Urban policy in Australia has undergone significant reform over the last 50 years, linked to wider social and cultural change. The objective of this study was to take a case that exemplifies one of the trajectories of this change, the entry of the private sector into provision of affordable housing and programs aimed at ameliorating of urban poverty, to further explore market-centric urban policy responses. The central research task was to investigate how public- and private-sector actors shaped tenant participation strategies within the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project, a $733,000,000 redevelopment of a public housing estate 30 km south-west of Sydney, Australia by public–private partnership. Part I of this thesis details the central research task, provides the study context and reviews literature relevant to the study.
CHAPTER 1 – Public housing estate redevelopment, tenant participation and public-private partnerships

There are many ways in which a social geographer, not to mention an economist, urban planner, property developer or public housing tenant, might provide an account of tenant participation in a public housing estate redevelopment project being undertaken by public–private partnership. How does one rigorously analyse all the machinations over the first 5 years of a 30-year urban redevelopment project, represent all the different perspectives, and acknowledge and reflect on all the subjective points of view? Certainly, points of reference are important.

Imagine a conversation between an economist, an urban planner and a public housing tenant over the optimal use of the accumulated capital in a piece of land or a selection of housing stock, or the appropriate mechanism for providing or managing affordable housing, or the time horizon, the residual life, of an existing public housing estate (Harvey, 1996, p.229). The economist might propose that assessments of all these factors should be determined by the market and interest rates, and they might even suggest that the market is the best mechanism for realising any changes in the urban space and built environment. The time horizon for the economist in this case is short term, and recalculations are expected with changes in the national economy resulting, for instance, from fluctuations in interest rates and housing markets (Harvey, 1996).

By contrast, the urban planner, operating under a very different conception of time relating to the urban space, might propose that these economic and social factors should be determined by land-use planning based on regional

---

2 This question is posed in reflection of Socrates’ dialectic method, in which Socrates poses an abstract philosophical question to which there appears to be an easy answer. However, on further reflection, the social subjects involved in the dialogue with Socrates come to realise that none of their answers seem adequate. To everyone but Socrates, the original question proves difficult to answer on reflection (Cross and Wozzley, 1989). On my assessment, David Harvey (1996, p.229) uses a simplified narrative form of the dialectic method to determine the underlying beliefs and knowledge formulation of a group of participants in an imagined conversation to highlight, in his example, the ecological versus market definitions of spatio-temporality.
considerations, population forecasts, transport networks and the anticipated housing needs for a given geographical space over a much longer period.

Alternatively, the public housing tenant, a resident of a publicly owned dwelling whose tenancy is managed by the state, might outline a very different spatio-temporality\(^3\) – the bringing together of different constructions of space and time as subjective experience – relating to the urban space and built form. This narrative might invoke notions of home and constructions of place. The narrative might stretch back into the past to outline how this public housing tenant grew up in the suburb, or project into the future to discuss family plans that might span generations. This public housing tenant might propose that the economic and social decisions that are taken about his or her home and suburb should reflect the lived experience of those who inhabit the public housing estate.

As Harvey (1996) argues, there is no logical way to resolve these conflicts:

> We here identify the potentiality for social conflict deriving entirely from the time horizon over which the effect of a decision is held to operate. While economists often accept the Keynesian maxim that ‘in the long run we are all dead’ and that the short-run is the only reasonable time horizon over which to operationalise economic and political decisions (Harvey, 1996, p.229) ...

> Internal spatio-temporal organisation of the household, of workplaces, of cities, is the outcome of struggles to stabilise or disrupt social meanings by opposing social forces. (Harvey, 1996, p.230)

Therefore, assessments of public housing estates, public housing dwellings or the provision of affordable housing might be better judged over a longer period and using a different decision-making mechanism than the market. This study engages with this debate and takes as a starting point the right of public housing tenants, as citizens\(^4\) of the state, to be included in the decision-making processes that affect their lives (NSW Department of Housing, 1986, p.1). In 1986, the New South

---

\(^3\) Drawing on Harvey (1996), Cornwall (2008), Lefebvre (1991) and others, in this study spatio-temporality is defined by the author as “the bringing together of different constructions of space and time as subjective experience”.

\(^4\) In the case of public housing, citizens also have a relationship to the state through the form of housing assistance that they receive (i.e. as landlord and tenant).
Wales (NSW) state housing authority formalised its commitment to involving public housing tenants in decision-making with the introduction of the Department of Housing’s Participation Policy, with the stated aim

To recognise tenants’ rights as housing consumers by giving them a say in broad public housing issues and more specifically in decisions affecting their homes and environment. (NSW Department of Housing, 1986, p.3; emphasis added by author)

In this study, the central research task is to investigate how the actions of public-and private-sector employees – in this case, through a public–private partnership in Sydney, Australia – were shaped by neo-liberal ideology. The analysis explores how the various social actors reconceptualised their institutional tenant participation strategies within the discourses of neo-liberalism, as part of this large urban redevelopment project.

The citation above from the state housing authority refers to public housing tenants as ‘consumers’, a term often deployed within neo-liberal discourse, with similarities to the term ‘customer’ (also see NSW Department of Housing, 2004c). Within neo-liberal discourse, the terms ‘consumer’ and ‘customer’ connote a relationship between social subjects and social structures that is often constructed as a relationship between ‘individuals’ and the market. In the case of public housing, the sovereignty of the individual – public housing tenants’ rights – is established through their relationship to the housing market as ‘housing consumers’. Comparatively, within the discourse of citizenship, the sovereignty of the individual – public housing tenants’ rights – is established, at times collectively, through their relationship to the state as ‘citizens’.

