

Mayfield's loitering spaces were strongly influenced by the movements of cars in the area, which contributed the perception of places as good or appropriate places to perform some activities and not others. Like loitering, street-skating was another use of public space in Mayfield, and especially its roadways that was considered to be anti-social or non-conformist by those who were interested in the production of the discourse of Mayfield as gentrifying. And street-skating also brought places into being in an immediate way, making and remaking the spaces in the suburb through contingent, un-proscribed, everyday uses, and in this way, was linked to the idea of Mayfield as transitional place. Yet, unlike Mayfield's loitering places skateboarding in the suburb became the subject of (successful) attempts to control or contain it through the establishment of a skatepark in a local park, Dangar Park (see Figure 7.6 for location of Dangar Park). The processes leading to the construction of the Dangar Park skatepark illustrated the dominant discourse of transition in the suburb ordered around heritage-based gentrification. It highlights the exclusion, and ultimately, attempts to contain, street-skaters. So, although the skatepark was the culmination of lobbying from local skaters, it was strongly supported by the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee who saw it as a way to contain the ‘problem’ of skateboarding in Mayfield, and this support contributed to Council's agreement to build the facility.

**The Dangar Skatepark**

Mayfield's skatepark is located in Dangar Park on Maitland Road which is the most prominent park in the suburb. Dangar Park includes a band-stand, a cricket/rugby
pitch, and the Mayfield public swimming pool (Figure 7.6). The rugby field was the location of many local games revealing strong local support for team sports as legitimate forms of leisure. The skatepark was built by the Newcastle City Council, with work commencing at the end of 2005, and the park opened in July 2006. The skatepark is a moderately large installation, approximately fifty metres long and thirty metres wide, including surrounding seating. The park has two main areas, and a variety of ramps and street-skating jumps. During the period of time that I was specifically observing the skatepark during 2006, it was difficult to find a time when it was not being used, even during the night. Mayfield’s skateboarders travelled to and from the new skatepark on their boards, encountering the suburb in their own way as they went. The skatepark was popular with skateboarders. According to the Newcastle City Council’s Cultural Planning Officer and the Mayfield Mainstreet Co-ordinator it exceeded the expectations of the City Council and local community groups. Simple observation showed the park's popularity. During peak periods (after school hours) it was often so busy that skaters had to queue to use the ramps and sliders. The skatepark attracted a wide range of users of all ages and backgrounds and subtle patterns of use emerged as the facility became more established, with younger people using the park at certain times and older skaters coming later in the evening.

![Figure 7.5 The Mayfield Skatepark is situated at the Maitland Road end of Dangar Park](image)
Figure 7.6 Dangar Park as seen from Maitland Road
Figure 7.7 Mayfield Skatepark

Figure 7.8 Skaters at Dangar Park Skatepark
According to the Mayfield Mainstreet Co-ordinator the establishment of the Dangar Park skatepark was initially suggested by a Mayfield resident on behalf of his son and his son's friend, who were both skateboarders. The plan initially drew a degree of trepidation from the local community who expressed concerns over 'wild' youth. These concerns apparently included a feared increase in crime and disorder in the local area. Indeed, even after the park had been in operation for several months, some local residents continued to view it as a site for illicit or disruptive behaviour. This was an issue that emerged at one Mayfield Mainstreet Meeting in late 2006 with members of the committee discussing residents' reactions to the park in general terms, noting that although there was support for the park, it was also the subject of significant concerns from residents living in the surrounding houses who apparently were uneasy about the skatepark, and feared that it would condone or encourage 'anti-social' behaviour, and cast a negative image on the suburb. According to local resident, Bill, who was involved in the establishment of the skatepark:

...they (Mayfield residents) just don't want the hassle, you know the noise, and the potential, I mean, it's not as if, you can't immediately think that just cause there's a skatepark ....that there's automatically going to be one problem or...problems. It's just they're thinking about crime and noise and that sort of thing. It's mainly the people living right around it, you know, thinking about the kids going to and from [the skatepark], and just encouraging that movement [through that area of the suburb]. (Interview, Bill, 2006)

The main impetus for supporting the skatepark (especially for the MMC) was to constrain the activities of the street-skaters - simply, to get them and their perceived 'anti-social' behaviour off the street. So, the skatepark came into being through two main factors - push from local skateboarders and enthusiasm from community organisations such as the MMC, who were interested in managing the activity. The planning and implementation of the skatepark was a political process that revealed the power of gatekeepers in trying to shape the image of Mayfield. The MMC had the ability to exercise influence over the types of activities and practices that would contribute to the perception of the suburb, especially in some of its most visible spaces, such as around the main road. For the MMC the establishment of the
skatepark formed part of broader efforts to manufacture or present an image of the suburb as the site for some activities and not others. The MMC emphasised the negative aspects of street-skating in meetings I attended saying that it was these elements that led them to support the Council's decision to build the skatepark. The MMC did not fabricate accounts of street-skating as having a negative image in the suburb, rather, they provided the institutional means to formalise and represent these concerns in the case for a skatepark.

The concerns and perceptions of the skatepark’s detractors are difficult to locate - they were unfocused, and could be characterised generally as a sense of unease about skateboarding as part of youth culture in general. Some participants in my research expressed the opinion that although the park would potentially increase the amount of ‘skate traffic’ with skaters travelling to and from the facility and also using the surrounding areas, the skaters had to 'go somewhere'. Residents who were opposed to the skatepark and street-skaters themselves talked about the (undesirable) propensity for skaters to use the streets, curbs, gutters and other public spaces of the suburb for skating. Many residents who were interviewed framed street-skating as disruptive and anti-social, and the skaters also talked about street-skating as if it was a subversive activity. Two skaters used the term 'punk' to refer to street-skating, as if the activity transgressed socially accepted norms of behaviour. Both groups relayed the opinion that it was somewhat inevitable that skaters were going to ‘transgress’ and that without the park this would continue to take the form of taking risks and renegotiating the boundaries of 'legitimate' space, claiming and reclaiming places in the neighbourhood for themselves. Thus, the Mayfield skatepark was positioned by those interested in maintaining the image of Mayfield as in transition from stigmatised place to gentrified future as helping to contain or manage street-skating in the suburb.

…it's given them [skateboarders] somewhere to go, kind of dealt with how...or where, you know, off the street. (MMC Co-ordinator 2006)

The MMC was keen to point out that the elements of skateboarding its members were interested in 'dealing with' were the perceived dangers of skateboarders using footpaths and other features in the streetscape. But the perception of skateboarding as an anti-social activity remained evident through the uses of the skatepark. According
to discussions with skaters, the Dangar Park skatepark attracted some of the skaters who frequented a skatepark on the Newcastle waterfront, opposite one of the most popular surf beaches in Newcastle. According to one member of the MMC, who reflected on the way the skatepark had come to fruition, these skaters were referencing Newcastle's 'tough' surfer image. This member of the MMC had been surfing in Newcastle for most of his life, and for him, Newcastle's surfing culture had a 'tough' or masculine image. He made the point that although movements to open surfing up to women and girls, such as clinics and fun days had had some success, a strong competitive, masculine discourse of risk and thrill-seeking played a significant role in the perception of surfing in Newcastle. He compared Newcastle's surfing culture with other surfing locations on the east coast of Australia, such as Sydney, describing Newcastle's surf culture as violent, masculine and anti-social. He was concerned that skaters using the new Dangar Park facility would continue the 'tough' image seen at the Newcastle Beach skatepark. The image of skateboarding as a tough or anti-social activity was important to the way it was positioned in terms of the broader, emerging official discourse of Mayfield as slowly gentrifying through the realisation and capitalisation of its rich heritage.

You can't have people...kids...hurtling around [street-skating], up and down the place all the time. (MMC Committee member, discussing the justification for the skatepark as part of efforts to 'clean up' the main street, August 2005)

This position was revealed in particular through the planning and consultation process regarding the skatepark. The image of skateboarding as tough or masculine and positioned in relation to other skateparks and skateboarding areas in the broader Newcastle area was also evidenced through my discussions with members of the MMC and skaters about how entrenched social hierarchies and cultural values associated with skateboarding would play out at the new Dangar Park facility. Interviews with skaters at the park attested to the social hierarchies oriented around a masculine anti-social sub-culture. Interviewed prior to the Dangar Park's skatepark's opening, one interviewee (aged approximately 18), and a skater who used the Newcastle Beach skatepark positioned the new park as a 'blank slate'. In his opinion, there would be a period of 'working out' where local skaters would strive to establish
the kinds of hierarchies that already existed at other skateboarding facilities in the Newcastle area:

I reckon it’s gonna be interesting, just to see…how the place gets started, if that thing from the others, if it’s the same as the other ramps [Newcastle skateparks]. It’s gonna be interesting, cause there’s some guys, you know who kind of own, well, not own but they um, they sort of control the place. (Interview, Danny, skater and Mayfield resident, 2005)

There were several discussions at Mayfield Mainstreet Committee meetings about the ways in which the Dangar skatepark would fit into the broader patterns of ‘anti-social’ activities in Newcastle, such as surfing and skateboarding. Skateboarding was talked about negatively by some members of the MMC as being emblematic of youth crime. Importantly, several members agreed that although they personally did not believe that young skateboarders were necessarily responsible for anti-social behaviour such as tagging and petty vandalism in the suburb, the community perception was that they were and these were key markers of a status the MMC wished to transcend. One member of the committee cited the community discord over the skatepark during its planning stages as evidence of the negative view of skateboarding. He recounted conversations with residents who talked about the possible impacts around their homes.

I felt you know, that I couldn't help them, you know, I had nothing to…no way…nothing to say to them about it. I've got no answers to that. I'm not sure…it's not my opinion [that the skatepark would bring negative impacts to surrounding houses] but it's [the opinion] out there. (MMC Member, MMC meeting, verbatim quote, meeting notes, August 2005)

Although the skatepark was officially opened in July 2006, it had been completed and in use for several months prior to this. And, as Danny (quoted above) surmised, the park attracted a wide range of users for the first few months after it was open. Compared with the skatepark adjacent to Newcastle Beach, which although busy,
appeared to be frequented by 'cohorts' of skaters (similar ages who seemed to know one another), the Dangar Park skatepark hosted a very wide variety of skateboarders from groups of very young skaters to older skaters in their thirties and forties, all using different parts of the park. Sustained periods of observation revealed that these groups maintained demarcations, generally divided along lines of skill (first) and age (second), and used different parts of the ramps. Personal conversations with some of the skaters revealed that many had come from other areas of Newcastle, some had taken the bus from as far away as Charlestown (14kms to the south of Mayfield) and one group said they often took the train from suburbs even further to the south (both areas involve around an hour's travel time). This ‘diversity’ was largely a feature of the first couple of months, but it changed significantly following the official opening and 'Fun Day' organised by the Mayfield Mainstreet Co-ordinator:

There was a great turn-out, really...young and old, heaps of young people, we had food and, yeah, a really family fun day out. (MMC Co-Ordinator, Interview 27th June 2006 - two days after the official opening of the Dangar Park skatepark)

The official opening and Fun Day, although well attended, seemed to have a dampening effect on the use of the skatepark altering its patronage quite significantly. The official opening and Fun Day emphasised the skatepark as a suburban park where inclusive, family-oriented recreation could take place. This image was somewhat incongruous with the traditional skate theme more oriented around anti-establishment activities and the skaters who appeared to subscribe to this image seemed to leave the skatepark perhaps in favour of other skating areas, such as the Newcastle Beach skatepark. A few months later however the numbers of skaters at the skatepark rose again in an unexpected way as the result of a new activity taking place at the skatepark - night skating.

Six months after the skatepark's opening the two youths who had initially requested the skatepark be built attended a meeting of the MMC and asked for lighting to be installed at the park. This was discussed at several Mainstreet Committee meetings, however the general consensus was that lighting the skatepark would encourage crime by increasing the number of youth loitering around the venue at night, despite the fact
that the rear part of Dangar Park (too far away from the skatepark to provide light) was lit already seemingly without such problems. The lighting issue was raised and denied at subsequent meetings, but in the meantime a small group of skaters had already begun to use the park during the night, despite the dangers and difficulties involved in skating in the dark. This rather dangerous activity realigned the skatepark with more traditional tropes of skateboarding, described above, and according to my observations of the skatepark, brought more skaters back to the park. It seemed to reassert the park's position as an ‘authentic’ skate-place. According to Beale, (1996) a key ordering trope in skateboarding is its anti-establishment, protest ‘punk’-ness, which challenge mainstream, ordered notions of sport oriented around control of the body. This idea certainly explains Mayfield's night skaters, who resisted the 'mainstreaming' of the park that occurred through its official opening and positioning as suburban community resource, and sought to realise their legitimacy as skaters through using the park in an un-sanctioned way. The activity seemed to work against the agenda of the MMC and conform to the image of the suburb that it was seeking to transcend.

The uses and activities carried out at the skatepark as part of attempts to maintain its core legitimacy reveal the underlying tropes of skateboarding as a practice that constructs places through interaction and movement, or mobility and therefore resistant to proscribed notions of space. Like loitering, skateboarding in Mayfield prior to the establishment of the skatepark capitalised on the contingent, immediate and personal construction of space and place through involvement and activity. The establishment of the skatepark was an attempt to 'tame' skating and drew these key organising principles into sharp relief, as skaters attempted to reassert the non-conformist uses of space by contravening the proscribed dictates of the skatepark, through night-skating in particular. The establishment of Mayfield's skatepark illustrated and mapped out the official and unofficial discourses of transition in the suburb in intriguing ways. The idea of Mayfield as mobilising elements of its heritage as part of a broader process of gentrification was necessarily in direct tension with a different reading of the suburb's transitionality. In this case, skateboarding was positioned as a subversive or anti-social activity, which was out of 'character' with the emerging discourse of the suburb as a gentrifying place in transition, rather than transitional space, a space for moving through, a space that is stigmatised. At the
same time however, the establishment of the skatepark provided a means by which to try and sanitise, control and account for the practice of skateboarding in the suburb, and its positioning as a neighbourhood space (the 'Fun Day') further reinforced this control. In response, however, skateboarders resisted attempts to proscribe their behaviour by reasserting the non-conformity of their use of the skatepark through night skating. Viewed in de Certeau's terms, the skatepark represented the spatial domestication or containment of an activity that was actively invoking the spaces of Mayfield in immediate, un-proscribed and contingent ways. In other words, like loitering, street-skating resisted proscribed notions of place by producing and reproducing the meanings associated with space and place through action and movement. Lefebvre's (1991) work takes this idea further, positioning the skatepark as highlighting abstract space and constructed social space. As I discussed in Chapter Three, Lefebvre (1991:353) identifies the tendency for abstract, modelled space, to become reified into concrete space, to colonise, occupy, shape and order the symbolic, expressed, lived experiences and memories of concrete space. Apprehending 'real' space requires a process of recognition of the abstract as one expression of space, rather than a totalising or complete example of space. For Lefebvre, this is key to making sense of a dialectic of space. Skateboarding and loitering both presented a challenge to the official discourse of Mayfield as gentrifying, that is, an abstraction of part of the suburb's spatiality that was edited and intended to stand for or represent the transition in and of the suburb. For some, such as the MMC, the Mayfield skatepark was established to control, account for, and apprehend these immediate ways-of-knowing space and place which were embedded in what they regarded as the suburb's stigmatised past, domesticating skateboarding into a knowable format that meshed more appropriately with the image of Mayfield as gentrifying. More specifically, skateboarding (prior to the establishment of the skatepark) and loitering in the streets and carparks of Mayfield confronted and transgressed the ordering trope of heritage-based gentrification, oriented around the preservation of discrete time 'capsules', represented in heritage housing as disconnected from everyday life. It was here that the tensions between the two versions of knowing Mayfield, the official and unofficial refracted the tension between the suburb's Fordist past and its post-Fordist future.
Keeping in mind the framework of unofficial versus official discourses of knowing Mayfield which are at the heart of the idea of place in transition, skateboarding, like loitering, can be further apprehended with regard to the literature on mobilities. Street-skating involved the interstitial places and spaces of Mayfield such as driveways, footpaths, and carparks, highlighting their visibility as places where subversive or contingent activity could take place. Street-skating shared characteristics with loitering in that it immediately constructed and produced interstitial spaces and places through movement, and it rendered spaces and places in Mayfield as unproscribed, contingent and immediate, resonating with the practices and strategies that also played out through loitering. The loiterers' interstitial spaces refracted the logic of the car. These were spaces created for the car, spaces that mark the suburb as a place for passing through. And, with street-skating the construction of space and place was unfixed, dialectical and immediate. Both groups were 'playing out' or realising ways-of-knowing Mayfield oriented around transience, of space as a site for the movement of images, rather than the 'fixing' of images, as in the heritage-gentrification discourse. In other words, Mayfield's skaters and loiterers produced transitional spaces that were in opposition to the official discourse of heritage-based gentrification, oriented around the idea of Mayfield as a place in transition.