This study makes explicit the tensions and contradictions between the sovereignty of the individual as a ‘citizen’ of a state and as a ‘customer’ within a market-based social intervention. However, the construction of public housing tenants within this urban redevelopment project should not be understood as binary, or even equidistant, between ‘citizen’ and ‘consumer’, for public and private actors
connect the state and the market in intricate and diffuse ways. This study examines the discursive rules within various social institutions that governed how social actors created public housing tenant participation spaces in this urban redevelopment project (Foucault, 1969).

Complex ‘conditions of possibility’ (Foucault, 1969) mean that public- and private-sector actors demarcate and regulate public housing tenant participation strategies in ways that are dynamic and constantly changing. However, while these conditions of possibility may be time and place specific, they often manifest with ideological consistency. It is therefore possible to document empirically how social actors create public housing tenant participation spaces with ideological specificity. This study investigates how the discursive rules within various institutions were dynamic and changed over time, but also how they worked to neo-liberalise the public housing tenant participation spaces.

In this case study, public- and private-sector actors redefined the conditions that governed how public housing tenants could exercise decision-making power. The analysis demonstrates that the changes in the public housing tenant participation strategies, deployed by both the public and private sectors, created tensions between the democratic rights of citizens to be involved in decision-making processes and the construction of public housing tenants as customers through market-based social policy.

The Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project (BLCP5) is a $733,000,0006 redevelopment of a public housing estate 30 km south-west of Sydney, being undertaken by public–private partnership. Over the next 30 years, the redevelopment project will be significantly transforming, for better or worse, the lives of over 3,000 citizens, and provides significant insight into the democratic potential of market-centric social policy contracted out to the private sector.

5 This public housing estate redevelopment project will hereafter will be called the BLCP, as this was the colloquial acronym given to the project by the state housing authority in Sydney.
6 Australian dollar.
Therefore, the BLCP is an important case that highlights the opposing social, political, financial and emotional forces alluded to in the opening section above.

In 1984, the then Minister for Housing in NSW “made a commitment to put the principle of tenant participation into practice” (NSW Department of Housing, 1986, p.1). Exactly 20 years later, in December 2004, Housing NSW sent a letter to all public housing tenants on the Bonnyrigg public housing estate (Estate), stating:

The State Government has announced the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project ... As one of the first steps the Department will be working with Bonnyrigg residents, community groups, Fairfield City Council and the private sector to put together a community renewal plan for Bonnyrigg ... The Department wants residents to be fully involved and to have a say in the project. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004d)

To further define the investigation into public housing tenant participation undertaken in this study, this chapter continues with a brief overview of the BLCP. The BLCP overview is followed with an outline of the scope of the study and concludes with the structure and organisation of the thesis.
Overview of the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project

This section provides a brief overview of the BLCP and the suburb of Bonnyrigg. A more detailed overview of the suburb and Estate is provided in Chapter 2 and a more detailed analysis of the BLCP is provided in Chapters 5–7.

Bonnyrigg is a suburb within the highly cosmopolitan Fairfield Local Government Area, located 30 km south-west of Sydney (see Figure 1 overleaf). The Fairfield Local Government Area (LGA) consists of 27 suburbs, and in 2001 the LGA had “one of the highest proportions of overseas born residents of any LGA in Australia” (Fairfield City Council, 2004, p.4).

The study area of the research is the Bonnyrigg public housing estate (see Figure 2 overleaf), which covers 81 hectares. In 2006, the Estate had a population of around 3,300 people and included 833 publicly owned and approximately 100 privately owned dwellings (NSW Department of Housing, 2006d, p.1). The Estate was originally designed using the ‘Radburn’ civil engineering design principle and was poorly maintained by the state housing authority throughout the decade preceding the announcement of the BLCP (Berry, 2002; Hall and Berry, 2004; NSW Department of Housing, 2004c).

In December 2004, the Housing Minister of NSW announced the redevelopment project. The BLCP is NSW’s first public housing estate redevelopment by public–private partnership and involves a 30-year contract between the NSW Government and a private-sector ‘partner’ (NSW Department of Housing, 2004b).  

---

3 The analysis returns to the discursive deployment of the terms ‘partner’ and ‘partnership’ and the contractual relationships between the various public- and private-sector entities in subsequent chapters.
Figure 1 – The location of Bonnyrigg within Greater Western Sydney

Source: Fairfield City Council (2008, p.12)

Figure 2 – The location of the Bonnyrigg Public Housing Estate with the suburb

Source: Rogers (2006, p.4)
The public–private partnership contract covers the delivery of physical infrastructure and a suite of social objectives, including tenancy management, ‘community building’, ‘community consultation’ and an array of communication functions. The contract is managed under a performance-based fee structure and will explore new asset management and dwelling maintenance practices contracted out to the private sector by the NSW state housing authority.

During the selection of the private-sector contractor, the state housing authority (Housing NSW) and the local government authority (Fairfield City Council) implemented a ‘community engagement’ program to assist Housing NSW with planning and design matters during the public–private partnership bidding phase. Fairfield City Council also became the planning approvals authority for development applications issued by the private-sector contractor in subsequent phases of the BLCP.