**Conclusion**

This chapter discussed the immediacy of skateboarding and loitering as key to contingent version of space and place that characterised the suburb as comprised of transitional spaces and link with its stigmatised industrial past, as opposed to the official image of Mayfield as a suburb in transition to transcend this past. In the case of street-skating, it was this logic of interstitiality and transition that underpinned attempts to control, sanitise or domesticate it through the establishment of the skatepark, therefore ultimately subordinating it within the gentrification discourse of transition. Mayfield's loiterers presented a more intractable disruption to the gentrification discourse, as their activities and uses of the suburb's places were less easily contained. Loitering and street-skating, both unofficial, unsanctioned practices producing transitional 'ways-of-knowing' Mayfield and were markers of a place identity that antagonised images of the suburb as gentrifying. They reconstituted the
spatial logics of Mayfield as a Fordist, working-class industrial suburb that was constructed around cars and heavy industry and developed a negative image as a result. The skaters and loiterers were markers of the suburb's stigmatised industrial past. The loiterers 'played out' the transitional logic of car-spaces through their practices, while the skaters also invoked the logic of suburban car-oriented Fordist spaces engaging with space and place in immediate, un-proscribed and contingent ways.

This chapter sought to illustrate the lived and contested spaces of transitionality as revealed in a transitional suburb. Illuminating the cultural narratives and tropes that ordered unofficial, unsanctioned discourses of place in the suburb, these uses of space contrasted with the official place-transition discourse maintained and perpetuated by some of the suburb's gatekeepers. Ultimately, the examination of Mayfield's official and unofficial discourses of knowing Mayfield reveals a tension at the intersection of Fordist and post-Fordist urban space. Mayfield's development trajectory, real or imagined, is not bifurcated between two images of the place. Rather, deindustrialisation and transition open up a discursive space or site within which images of the suburb's future are negotiated and contested in the context of its past. Fordism and post-Fordism are not fixed models of place, rather they are poles around which images of the Mayfield's future pivot. Attempts to secure or control images of the suburb's future highlights the theme of transitionality; for the heritage-gentrifiers Mayfield is positioned as moving both forward and backward, using images of a pre-industrial suburb to inform the future of the place as post-industrial. For the loiterers and skaters it is the spaces and places of Fordism, increasingly marginalised by, and through, the shift to post-Fordism and alternative images of the suburb that are sites for contingent and immediate forms of subversive placemaking. Chapter Eight develops a more fine-grained analysis of this tension, identifying synergies between the official and unofficial discourses of placemaking in Mayfield and the broader literature on the cultural implications of post-Fordism and the production of urban space, especially in regard to consumption.
Chapter Eight

Transition and the commodification of place

The closure of the BHP steelworks in the Australian city of Newcastle was the starting point for this thesis. With its large site and workforce the steelworks played, and continues to play a significant role in the suburb of Mayfield and Newcastle more generally. BHP had long been held responsible for Mayfield's status as a polluted working class suburb, and its closure and the subsequent job losses was positioned as the latest in a long line of negative impacts on the suburb associated with the plant and the processes of deindustrialisation unfolding in Australian cities more generally. Yet, as the closure came and went, an alternative view emerged, one that emphasised the putative positive aspects of the steelwork's closure, positioning Mayfield as newly released from the strictures of its stigmatised industrial past. The closure was spruiked as an opportunity for Mayfield to develop its potential as a desirable middle class suburb.

That the closure of an industry that had been such a prominent economic and symbolic generator could represent a positive change in Mayfield highlighted broader ideas of renewal and rejuvenation at work. As the processes of deindustrialisation unfold across cities of the western world, planning has changed to reflect the increasing importance of the images associated with urban places. Where previously planning was primarily concerned with securing the economic success of cities by organising and providing infrastructure and suitable housing for a workforce, newer forms of post-industrial planning attempt to foster a sense of 'place' as one in a regime of economic generators oriented around the consumption of the cultural aspects of a city. Further, this form of planning is increasingly charged with ameliorating the negative impacts of deindustrialisation. It was against this backdrop that I became interested in investigating the images of Mayfield that were developing in the context of the closure of the BHP steelworks. An understanding of something as diverse and diffuse as notions of place in a large suburb such as Mayfield required a strategic
approach that identified and investigated key themes and then interrogated them with respect to both relevant literature, as well as ongoing participant observation and interviews. Through an iterative research methodology I developed an understanding of the contested nature of the creation of images of Mayfield. Early on it became clear that there were two discourses at work in the imagination of Mayfield as a place: the official, held by institutionalised interests and gatekeepers over the suburb's imagined future, and the unofficial, often played out or represented through the practices of some of the suburb's most marginalised residents. Probing this dichotomy guided the research as I interrogated ways-of-imagining/knowing Mayfield that emanated from both the 'top' (the institutional), and the 'bottom' (the everyday).

The activities of the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee formed an early and prominent example of organised, institutionalised attempts to manipulate the images associated with the suburb in the wake of BHP's closure. The MMC, with support from the Newcastle City Council, tapped into broader ideas about city renewal and regeneration, developing and implementing initiatives that sought to reimage the suburb. Gentrification was positioned as an opportunity made possible by BHP's closure as well as a strategy for dislodging the stigma associated with the suburb's industrial past. Gentrification was discussed by some of the gatekeepers of images of Mayfield's past and future as an unstoppable process unfolding in the suburb, despite little evidence that gentrification was actually taking place.

As discussed in the thesis, deindustrialisation provided the impetus and focus for the first 'official' discourse of transition in Mayfield centred on gentrification and the idea of the suburb as having a rich (pre-industrial heritage) stock of heritage housing which was a 'hidden treasure' that could be mobilised as part of the project of gentrification. This positive aspect of Mayfield was positioned as 'uncovered', only coming to the surface with the closure of BHP. Powerful local actors such as the Mayfield Mainstreet Committee mobilised elements of the suburb's history through projects like the heritage walks to foster a sense of value and prestige in the area. Mayfield's pre-industrial heritage was a resource for the regeneration of the suburb's streetscapes and housing aesthetics. And although heritage was a way of connecting with the suburb's pre-industrial past with a view to defusing the negative images associated with its industrial legacy, it also invoked wider, established tropes of
heritage that engendered a sense of history, timeless and solidity, especially valuable in a suburb with a relatively high turnover of residents. Clearly, the heritage discourse appealed to many existing home-owners who were interested in increasing the capital value of their houses through gentrification. Yet, a straightforward increase in property values was not the only desirable outcome of the heritage discourse. I argue in the thesis that heritage provided a means through which Mayfield residents could play out and realise regimes of cultural capital and value production through the preservation of their houses. In this way, these 'heritage' houses were commodified beyond the simple fact that they were owner-occupied homes. 'Heritage' houses provided the means by which home-owning residents could exert influence over images of the suburb's future, and reinterpret its past. In this official version of knowing place, Mayfield was a suburb in transition from stigmatised industrial suburb to a gentrified post-industrial future. This was the theme that guided the interventions of institutional actors such as the MMC and Newcastle City Council.

The idea that the closure of BHP would theoretically 'free up' the suburb from its stigmatised industrial past and allow it to realise its future as a desirable gentrified suburb referenced wider ideas about the reimaging of cities following deindustrialisation which were analysed in the thesis. For instance, the notion that renewal and regeneration was/is a way of addressing the impacts of deindustrialisation fits within a neoliberal agenda, as gentrification 'improves' an area largely through private investment. More subtly, the official version of Mayfield as a suburb in transition mobilised the suburb's heritage as a site for the contestation and establishment of cultural capital and symbolic value. Mayfield as a gentrified place was intrinsically connected with the processes of value-making carried out by home-owners and gatekeepers such as the MMC. In this view, gentrification is a theme or narrative that guides the production of values oriented around and through the heritage aesthetic.

The production of cultural regimes of value can be located within the symbolic economy and are embedded within a broader planning orthodoxy in which the spheres of work, creativity and home are blended together to create 'place'. In the post-Fordist model, planning positions places as commodities which are part of the symbolic economy, and therefore critical to the success of cities. Place is no longer the
backdrop to the processes of production and consumption; rather, it is contingent in both. This holistic framework however is not limited to the ambit of post-Fordist urban planning. Lefebvre's work argues that urban place and space are intrinsically connected with, and through, the social, technological and economic processes of a period. Lefebvre's triadic conceptualisation of place situates the official discourse of Mayfield as a suburb in transition, a discourse that references the processes and discourses of post-Fordist planning. Although the official discourse of Mayfield looked toward notions of gentrification and the commodification of places, my research found that the legacy of Mayfield's industrial past remained, sometimes subtle, sometimes prominent, in the suburb's ideoscapes. In other words, Mayfield's industrial history was embedded, imagined and built into and through the suburb's places and spaces. It resonated through more subtle and nuanced practices of place, producing alternative unofficial ways-of-knowing Mayfield. The idea of Mayfield as 'transitioning' from its industrial past into a post-industrial future was revealed through my research as being 'messier', contested and more diffuse than the official representation suggested. And again, patterns of power and franchise were mapped onto this untidy dichotomy. Where institutionalised groups and homeowners represented their interests and agendas through the official discourse of Mayfield as a suburb in transition (to a post-industrial future), Mayfield's stigmatised industrial history was represented by the suburb's most marginalised residents, those with the least access to formal channels of influence over images of the suburb and for whom the discourse of gentrification was at best inaccessible, and at worst held negative implications for their continued tenure in the suburb. Through practices such as skateboarding and loitering these residents simultaneously invoked and played out the marginalised spaces of Mayfield that were formed around the technologies and processes of suburbia, especially the dominance of the car. Yet, the theme of transition emerged once again as important.

The practices of Mayfield's skaters and loiterers were guided by the notion of transition, but in very different ways to the 'gentrifiers'. These residents were representatives of the suburb's stigmatised status as comprised of transitional spaces, spaces of transience and transgression. In this version of knowing place, Mayfield was a transitional space rather than a suburb in transition. By appropriating and incorporating the disused or marginal spaces of Mayfield into ways-of-knowing place
these residents highlighted the elements of the suburb's industrial past that the gentrification discourse sought to transcend or control. Again, Lefebvre's idea that space and place are produced through the processes and technologies of the period proved useful because as discussed in Chapter Four, it brought to mind a view of suburbia as constructed of transitional spaces emblematic of the spatial logic of car travel as discussed in Chapter Four. Mayfield's carparks and road verges were inculcated into social patterns and practices that refracted the spatial logic of an industrial suburb oriented around the car.

Chapters Five, Six and Seven probed the two discourses of Mayfield, the official - Mayfield as a suburb in transition - and the unofficial - Mayfield as comprised of transitional spaces. Both these ways-of-knowing Mayfield are framed by the shift from Fordism to post-Fordism and this context helps make sense of the tension between them. For those invested in the heritage discourse the images of Mayfield's stigmatised industrial past represented by the skaters and loiterers were unwelcome and they sought to control and domesticate their marginal activities and as the thesis argued they attained some degree of success through the establishment of a skatepark. More broadly, although the closure of BHP was positioned as the hallmark of Mayfield's deindustrialisation by those wishing to forward an image of the suburb as gentrifying, the transition from Fordist suburbia to post-Fordist gentrifying suburb was not a linear progression. Rather, the idea of the suburb 'transitioning' that emerged in response to deindustrialisation opened up a discursive space for competing spatial practices to be observed. Mayfield as a transitional space was characterised by seemingly contradictory images of place and practices of place that pivoted on access to regimes of power and franchise in the suburb.

**Fordism to post-Fordism, a transition?**

Examining the nuances of both the official and unofficial discourses of transition in Mayfield demonstrates that although Fordist and post-Fordist spaces are different and easily positioned as emblematic of the two historical economic and social regimes, they can also be positioned as linked through the wider rubric of capitalism. As described in Chapter Four, capitalism is more than an economic regime, it shapes and
organises social and cultural images of place, through the spatial and technological arrangements of the period. Lefebvre's (1991) theoretical model highlights resonances between the ways in which both Fordist and post-Fordist spaces resemble, reflect and produce, and are produced by, the economic conditions of capitalism. In Lefebvre's triadic formulation images of place and space are socially contingent and intertwined in the creation of urban geographies. For instance, the spaces of industrial Fordism are projections of economic patterns and processes of mass consumption as well as technologies, such as the car. On the other hand, post-Fordist places represent the importance of the symbolic economy, where housing becomes the site for the careful manipulation of images incorporated into regimes of cultural capital and social distinction. As discussed in the thesis both the official and unofficial discourses of place in Mayfield pivot on the idea of transition. Further analysis of this finding using Lefebvre's work suggests possible connections between the two versions of practising place. The production of space, in Lefebvre's terms, is intrinsically coupled with the economic conditions of capitalism. Theorists inspired by Baudrillard's (1983) notion of hyperreality suggest that heritage is a form of commodification, a site that hosts images, rather than establishing meaning, the 'flow' of images akin to the fetishisation of objects, where places are disembodied and consumed. Heritage is a commodity within the symbolic economy. Yet, the processes of capitalist exchange are also evident in the (Fordist) spaces of suburbia, where the car produces spaces or non-places as Auge (1995) suggests, flattened, dehistoricised spaces that again privilege the 'flow' of images rather than their meaning. The transitionality of images remains central to both versions of place. In Lefebvre's terms both versions of place represent the processes of capitalist exchange. And, as explained in the thesis Lefebvre's spatial dialectic holds that space shares the same form as the general value of commodities. In other words, the processes of capitalist exchange, uncoupled and oriented around increasingly fetishised objects are spatialised; there is a connection between the meta-logic of capitalist exchange, and the ‘form’ of urban space. In this (Marxist) reading, the patterns and processes of capitalism are (re)produced by, between and through space, and Fordism and post-Fordism are incarnations of the relations and patterns of capitalist exchange, ultimately resulting in the commodification of places. So, in Mayfield, the spatial representations of Fordism are not increasingly irrelevant with a view to being eventually superceded; rather under conditions of transition they represent the underlying conditions and logic of capitalist exchange that remain
germane to an understanding of both images of a Fordist past, and imagined post-
Fordist future. Further investigation of these ideas is beyond the scope of this thesis 
but presents a rich vein for further investigation.