Over the contract term, the net housing stock across the Estate will be increased from about 950 to over 2,330 dwellings. While retaining 833 newly constructed dwellings as publicly owned housing stock, this increase in housing density allows Housing NSW to reduce the percentage ratio of publicly owned dwellings across the Estate over the contract term. At the conclusion of the BLCP, the ratio of public to privately owned housing stock would be reduced from the 2004 ratio of about 90% public and 10% private to about 30% public and 70% private (see Figure 3 overleaf). The private-sector contractor will sell the additional housing stock generated by the BLCP over the contract term on the open housing market to part finance the BLCP.

The BLCP contract will see the public tenancies transferred to a non-profit housing manager, under contract to the private-sector ‘partner’, for the 30-year period. The private-sector contractor undertaking the BLCP consists of a major financial institution, a property developer, a property maintenance company and a non-profit housing manager. An overview of the services to be provided by the private-sector contractor is outlined in Figure 4 overleaf.
Figure 3 – ‘Quick facts’ about the BLCP: Private sector promotional material

**Quick facts about the Bonnyrigg development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original population</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of completed scheme</td>
<td>6810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original number of dwellings</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling numbers of completed scheme</td>
<td>2332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original mix of dwellings</td>
<td>90% public; 10% private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of dwellings on completed scheme</td>
<td>30% public; 70% private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning approval</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 construction starts</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected completion of Stage 1</td>
<td>September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected completion of scheme</td>
<td>c. July 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Newleaf Communities (2009b)

Figure 4 – Services provided by the private-sector contractor under the BLCP

Source: Milligan and Randolph (2009, p.35)
The BLCP is a single-contract arrangement between the NSW Government and Bonnyrigg Partnerships Consortium. The Bonnyrigg Partnerships Consortium is jointly owned by two of the four consortium ‘partners’, Becton Property Group (property developer) and Westpac Banking Corporation (financial institution). The other two consortium members are St George Community Housing (non-profit housing manager) and the Spotless Group (property maintenance company).

The BLCP master plan, prepared by Urbis (2008, p.17) on behalf of the Bonnyrigg Partnerships Consortium, outlines each contractor’s responsibility under the BLCP contract as follows:

Becton Property Group ... [is] responsible for planning, design and construction and overall project management for Bonnyrigg Partnerships;
Westpac Bank ... [is] responsible for raising the finance needed to carry out the Bonnyrigg Partnerships development and community renewal program;
St George Community Housing ... [is] responsible for tenancy management of the social housing for Bonnyrigg Partnerships; and
Spotless Group ... [is] responsible for facilities maintenance of all social housing and agreed public areas and facilities of Bonnyrigg Partnerships.

The contract provides that the private-sector contractor will complete the following:

- Master-plan the redevelopment, including the design and construction of new public and private dwellings, roads, open spaces and community facilities.
- Undertake the physical works.
- Stage the construction over 10–15 years.
- Ensure that there is no discernable difference from the street between new dwellings placed on the market for private sale and dwellings retained as publicly owned housing.

A single-contract arrangement is a contract between two entities only. To facilitate this arrangement, the four contracted companies formed a consortium company to bid for the contract.
• Sell the private housing stock on the open housing market.
• Manage and maintain the infrastructure for the contract term.
• Manage the public housing tenancies for the contract term.
• Ensure that there is no net loss in public housing stock – although the private-sector contractor may purchase additional housing off site if public allocations cannot be met on site.
• Provide a mixture of housing types, including detached homes, group attached homes and higher-density apartment buildings near the Town Centre (see Figure 5 below).

Source: Author (paraphased from NSW Department of Housing, 2004b; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007; Urbis, 2008)

Figure 5 - Mixture of housing types: Private sector promotional material

Source: Bonnyrigg Partnerships (2007f)

In addition to these tangible objectives, the private-sector contractor has also been contracted to complete a range of more ambiguous objectives, including: consulting public housing tenants and involving them in decision-making processes; building social cohesion; or minimising disruptions to the lives of public and private residents on the Estate (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007; Urbis, 2008a).
This reimagining of the Estate and its residents in terms of a set of management functions to be completed by the private sector – constructed around the demolition and construction of the built environment and the management of social subjects by the private sector – is clearly neo-liberal in its understanding of urban problems and solutions (the analysis returns to the construction of neo-liberal problem-solution narratives through this thesis). This neo-liberal understanding, the specificities of which include the demarcation of both time and space in unique and specific ways, is important to this study, for public–private partnerships create specific spaces within which particular contract functions are tasked (Argent, 2005; Barnett, 2010; Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Dodson, 2006; Graefe, 2005; Peck and Tickell, 2002; Weber, 2002). In the BLCP, these include those listed above, asset services, community services and tenancy services.

Corresponding to these contractual functions is a series of independent timelines that have been assigned to particular spatial locations and are guided by various completion schedules. For example, Housing NSW suggested that the physical works could take anything from 5 to 15 years, while tenancy management will continue for the 30-year contract term (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c). In the excerpt below, Housing NSW outline some of the contractual spaces:

For this Project, a Private Partner will be chosen to plan improvements to houses, roads, parks and community facilities and to undertake physical renewal works. The Private Partner will also undertake facilities management and potentially tenancy management. The Department recognises that sustainable renewal of Public Housing estates cannot be achieved by government or individual agencies acting alone. It can only happen through partnership, with tenants and other residents, the private and community sectors, local councils and government departments all working together. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.9)

This study is particularly focused on the final commitment outlined above, the social spaces created by Housing NSW and the private-sector contractor to involve public housing tenants in the BLCP and the redevelopment of their Estate. While a detailed analysis of the BLCP timeline, BLCP contract and public
housing tenant participation spaces is provided in subsequent chapters, the BLCP was broadly deployed in three distinct phases, outlined in Figure 6 below.

**Figure 6 – The three phases of the BLCP**

**Phase 1:** The period preceding BLCP announcement, including planning the redevelopment model and drafting the private-sector contracts by Housing NSW (until December 2004).

**Phase 2:** The period from BLCP announcement to the signing of the BLCP contract deeds by the private-sector contractor (December 2004 to December 2006).

**Phase 3:** The period from the signing of the BLCP contract deeds by the private-sector contractor for a 30-year contract period (from December 2006).

Source: Author (from NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, 2006a,f, 2007b).
The scope of this study: Tenant participation as an invited space

This study is about tenant participation as an ‘invited space’ in the context of neo-liberal discourses of urban governance (Cornwall, 2004, 2008; Cornwall and Schattan P. Coelho, 2007a; Jacobs et al., 2003). The analysis is therefore purposely targeted towards the involvement of public housing tenants in the redevelopment of their Estate by public–private partnership. The analysis, by design, does not engage with broader questions about the delivery of public infrastructure by the private sector, except where these questions relate to the involvement of public housing tenants. Even in these cases, the analysis is driven by tenant-related concerns and issues focused on their involvement in, or absence from, decision-making processes.

In this account of the BLCP, urban and social planners, economists, property developers, major financial institutions and non-government service providers all play important – indeed, central – roles. However, the fulcrum for this study, the pivot point on which the study is balanced, is citizenship. My analysis draws attention to neo-liberal conceptions of citizenship that view citizens of the state, who live in state-managed housing, as morally inferior to citizen ‘customers’ who source their housing in the marketplace. Barry Hindess (2002, p.140) argues, using the construct of the “neo-liberal citizen”:

If there is a common thread linking the many late twentieth-century projects of neo-liberal reform, both within particular states and in the international arena, it lies in the attempt to introduce market and quasi-market arrangements into areas of social life which had hitherto been organised in other ways – the corporatisation and privatisation of state agencies, the promotion of competition and individual choice ... These developments have striking consequences for both the political and the social aspects of citizenship: the political rights (such as they are) may remain but their scope is restricted as market regulation takes over from direct regulation by state agencies and the judgement of the market is brought to bear on the conduct of states, while the social rights of citizenship (where they exist) are pared back as provision through the market replaces provision directly or indirectly through the state.
Within this analytical frame, public housing tenants’ experience of citizenship can be traced over time through the different participation spaces created by the public and private sectors to involve them in the redevelopment project. These experiences can be traced along a dialectically connected continuum from a well-informed and politically powerful citizenry to subjugated social subjects (Arnstein, 1969; Foucault, 1969), drawing attention to the discursive strategies that constructed the participation spaces.

The aim is to identify and contrast the social subjects and social institutions that held decision-making power within certain decision-making spaces at specific moments in time. The analysis will uncover and make explicit the mechanisms by which social subjects were invited into or restricted from decision-making spaces.

Hence, the term ‘space’ is this study is not understood solely as geographical or physical space. Space also encompasses social and moral spaces, including community consultation, market, social and economic policy and other constructed or imagined spaces (Cornwall, 2004; Harvey, 1996; Lefebvre, 1991; Peck and Tickell, 2002). In this view, the Bonnyrigg public housing estate is understood as a moral space that brings people together through geographical, sociological and emotional relationships with other social subjects and institutions. In these spaces, social subjects’ identities are constructed through micro- and macro-cultures of values and meanings, and the coordination and demarcation of time and space become important factors within the analysis (Rose, 2003).

Therefore time and space are central to the theoretical framework of this study. Harvey (1996, pp.207–227) argues that space and time are not only social constructs, but that conceptions of space and time affect the way we understand the world to be. And they also provide a reference system by means of which we locate ourselves (or define our “situatedness” and “positionality” ...) with respect to that world. It is therefore impossible to proceed far with a discussion of space and time without invoking the term “place”. (Harvey, 1996, p.208)
Fairclough (2003, p.151) concludes, drawing on the work of Harvey (1996, 1990), that time and space “are differently constructed in different societies, change in their construction is part of social change, and constructions of space and time are contested”. Our experiences of time and space, relative to place, are therefore important areas for analysis when considering the contention and conflicts between citizenship and capital. Pierre Bourdieu (1985, p.46) contends that

[T]he structure of the distribution of the different types and subtypes of capital at a given moment in time represents the immanent structure of the social world, i.e., the set of constraints, inscribed in the very reality of that world, which govern its functionality in a durable way, determine the chances of success for practices. It is in fact impossible to account for the structure and functioning of the social world unless one reintroduces capital in all its forms and not solely in the one form recognised by economic theory.

Capital, as understood by economic theory, would equate to land and property owned by the state and accumulated capital and borrowing potential residing with private-sector entities and financial institutions in this case study (the analysis returns to other forms of capital in Chapter 3). These constructs, citizenship as a democratic activity and capital as an economic resource for use in the market, should be viewed as the key constituents in conflict over determining who had the right to exercise decision-making power in different invited spaces in the market-centric urban governance structure explored in this study.