The central proposition of this thesis, however, emerges from Lefebvre's (1991) 
assertion that space is produced by, and through, social, cultural and economic 
relations. The thesis revealed ways-of-knowing or practising Mayfield in the context 
of deindustrialisation and the intersection of Fordism and post-Fordism. Lefebvre's 
triadic conceptualisation of space captures both the dimensions of the official 
discourses of transition realised through gentrification and the heritage discourse, and 
the unofficial discourse of transitional spaces in the suburb. With its focus on the 
intersection of social and economic dimensions of spatiality, Lefebvre's spatial 
dialectic contextualise the changing nature of place in the context of the shift from 
Fordism to post-Fordism. For instance, the heritage discourse discussed in Chapter 
Six is an example of a post-Fordist way-of-knowing Mayfield, where home-owners 
could construct, legitimise and engage with images the suburb as a way of realising 
cultural capital and social regimes of value. These attempts were part of the process of 
gentrification that would theoretically ameliorate the consequences of 
deindustrialisation, dampening the shift from Fordism to post-Fordism and see the 
suburb move from its status as stigmatised, transitional and marginal. In other words, 
this 'new' post-Fordist formulation of place was positioned as the successor of 'older' 
Fordist models of space, which were emblematic of the industrial period. Where post-
Fordism blurs the boundary between producer and consumer, realised through 
gentrification, its 'predecessor', Fordism is evidenced in the streetscapes of industrial 
suburbia, through consumerism of mass-produced goods and in particular, through 
recognition of the importance of mass transport, especially the car. However, under 
conditions of transition the places and spaces of Fordism also retain significant 
cultural dimensions. The synergies between the Fordist and post-Fordist images of 
Mayfield were evident through the prism of the gentrification discourse and the 
unofficial spatial practices of the suburb, revealed and expressed through skating and 
loitering.
Conclusion

The economic consequences of post-Fordism are well documented, detailing the changes unfolding across the cities and suburbs of Australia. Yet, its cultural consequences are less often examined, especially in terms of place identity in the areas undergoing a shift from Fordism to post-Fordism. Although city-scapes are constantly undergoing processes of reinterpretation and change in order for their inhabitants to make sense of their needs, aspirations and values, broad themes run through these processes. These themes derive, intersect and inform the economic and social changes associated with the shift from Fordism to post-Fordism, especially in relation to deindustrialisation. In other words, Fordism and post-Fordism are more than economic processes, they are expressed culturally and spatially, helping to organise the way people think about place and space in a city. Through a holistic understanding of space, informed by the work of Lefebvre and others, this thesis argues that the symbolic and cultural elements of overarching organisational themes, such as Fordism and post-Fordism, resonate spatially in the city. Their subtle, underlying tropes represent the processes of industrial capitalism in unexpected ways.

In Mayfield, the legacy of Fordism remains inscribed on the suburb, ordering key themes of transition/intransigence. The shift from Fordism to post-Fordism is taking place in cities across the globe. This thesis pivots on the cultural and symbolic dimensions of deindustrialisation to identify themes that speak to broader topics of heritage, gentrification and the commodification of place and space, especially in the context of deindustrialisation.

In Mayfield, the closure of the BHP steelworks opened up a discursive space for the reimagination of the suburb as a post-industrial or post-Fordist place. Some of Mayfield's most visible areas were recruited into contested projects of placemaking, oriented around the official discourse of Mayfield as 'coming free' from industrialisation and realising its destiny. Transition in this context was understood as gentrification. Framed by patterns of franchise and marginalisation, an official discourse of gentrification guided by the sub-theme of Mayfield's housing heritage dominated claims over the suburb's future. Gentrification and the sub-theme of the heritage discourse were identified within the purview of post-Fordist ways-of-knowing Mayfield, where places and spaces were incorporated into the symbolic
Yet, the legacy of Mayfield's predominantly industrial suburban history was, and is, not easily dislodged. Some of Mayfield's most 'suburban' places and spaces, its roadways and carparks, were the location of highly visible activities of loitering and skateboarding that spoke to Mayfield as a stigmatised suburb. These were Mayfield's marginalised places and spaces, contributing to the perception of the suburb still being in decline, suffering from industrialism's retreat, rather than realising the benefits of being emancipated from it. Transition, then, was the site of attempts to establish, control and fix images of the suburb as a 'suburb in transition' rather than a suburb of transitional spaces. Mayfield's trajectory was negotiated through images of 'moving ahead' into the period of post-industrialism through regeneration and gentrification, rather than suffering the impacts of deindustrialisation through further decline. Theorising the spatial dimensions of industrialism, especially oriented around the implications of Fordist technologies of spatial organisation, such as the car, as well as deindustrialisation post-industrialism revealed the theme of transition at work in the formation of capitalist or commodified place and space, where the logic of exchange resonated and found expression through the technologies and processes of place.

This thesis contributes to an understanding of the spatial expression of post-Fordism. Australian cities in particular have strong suburban legacies and attempts to gentrify must account for the dominance of the suburban form. In Mayfield, heritage provided a means through which residents could participate in the symbolic economy as a means to gentrification. Further analysis of the heritage discourse provided insights into more subtle, cultural dimensions of place and space, such as the idea of heritage as a type of hyperreality. Chapter Six explored the ways in which buildings and streetscapes could symbolically intervene in the creation of ideoscapes with concomitant implications for the imagination of time as well as space. They symbolic dimensions of heritage arguably contributed to its popularity in the construction of the image of Mayfield as a place in transition.

Alternative ways-of-knowing the suburb, however, proved durable, representing not just the spaces and places of industrial Fordism, but its spatial logics as well. Rather than becoming increasingly irrelevant in the imagination of Mayfield as a post-Fordist place, Lefebvre's work helps explain the durability of these transitional zones as
expressions not just of Fordism, but as representative of the economic processes that characterise both Fordism and post-Fordism.

My analysis showed that, rather than a linear progression, transition emerges as a discursive space for the contest over ideas about the suburb and its future. This is the space that is at the intersection of Fordism and post-Fordism imaginings of Mayfield. The dominant view that positioned Mayfield as gentrifying resonated with the tropes of the symbolic economy under the conditions of post-Fordism, while the more marginalised unofficial discourse of Mayfield evoked images of the suburb's industrial past. Finally, this thesis shows that place is comprised, informed and realised through and between social practices and processes, and that cities are the everyday evocation of regimes of meaning by those who use their spaces. Understanding the social and cultural dimensions of urban place is central to making sense of broader changes such as deindustrialisation and transition.
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Appendices

Appendix One: Interviewees
NB; all interview data is presented as verbatim in the text, except Emily’s comments, which were lengthier, and slightly edited for clarity. I interviewed 30 residents in
total. The list below refers to the 24 interviewees whose data is utilised in this thesis. All interviewees were Mayfield residents unless otherwise stated below.