Therefore, this thesis is not about the success or otherwise of the BLCP, the economics of the public–private partnership model or the capacity of the private sector to undertake public housing estate redevelopments. Similarly, the study does not determine whether public housing tenants were better or worse off after the BLCP, progressed socio-economically, remained in Bonnyrigg, moved away, gained employment or were satisfied or dissatisfied with the redevelopment project. Irrespective of the success or otherwise of the BLCP, measured using any number of evaluative mechanisms, the study is an analysis of how public- and private-sector actors involved public housing tenants in the decisions that affect their lives in a neo-liberalised space.
Consequently, I do not contend that the social subjects within either Housing NSW or the private-sector companies conceptualised the public housing tenant participation spaces in the same way as will be theorised in this study. Each social subject brings with them a different spatio-temporality to their assessment of the BLCP and tenant participation, partly constructed by the social institutions that they inhabited, but also by their social experiences and history (Carmody, 2001). So too, this account is structured by my own experiences with the BLCP and interactions with public housing tenants between 2005 and 2010, while working for the state housing authority (Housing NSW) and the local government authority (Fairfield City Council) involved in this redevelopment project and then as a university researcher with the University of Western Sydney.

Throughout 2005–2006, Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council employed me at different times within a locally based redevelopment team to manage a range of ‘community consultation’ and ‘capacity building’ projects. During 2006, I also completed an insider research project, a partnership project between the University of Western Sydney and Fairfield City Council, studying public housing tenant participation in the BLCP as part of an Honours degree. Then between 2007 and 2010, I undertook the current PhD study as a university researcher. As demonstrated throughout this study, these different subject positions and social experiences have shaped who I am as a researcher, the questions I chose to ask and the methods I deploy (Carmody, 2001, p.170).

The account of the BLCP offered in this thesis is thus partly an attempt to make sense of my own experience in the BLCP, as a researcher and consultant who worked closely with public housing tenants, Housing NSW and with the private-sector contractors on public housing tenant participation processes over the first 5 years of the BLCP.
The organisation of the thesis

To present this account of the BLCP, the thesis is structured in three parts. Part I includes Chapters 1–4 and further defines the central research task, reviews literature relevant to the study context and provides the research framework. To achieve this aim, in Chapter 2 citizenship and democracy are theorised as the raison d’être for including participation strategies in urban redevelopment processes, especially when these projects involve the urban poor. This discussion is positioned in relation to more direct forms of democratic practice (Cooke and Kothari, 2001; Cornwall, 2004; Gaventa, 2004; Sinclair, 1988) and participation conceived as democratic action (Nabatchi et al., in print; Keane, 2009). Finally, the BLCP public housing tenant participation spaces are defined and positioned within this analytical frame.

Chapter 3 outlines the political and policy context to be taken up in the data analysis chapters. This chapter reviews literature relating to neo-liberalism, with a particular focus on the political economy of public housing in the United States (USA), the United Kingdom (UK) and Australia. This discussion shows that social actors within neo-liberalised spaces make moral claims about ‘citizens’ and ‘community’, and this in turn shapes how social policy is formulated and deployed. The chapter concludes with a brief history of public housing estate redevelopment in Australia, to locate the BLCP in its historical and political context.

Chapter 4 reflects on the literature review and central research task – an investigation into how the actions of public- and private-sector actors in this public–private partnership were structured by neo-liberal ideology and how these actions subsequently shaped the public housing tenant participation strategies – to construct a theoretical framework and a set of methodological tools to investigate public housing tenant participation in the BLCP. The chapter puts forward a spatio-temporal research tool that is broadly Foucauldian in approach and uses
Andrea Cornwall’s (Cornwall, 2004, 2008; Cornwall and SchAttan P. Coelho, 2007b) spatial metaphor of ‘invited space’ to demarcate and investigate specific public housing tenant participation processes. This chapter also puts forward reflective ethics as a theoretical apparatus for attending to researcher subjectivity within the study.

Part II includes Chapters 5–7 and provides a spatio-temporal analysis of the BLCP to investigate how the public–private partnership demarcated and regulated public housing tenant participation strategies in this urban redevelopment project. Chapter 5 covers Phase 1 of the BLCP, the period preceding BLCP announcement, to make explicit the spaces that Housing NSW created to plan the redevelopment project and to draft the private-sector contracts (before December 2004). This analysis shows that Housing NSW did not invite public housing tenants into these spaces, and demonstrates that a range of national and supra-national political and economic discourses shaped the framing of the BLCP.

Chapter 6 covers Phase 2 of the BLCP, the period from BLCP announcement to the signing of the BLCP public–private partnership contract by the private-sector contractor (December 2004 to December 2006). This analysis shows that Housing NSW created two macro-level invited spaces in Phase 2. Housing NSW created the first space to conduct community consultations with public housing tenants and the second space to conduct contractual negotiations with the private sector. The analysis demonstrates how the conditions of possibility within this neo-liberal urban redevelopment project mandated distance between these two spaces. In this phase, Housing NSW did not invite public housing tenants into the space constructed to negotiate with the private sector.

Chapter 7 covers Phase 3 of the BLCP, the period from the signing of the BLCP contract deeds by the private-sector contractor for a 30-year contract period (from December 2006). This analysis shows that Housing NSW withdrew from direct engagement with public housing tenants in this phase and required the
private-sector contractor to develop its own community engagement spaces. As in Phase 2, the analysis demonstrates how the conditions of possibility within this neo-liberal urban redevelopment project mandated this action. In this phase, Housing NSW did not invite public housing tenants into the space constructed to manage with the private-sector contracts.

Part III, Chapter 8 concludes the thesis by providing a discussion that links the central research task outlined in Part 1 to the findings of the study outlined in Part II. Chapter 8 draws together the research observations and researcher reflections of public housing tenants’ participation in the BLCP over the first 5 years of the redevelopment project.
Urban policy in Australia has undergone significant reform over the last 50 years, linked to wider social and cultural change. The objective of this study was to take a case that exemplifies one of the trajectories of this change, the entry of the private sector into provision of affordable housing and programs aimed at ameliorating of urban poverty, to further explore market-centric urban policy responses. The central research task was to investigate how public- and private-sector actors shaped tenant participation strategies within the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project, a $733,000,000 redevelopment of a public housing estate 30 km south-west of Sydney, Australia by public–private partnership. Part I of this thesis details the central research task, provides the study context and reviews literature relevant to the study.
CHAPTER 1 – Public housing estate redevelopment, tenant participation and public-private partnerships

There are many ways in which a social geographer, not to mention an economist, urban planner, property developer or public housing tenant, might provide an account of tenant participation in a public housing estate redevelopment project being undertaken by public–private partnership. How does one rigorously analyse all the machinations over the first 5 years of a 30-year urban redevelopment project, represent all the different perspectives, and acknowledge and reflect on all the subjective points of view? Certainly, points of reference are important.

Imagine a conversation\(^2\) between an economist, an urban planner and a public housing tenant over the optimal use of the accumulated capital in a piece of land or a selection of housing stock, or the appropriate mechanism for providing or managing affordable housing, or the time horizon, the residual life, of an existing public housing estate (Harvey, 1996, p.229). The economist might propose that assessments of all these factors should be determined by the market and interest rates, and they might even suggest that the market is the best mechanism for realising any changes in the urban space and built environment. The time horizon for the economist in this case is short term, and recalculations are expected with changes in the national economy resulting, for instance, from fluctuations in interest rates and housing markets (Harvey, 1996).

By contrast, the urban planner, operating under a very different conception of time relating to the urban space, might propose that these economic and social factors should be determined by land-use planning based on regional

\(^2\) This question is posed in reflection of Socrates’ dialectic method, in which Socrates poses an abstract philosophical question to which there appears to be an easy answer. However, on further reflection, the social subjects involved in the dialogue with Socrates come to realise that none of their answers seem adequate. To everyone but Socrates, the original question proves difficult to answer on reflection (Cross and Wozzley, 1989). On my assessment, David Harvey (1996, p.229) uses a simplified narrative form of the dialectic method to determine the underlying beliefs and knowledge formulation of a group of participants in an imagined conversation to highlight, in his example, the ecological versus market definitions of spatio-temporality.
considerations, population forecasts, transport networks and the anticipated housing needs for a given geographical space over a much longer period.

Alternatively, the public housing tenant, a resident of a publicly owned dwelling whose tenancy is managed by the state, might outline a very different spatio-temporality\(^3\) – the bringing together of different constructions of space and time as subjective experience – relating to the urban space and built form. This narrative might invoke notions of home and constructions of place. The narrative might stretch back into the past to outline how this public housing tenant grew up in the suburb, or project into the future to discuss family plans that might span generations. This public housing tenant might propose that the economic and social decisions that are taken about his or her home and suburb should reflect the lived experience of those who inhabit the public housing estate.

As Harvey (1996) argues, there is no logical way to resolve these conflicts:

\begin{quote}
We here identify the potentiality for social conflict deriving entirely from the time horizon over which the effect of a decision is held to operate. While economists often accept the Keynesian maxim that ‘in the long run we are all dead’ and that the short-run is the only reasonable time horizon over which to operationalise economic and political decisions (Harvey, 1996, p.229) ...

Internal spatio-temporal organisation of the household, of workplaces, of cities, is the outcome of struggles to stabilise or disrupt social meanings by opposing social forces. (Harvey, 1996, p.230)
\end{quote}

Therefore, assessments of public housing estates, public housing dwellings or the provision of affordable housing might be better judged over a longer period and using a different decision-making mechanism than the market. This study engages with this debate and takes as a starting point the right of public housing tenants, as citizens\(^4\) of the state, to be included in the decision-making processes that affect their lives (NSW Department of Housing, 1986, p.1). In 1986, the New South

\(^3\) Drawing on Harvey (1996), Cornwall (2008), Lefebvre (1991) and others, in this study spatio-temporality is defined by the author as “the bringing together of different constructions of space and time as subjective experience”.

\(^4\) In the case of public housing, citizens also have a relationship to the state through the form of housing assistance that they receive (i.e. as landlord and tenant).
Wales (NSW) state housing authority formalised its commitment to involving public housing tenants in decision-making with the introduction of the Department of Housing’s Participation Policy, with the stated aim

To recognise tenants’ rights as housing consumers by giving them a say in broad public housing issues and more specifically in decisions affecting their homes and environment. (NSW Department of Housing, 1986, p.3; emphasis added by author)

In this study, the central research task is to investigate how the actions of public- and private-sector employees – in this case, through a public–private partnership in Sydney, Australia – were shaped by neo-liberal ideology. The analysis explores how the various social actors reconceptualised their institutional tenant participation strategies within the discourses of neo-liberalism, as part of this large urban redevelopment project.