Michelle August 2005 Female; 30-50
Leanne July 2005
Glenys August 2005 Female; 30-50
Marianne S. August 2005 Female; 30-50
Maryanne H. April 2006 Female; 30-50
Sheri August 2005 Female; 30-50
Marianne August 2005 Female; 30-50
Kath August 2005 Female; 30-50
Denise September 2005 Female; 50+
Mick September 2005 Male 30-50
Bob September 2005 Male 30-50
Vi August 2005 Female 30-50
Jens April 2006 Male 20-30
James April 2006 Male 20-30
Emily 2006 Female 20-30
Kat May 2006 Female 30-50
Dave 2005 (neighbour) Male 50+
Danny August 2005 Male 20-30

**Mayfield Mainstreet Meeting participants**
Dan: meeting participant, and ex owner of the jewellers on Maitland Road, Oct 05, Male 30-50
Jan, Female 30-50, Oct 2005
Norm, Male 50+, Oct 2005

**Professionals**
Stacey, Cultural Planning Officer, Newcastle City Council, December 05 (Non Mayfield resident)
Kathy Heyman, Chair Mayfield Mainstreet Committee August 2005 (Non Mayfield resident)
Bill April 2006 (organiser of the skatepark project)
Appendix Two: Research map Newcastle with legend
1. Community meetings, Mayfield Arts and Culture Committee, Places in Transition working group
2. Interview, private home
3. Interview, private home
4. Interview
5. Interview, ethnographic research, Dangar Skatepark
6. Interview, ethnographic research, Woolworths carpark and seats
7. Event, Interviews, ethnographic research
8. Interview, ethnographic research, Harmony Day, Webb Park, 2006
9. Event, Interviews, MayCare Drop-in centre
10. Interviews, cafe
11. Event, Interviews, Graffiti Wall
12. Interview, private home
13. Interview, private home
14. Interview, private home
15. Ethnographic research
16. Ethnographic research
17. Event, Interviews, Miss Mayfield, Senior Citizens
18. Event, Interviews, Miss Mayfield Pageant
19. Ethnographic research

Locations
20. Arnott House
21. Muster Point sculpture
22. Former migrant camp and hostel, post WW2 settlement of migrants
23. Mayfield Mainstreet Committee offices
24. Hanbury Street, one of only three roads connecting Mayfield with the rest of Newcastle
25. Clyde Street, one of only three roads connecting Mayfield with the rest of Newcastle
26. Maud Street, one of only three roads connecting Mayfield with the rest of Newcastle
27. Dangar Park skatepark
28. Interviews, dog-walkers, "off-leash area"
Appendix Three: BHP Employment timeline

BHP Employment timeline (Source NIHA 2009)
1921 5500 (wide-scale retrenchment took it down to 840 the following year, followed by a complete shut down of the plant
1943 work shortages during the War dropped to 8217 then migration boosted it to -
1945 employed 12000, 20 percent of whom were immigrants
1980 - 11150
1952 -7373, then gradual decline with increasing mechanisation
1983-6000
Appendix Four: Fliers, information sheet and consent form for research recruitment

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT: An Analysis of Cultural Planning and Placemaking in Australia

18/3/05

The Research Team:
Associate Professor Deborah Stevenson
Associate Professor David Rowe
Ms Fiona Grubb

I agree to participate in the above research project and give my consent freely.

I understand that the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained and understood. I understand that I can withdraw from the project at any time without explanation.

I consent to take part in this project (sign name):

Face to face interview
Participant’s contact details:

I have had the opportunity to have any of my questions answered to my satisfaction. I understand that my information be used in any publication it will be anonymous, and that any information I give will remain confidential to the researchers and be destroyed after five years.

Print Name:
Signature:
Date:
INFORMATION STATEMENT FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

An Analysis of Cultural Planning and Placemaking in Australia

The Research Team:
Associate Professor Deborah Stevenson
Associate Professor David Rowe
Ms Fiona Grubb

Email: Fiona.Grubb@studentmail.newcastle.edu.au
Mobile 0416425109
Ph 4968 9580

You are invited to participate in the project identified above which is being carried out by Fiona Grubb as part of her PhD candidature at the University of Newcastle, under the supervision of Associate Professor Deborah Stevenson and Associate Professor David Rowe from the School of Social Sciences.

Why is the research being done?
The purpose of the research is to discover how Mayfield is perceived by its residents and other people involved in the suburb.

Who can participate in the research?
Anyone who has a connection to Mayfield can participate in this research.

What choice do you have?
Participation in this study is purely your choice. Only those who give their informed consent will be included in the project.

If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without explanation.

We do not expect that anyone will wish to discuss illegal behaviour. However we are obliged to tell you that if someone in the interviews were to give specific details about an illegal incident (e.g. date, place, perpetrators) then the researchers might be required to report the information to police.

What would you be asked to do?
If you were to agree to participate in the study you will be asked to take part in an interview with Fiona Grubb which would last approximately one hour.

As a research participant, you would be asked to talk about a range of issues. For example, you may be asked to discuss:

Do you think Mayfield has changed in the last few years? If so, how?

Do you use any public places in Mayfield, such as local parks?

Where do you do your shopping?
Did you choose to live in Mayfield? If so, why?

How do you think Mayfield is perceived by non residents?

Are you involved in any community activities in Mayfield? If so, what?

Do you like living in Mayfield, and if so, why?

The interview will be conducted in a location and at a time convenient to the participant. The interviews will be audio taped and later transcribed. You will be given the opportunity to listen to the tape and delete any part of your contribution that you wish at the end of the interview.

How will your privacy be protected?
Your confidentiality is assured. Nobody except the research team will have access to the tapes or transcripts, and if we were to quote you in any published report we will use a false name and change any identifying information.

Your name will only appear on the consent form, which will not be stored with the interview data. All information will be securely stored and only accessible to the researcher and her supervisors. All data will be stored for five years and then destroyed.

How will the information collected be used?
The information will be used to inform a study investigating the way in which Mayfield is perceived, and the values and understandings residents and other people connected to Mayfield consider important to the suburb. We want to find out how people feel about living in the area, how they think it may have changed, if they would like it to change and if so, in what way. This project will then examine these ideas in relation to ‘cultural planning’, a type of planning undertaken by the Newcastle City Council.

The results of the research will be used to prepare a research thesis to be submitted for Fiona’s PhD degree. The results of the research will also be used to prepare papers for publication in professional journals and/or for presentation at conferences. Individual participants will not be identified in any reports arising from this research. If you choose to take part in the project, you will be able to obtain a summary report of the research findings by contacting Fiona Grubb in December 2006.

What do you need to participate?
To take part in this study please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, please call or email Fiona Grubb or her supervisors (details above).

If you might be interested in taking part in this project, you can register your interest:
- By completing and returning the attached consent form to the box in your organisation
- Or by phoning, emailing or sending a text message to the Fiona Grubb (details above)
The researcher will then contact you to arrange a convenient time for the interview.

We hope that you will agree to participate in this study and look forward to meeting and talking to you. If you have friends who might be interested in taking part, please pass this Information Statement on to them.

Yours Sincerely,

Ms Fiona Grubb, Associate Professor Deborah Stevenson, Associate Professor, David Rowe

This project has been approved by the University's Human Research Ethics Committee.