The citation above from the state housing authority refers to public housing tenants as ‘consumers’, a term often deployed within neo-liberal discourse, with similarities to the term ‘customer’ (also see NSW Department of Housing, 2004c). Within neo-liberal discourse, the terms ‘consumer’ and ‘customer’ connote a relationship between social subjects and social structures that is often constructed as a relationship between ‘individuals’ and the market. In the case of public housing, the sovereignty of the individual – public housing tenants’ rights – is established through their relationship to the housing market as ‘housing consumers’. Comparatively, within the discourse of citizenship, the sovereignty of the individual – public housing tenants’ rights – is established, at times collectively, through their relationship to the state as ‘citizens’.

This study makes explicit the tensions and contradictions between the sovereignty of the individual as a ‘citizen’ of a state and as a ‘customer’ within a market-based social intervention. However, the construction of public housing tenants within this urban redevelopment project should not be understood as binary, or even equidistant, between ‘citizen’ and ‘consumer’, for public and private actors
connect the state and the market in intricate and diffuse ways. This study examines the discursive rules within various social institutions that governed how social actors created public housing tenant participation spaces in this urban redevelopment project (Foucault, 1969).

Complex ‘conditions of possibility’ (Foucault, 1969) mean that public- and private-sector actors demarcate and regulate public housing tenant participation strategies in ways that are dynamic and constantly changing. However, while these conditions of possibility may be time and place specific, they often manifest with ideological consistency. It is therefore possible to document empirically how social actors create public housing tenant participation spaces with ideological specificity. This study investigates how the discursive rules within various institutions were dynamic and changed over time, but also how they worked to neo-liberalise the public housing tenant participation spaces.

In this case study, public- and private-sector actors redefined the conditions that governed how public housing tenants could exercise decision-making power. The analysis demonstrates that the changes in the public housing tenant participation strategies, deployed by both the public and private sectors, created tensions between the democratic rights of citizens to be involved in decision-making processes and the construction of public housing tenants as customers through market-based social policy.

The Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project (BLCP) is a $733,000,000 redevelopment of a public housing estate 30 km south-west of Sydney, being undertaken by public–private partnership. Over the next 30 years, the redevelopment project will be significantly transforming, for better or worse, the lives of over 3,000 citizens, and provides significant insight into the democratic potential of market-centric social policy contracted out to the private sector.

---

5 This public housing estate redevelopment project will hereafter will be called the BLCP, as this was the colloquial acronym given to the project by the state housing authority in Sydney.
6 Australian dollar.
Therefore, the BLCP is an important case that highlights the opposing social, political, financial and emotional forces alluded to in the opening section above.

In 1984, the then Minister for Housing in NSW “made a commitment to put the principle of tenant participation into practice” (NSW Department of Housing, 1986, p.1). Exactly 20 years later, in December 2004, Housing NSW sent a letter to all public housing tenants on the Bonnyrigg public housing estate (Estate), stating:

The State Government has announced the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project ... As one of the first steps the Department will be working with Bonnyrigg residents, community groups, Fairfield City Council and the private sector to put together a community renewal plan for Bonnyrigg ... The Department wants residents to be fully involved and to have a say in the project. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004d)

To further define the investigation into public housing tenant participation undertaken in this study, this chapter continues with a brief overview of the BLCP. The BLCP overview is followed with an outline of the scope of the study and concludes with the structure and organisation of the thesis.
Overview of the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project

This section provides a brief overview of the BLCP and the suburb of Bonnyrigg. A more detailed overview of the suburb and Estate is provided in Chapter 2 and a more detailed analysis of the BLCP is provided in Chapters 5–7.

Bonnyrigg is a suburb within the highly cosmopolitan Fairfield Local Government Area, located 30 km south-west of Sydney (see Figure 1 overleaf). The Fairfield Local Government Area (LGA) consists of 27 suburbs, and in 2001 the LGA had “one of the highest proportions of overseas born residents of any LGA in Australia” (Fairfield City Council, 2004, p.4).

The study area of the research is the Bonnyrigg public housing estate (see Figure 2 overleaf), which covers 81 hectares. In 2006, the Estate had a population of around 3,300 people and included 833 publicly owned and approximately 100 privately owned dwellings (NSW Department of Housing, 2006d, p.1). The Estate was originally designed using the ‘Radburn’ civil engineering design principle and was poorly maintained by the state housing authority throughout the decade preceding the announcement of the BLCP (Berry, 2002; Hall and Berry, 2004; NSW Department of Housing, 2004c).

In December 2004, the Housing Minister of NSW announced the redevelopment project. The BLCP is NSW’s first public housing estate redevelopment by public–private partnership and involves a 30-year contract between the NSW Government and a private-sector ‘partner’ (NSW Department of Housing, 2004b).

3 The analysis returns to the discursive deployment of the terms ‘partner’ and ‘partnership’ and the contractual relationships between the various public- and private-sector entities in subsequent chapters.
Figure 1 – The location of Bonnyrigg within Greater Western Sydney

Source: Fairfield City Council (2008, p.12)

Figure 2 – The location of the Bonnyrigg Public Housing Estate with the suburb

Source: Rogers (2006, p.4)
The public–private partnership contract covers the delivery of physical infrastructure and a suite of social objectives, including tenancy management, ‘community building’, ‘community consultation’ and an array of communication functions. The contract is managed under a performance-based fee structure and will explore new asset management and dwelling maintenance practices contracted out to the private sector by the NSW state housing authority.