Should you have any concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research has been conducted, it may be given to the researcher’s supervisor: Associate Professor Deborah Stevenson (email Deborah.Stevenson@newcastle.edu.au) Phone 02 4921 6031. If an independent person is preferred, contact the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellory, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan, 2308, Phone 02 4921 6333, Email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au
Appendix Five: Secondary sources of data collection - Initial scoping of Mayfield and Newcastle

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2006, Quickstats Censusdata 2001


CIPs (Cultural Institutions and Practices centre), Mayfield, the Toorak of Newcastle, and Mayfield, Living the Life (Heritage Walks) brochures accompanying the walks available online:

Claridge, W 2000 The Pommy Town years: memories of Mayfield and other tales of the twenties William R. Claridge; edited by Helen Macallan, William Michael Press; University of Newcastle, Newcastle


Mayfield Mainstreet Committee website 2010 available online: www.mayfield.asn.au retrieved February 2006


Newcastle City Wide Heritage Study 1996 Suters Architects, prepared on behalf of Newcastle City Council 1996/7 available online:
www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au/__.../City_Wide_Heritage_Study_Thematic_History_Verbatim_copy.pdf, retrieved December 2010
Let’s begin by turning the clock back to 1901. You’ve just alighted from the tram near the top of Hannover Street, which was part of the main street commercial district. If you look above the street level of the buildings next to the pharmacy across the road, you would have seen nothing but white cloth overhead for shade. The Hunter family who built this property had moved here from New South Wales in the 1860s and lived here for many years. They would keep the pails of water in the yard and use the pail pump to fill them up at the well, which had a hand-cranked wheel. The villa was used as a residence for the family and as a guesthouse for visitors. In 1923, the Hunter family sold the property to the NSW Government, who used it as a training school for women. The school was later converted into a hostel for students and continued to operate as such until the 1980s. The building was then converted into apartments and is now used as a residence for students and professionals. If you look closely, you can still see traces of the original architecture, such as the brickwork and the arched windows. The tram, train, horse drawn buses and also the Hunter River meant that people could travel easily to and from Mayfield. The river was a source of water and was used for irrigation and transportation. The tram, which ran from Mayfield to the city centre, was a popular mode of transport and was used by many people to travel to work and to social events. The tram was replaced by buses and then by cars, but the street still has a sense of its original design. The street is lined with trees and has a canopy of foliage, which provides shade and a sense of tranquility. The street is also lined with shops and businesses, which have been in operation for many years. The street is a testament to the history and culture of Mayfield, and is a place where people come to shop, work and enjoy the community. This brochure and keeping an eye out for traces of the past still visible in the landscape (such as differences in housing styles, remnant vegetation, stone walls and fences) will allow wonderful views over the Hunter River flood plain, and afford wonderful vistas over the surrounding areas.
Across the road on the Mayfield Sport and Recreation Club site was the first school in Mayfield, a slab and shingle hut, which was part of Charles Simpson’s estate. Convicts would row Simpson to work every day along the river. This site was covered in ti-tree scrub up until the Tonks Hotel was built in 1890. The very wealthy families often employed girls in their early teens as maids. Other young girls worked in ‘knitting factories’ which were located throughout the suburb. Boys would deliver, work on farms or deliver the evening papers.

The Cottage was sold to Lysaghts after World War II and became first a hotel, then a school before becoming a consumer goods store.

The very wealthy families often employed girls in their early teens as maids. Other young girls worked in ‘knitting factories’ which were located throughout the suburb. Boys would deliver, work on farms or deliver the evening papers.

Across the road (on the Mayfield Sport and Recreation Club site) was the first school in Mayfield, a slab and shingle hut, which was part of Charles Simpson’s estate. Convicts would row Simpson to work every day along the river. This site was covered in ti-tree scrub up until the Tonks Hotel was built in 1890. The very wealthy families often employed girls in their early teens as maids. Other young girls worked in ‘knitting factories’ which were located throughout the suburb. Boys would deliver, work on farms or deliver the evening papers.

Across the road (on the Mayfield Sport and Recreation Club site) was the first school in Mayfield, a slab and shingle hut, which was part of Charles Simpson’s estate. Convicts would row Simpson to work every day along the river. This site was covered in ti-tree scrub up until the Tonks Hotel was built in 1890. The very wealthy families often employed girls in their early teens as maids. Other young girls worked in ‘knitting factories’ which were located throughout the suburb. Boys would deliver, work on farms or deliver the evening papers.

This is the oldest surviving dwelling at Mayfield, built in 1842. Although he did not live here, this was part of Charles Simpson’s estate. Simpson ran the Newcastle Company’s Efficient which built “Bunabah House”, which gave its name to the railway station and, later, the suburb. Convicts would row Simpson’s ship every day along the river. Many of the slopes and ridges of Mayfield were originally covered by forest of the type in Blackbutt Reserve: a mix of spotted gum, ironbark, grey gum and eucalypt. Townspeople who moved into the area in the early 20th century in Mayfield.

One of the saddest chapters of Mayfield’s history is that of the lost islands. Moscheto Island even had a school and a post office. Some Novocastrians remember growing up on the islands. Did you also know there used to be a beach in Mayfield?

This site was covered in ti-tree scrub up until the Tonks Hotel was built on the site in 1890. The very wealthy families often employed girls in their early teens as maids. Other young girls worked in ‘knitting factories’ which were located throughout the suburb. Boys would deliver, work on farms or deliver the evening papers.

The cottage was built for Harriett Winn in 1903. She was the daughter of James Winn, who lived in Whitley. Convicts were used to run right down to the river at Ingall St wharf. Did you know

Continue working on Vine Street crossing Cullen St and continue up to Cullen Centre. You should now be able to see the beautiful houses Winahra directly in front of you. This house was built in 1890 originally by William Ainslie for one of his daughters, who married one of the sons of the Winn family, who had the Winn Bros in Hunter Street. If you have time, take a little walk up 17 Highfield Street, which was built by the Hunter family, one of the shop owners on Matchel Road in the 1950s.
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BHP's development on the site, massive changes occurred to the River
influx of householders followed the closure of the BHP steelworks, in
However, there are many Mayfield residents of longstanding and a new
sub-population has more recently existed in the suburb, with many
university students living here.

Prior to 1913 the landscape you are looking at now would have been
Platt's Channel, which along with much of the flood plain, its wetlands
for locals. It's buried too, though the happy memories of the old timers
head down the street about a hundred metres.

This amazing view, from the highest point in the suburb, allows us to see
THE HUNTER RIVER
Source of Life

BHP
The Big Australian

We will talk more about the river in a moment.

Cnr of Maitland Rd and Kerr Sts

This brochure has been produced by The University of Newcastle's

Mayfield Mainstreet

- ORPHANAGE

WINNOVILLE (1878)

WINDEYER HOUSE (1880)

Cnr Kerr and Bull Sts

As the
Newcastle the birth of what will certainly become the most extensive
was huge!

small foundry. But as you can see, the industrial complex that developed
residents of Mayfield at the time apparently had little idea of the size and

Orphanage, which in 1952 became the home for 31 boys ranging in age
from 9 to 14 who had travelled unaccompanied from the UK to
Australia. These boys, many of whom were in fact, not orphans, were
sent to Mayfield to be 'orphans'- or at least that's the story that has been
passed down to the next generation.

His eldest son stayed on in the house, eventually selling it and the land
to the Australian Agricultural Company in 1857.

In 1933, the Catholic Church bought the property and established the
Orphanage, which in 1952 became the orphanage for 31 boys ranging in age
from 9 to 14. He had travelled unaccompanied from the UK to
Australia. These boys, many of whom were in fact, not orphans, were
sent to Mayfield to be 'orphans'- or at least that's the story that has been
passed down to the next generation.

Can you imagine what it must have been like to have been so young and
so far away from their families, living in an isolated orphanage? Being
abandoned at such a young age must have been both frightening and lonely.

Can you imagine what it must have been like to have been so young and
so far away from their families, living in an isolated orphanage? Being
abandoned at such a young age must have been both frightening and lonely.

Windeyer. We will see his home shortly. By the way, even up until the
1920s, many of the roads and tracks in the Mayfield area were made
from white sand and Maitland Road was red gravel.

This once impressive house was built for William Winn in 1878 on a
2 acre block bounded by Highfield Street, School road and a coach house.
Like many of the larger houses in Mayfield, lessor owners have
subdivided the property and constructed Ext here around the original
house. In 1944 Colin Gama, a local dentist, who was locally renowned for his
fully fitted dental machinery, purchased the house. Crossing Crebert St we walk
further up Kerr Street.

Imagine the clip clop of horses up what was the path or drive to this
house. John Winn was a prominent Newcastle solicitor. The
Winn family, like other wealthy families of the time, had individual
servants, including girls as young as 15, who would fetch such items as
1914 the family moved to Toronto on Lake Michigan. Many, if not
most, of the wealthiest people moved away from Mayfield around this
time, as the suburb changed from one governed to increasingly industrial.

This walk begins at the big yellow key located on the corner of
Maitland Rd and Kerr Sts

The new church you see now was built in 1937. Continue walking up
Kerr Street, one of the oldest streets in Mayfield. It used to be very
narrow, and when streets were planned to the Mid and late 1800s, most definitely

didn't come into the picture.

Toorak is a suburb of Melbourne that is widely
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Can you see that lone Cook Island Pine on that low hill? That was known
as Ironbark Hill, where John Laurio Platt built his homestead in 1823.

WINDREYER HOUSE

Cnr Kerr and Bull Sts

Can you see that lone Cook Island Pine on that low hill? That was known
as Ironbark Hill, where John Laurio Platt built his homestead in 1823.

Can you see that lone Cook Island Pine on that low hill? That was known
as Ironbark Hill, where John Laurio Platt built his homestead in 1823.

Imagine the clip clop of horses up what was the path or drive to this
house. John Winn was a prominent Newcastle solicitor. The
Winn family, like other wealthy families of the time, had individual
servants, including girls as young as 15, who would fetch such items as
1914 the family moved to Toronto on Lake Michigan. Many, if not
most, of the wealthiest people moved away from Mayfield around this
time, as the suburb changed from one governed to increasingly industrial.

From the highest point in the suburb, allow us to see
Windeyer. We will see his home shortly. By the way, even up until the
1920s, many of the roads and tracks in the Mayfield area were made
from white sand and Maitland Road was red gravel.

This once impressive house was built for William Winn in 1878 on a
2 acre block bounded by Highfield Street, School road and a coach house.
Like many of the larger houses in Mayfield, lessor owners have
subdivided the property and constructed Ext here around the original
house. In 1944 Colin Gama, a local dentist, who was locally renowned for his
fully fitted dental machinery, purchased the house. Crossing Crebert St we walk
further up Kerr Street.

Imagine the clip clop of horses up what was the path or drive to this
house. John Winn was a prominent Newcastle solicitor. The
Winn family, like other wealthy families of the time, had individual
servants, including girls as young as 15, who would fetch such items as
1914 the family moved to Toronto on Lake Michigan. Many, if not
most, of the wealthiest people moved away from Mayfield around this
time, as the suburb changed from one governed to increasingly industrial.

This walk begins at the big yellow key located on the corner of
Maitland Rd and Kerr Sts

The new church you see now was built in 1937. Continue walking up
Kerr Street, one of the oldest streets in Mayfield. It used to be very
narrow, and when streets were planned to the Mid and late 1800s, most definitely

didn't come into the picture.

You might recall Winn's Store in Hunter Street in the centre of
Newcastle which opened in 1818. The Winn family owned this store
for many years.

Can you see that lone Cook Island Pine on that low hill? That was known
as Ironbark Hill, where John Laurio Platt built his homestead in 1823.

WINDREYER HOUSE

Cnr Kerr and Bull Sts

Can you see that lone Cook Island Pine on that low hill? That was known
as Ironbark Hill, where John Laurio Platt built his homestead in 1823.
This park was central to the social life of many of the local residents. In 'Pommy Town' formed the Orb United Soccer Club in 1922, later Across the road you will see the entrance to Mayfield Park. This land was of William; 141 Crebert St was the home of Mr. Chinchen, a surveyor That house was then owned by the Dean family who had a pottery works. Crossing Kerr St we come across a row of houses built in 1888 which scenery and easy access to the city by rail' spruiked an 1851 advertisement. By 1915, incinerators were advertising land for worker's housing as the heart of the manufacturing district.

Continue walking along Crebert St.

**CREBERT STREET**

An Exquisite Address

Crossing Kart St we come across a row of houses built in 1888 which has the Essington Room named after the Essington Lewis men.

The mansion was built originally as the Work Manager's house for BHP. It was in 1894 in a classic Victorian Italianate style, and it retained the original chimneys, marble fireplaces, slate roofs, and Candle Factory which opened in Mayfield from 1886 east of Ingall St. It was a place for the social elite, some of whom built their villas along the ridge lines where they could admire the views, as well as take advantage of elevated positions. The delightful surrounding scenery and easy access to the city by rail spruiked an 1851 advertisement. By 1915, incinerators were advertising land for worker's housing as the heart of the manufacturing district.

Continue walking along Crebert St.

**BELLA VISTA**

 inherited from his father, the headland at Highfield St. Bella Vista is the first house on the right side of the street.

John Schleyer was a butcher, property developer, businessman and later Mayor of Wollongong (which included Mayfield) three times. He chose the highest point on the ridge to build his magnificent house, which was completed by 1884, and he gardened extensively all the way to Crebert St. The Schleyers were like the royal family of Mayfield.

It is said that when Mr. Schleyer wanted one of his servants to do something, he would simply say his name. And the other members of the 'Mayfieldocracy' were sometimes known as the 'Handclappers'.

In 1958 the house was purchased by the Baptist Home Trust to be used as a Hostel for Young Men and was renamed Lewis House again after the original chimney, intake Employee and residence. Looking across the road you can see another large house which is slightly hidden now.

**WINAHRA (1890)**

Originally built as a 5 acre block by Charles Uphold, owner of the Soap and Candle Factory which opened in Mayfield from 1886 east of Ingall St. The site was sold to William Arnott in 1888 and named Arnott Holme. The Arnotts remained here until 1898. The house was then sold to Mrs. Lewis, who renamed it Woon Court.

Many social functions, including fetes and Bible classes, were held in the house. For instance, in 1935 the house was acquired by the Church of England and became St Elizabeth's Children's Home and School. St Alban's Boys School. It is now part of Amenities Court. This could be a 'Tim-Tam' stop!

Turn right into Highfield St and park the car of 'Mayfield House', where you can see the Queensland Executive Building.

There is still much more of the Mayfield Story to tell, so come back again soon and do the full walking tour.
Appendix Seven: Map showing Mayfield in Newcastle region
Appendix Eight: Real estate advertisements

Sydney Morning Herald, *Realty Partners John Karmas* (Real Estate advertisement) for 82 Fawcett Street, Mayfield available online at www.domain.com.au retrieved January 2011