During the selection of the private-sector contractor, the state housing authority (Housing NSW) and the local government authority (Fairfield City Council) implemented a ‘community engagement’ program to assist Housing NSW with planning and design matters during the public–private partnership bidding phase. Fairfield City Council also became the planning approvals authority for development applications issued by the private-sector contractor in subsequent phases of the BLCP.

Over the contract term, the net housing stock across the Estate will be increased from about 950 to over 2,330 dwellings. While retaining 833 newly constructed dwellings as publicly owned housing stock, this increase in housing density allows Housing NSW to reduce the percentage ratio of publicly owned dwellings across the Estate over the contract term. At the conclusion of the BLCP, the ratio of public to privately owned housing stock would be reduced from the 2004 ratio of about 90% public and 10% private to about 30% public and 70% private (see Figure 3 overleaf). The private-sector contractor will sell the additional housing stock generated by the BLCP over the contract term on the open housing market to part finance the BLCP.

The BLCP contract will see the public tenancies transferred to a non-profit housing manager, under contract to the private-sector ‘partner’, for the 30-year period. The private-sector contractor undertaking the BLCP consists of a major financial institution, a property developer, a property maintenance company and a non-profit housing manager. An overview of the services to be provided by the private-sector contractor is outlined in Figure 4 overleaf.
Figure 3 – ‘Quick facts’ about the BLCP: Private sector promotional material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quick facts about the Bonnyrigg development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original population: 2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of completed scheme: 6810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original number of dwellings: 933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling numbers of completed scheme: 2332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original mix of dwellings: 90% public, 10% private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of dwellings on completed scheme: 30% public, 70% private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning approval: January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 construction starts: April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected completion of Stage 1: September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected completion of scheme: c. July 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Newleaf Communities (2009b)

Figure 4 – Services provided by the private-sector contractor under the BLCP

Source: Milligan and Randolph (2009, p.35)
The BLCP is a single-contract arrangement between the NSW Government and Bonnyrigg Partnerships Consortium. The Bonnyrigg Partnerships Consortium is jointly owned by two of the four consortium ‘partners’, Becton Property Group (property developer) and Westpac Banking Corporation (financial institution). The other two consortium members are St George Community Housing (non-profit housing manager) and the Spotless Group (property maintenance company).

The BLCP master plan, prepared by Urbis (2008, p.17) on behalf of the Bonnyrigg Partnerships Consortium, outlines each contractor’s responsibility under the BLCP contract as follows:

Becton Property Group ... [is] responsible for planning, design and construction and overall project management for Bonnyrigg Partnerships;
Westpac Bank ... [is] responsible for raising the finance needed to carry out the Bonnyrigg Partnerships development and community renewal program;
St George Community Housing ... [is] responsible for tenancy management of the social housing for Bonnyrigg Partnerships; and
Spotless Group ... [is] responsible for facilities maintenance of all social housing and agreed public areas and facilities of Bonnyrigg Partnerships.

The contract provides that the private-sector contractor will complete the following:

• Master-plan the redevelopment, including the design and construction of new public and private dwellings, roads, open spaces and community facilities.
• Undertake the physical works.
• Stage the construction over 10–15 years.
• Ensure that there is no discernable difference from the street between new dwellings placed on the market for private sale and dwellings retained as publicly owned housing.

A single-contract arrangement is a contract between two entities only. To facilitate this arrangement, the four contracted companies formed a consortium company to bid for the contract.
• Sell the private housing stock on the open housing market.
• Manage and maintain the infrastructure for the contract term.
• Manage the public housing tenancies for the contract term.
• Ensure that there is no net loss in public housing stock – although the private-sector contractor may purchase additional housing off site if public allocations cannot be met on site.
• Provide a mixture of housing types, including detached homes, group attached homes and higher-density apartment buildings near the Town Centre (see Figure 5 below).

Source: Author (paraphased from NSW Department of Housing, 2004b; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007; Urbis, 2008)

Figure 5 - Mixture of housing types: Private sector promotional material

Source: Bonnyrigg Partnerships (2007f)

In addition to these tangible objectives, the private-sector contractor has also been contracted to complete a range of more ambiguous objectives, including:
consulting public housing tenants and involving them in decision-making processes; building social cohesion; or minimising disruptions to the lives of public and private residents on the Estate (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007; Urbis, 2008a).
This reimagining of the Estate and its residents in terms of a set of management functions to be completed by the private sector – constructed around the demolition and construction of the built environment and the management of social subjects by the private sector – is clearly neo-liberal in its understanding of urban problems and solutions (the analysis returns to the construction of neo-liberal problem-solution narratives through this thesis). This neo-liberal understanding, the specificities of which include the demarcation of both time and space in unique and specific ways, is important to this study, for public–private partnerships create specific spaces within which particular contract functions are tasked (Argent, 2005; Barnett, 2010; Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Dodson, 2006; Graefc, 2005; Peck and Tickell, 2002; Weber, 2002). In the BLCP, these include those listed above, asset services, community services and tenancy services.

Corresponding to these contractual functions is a series of independent timelines that have been assigned to particular spatial locations and are guided by various completion schedules. For example, Housing NSW suggested that the physical works could take anything from 5 to 15 years, while tenancy management will continue for the 30-year contract term (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c). In the excerpt below, Housing NSW outline some of the contractual spaces:

For this Project, a Private Partner will be chosen to plan improvements to houses, roads, parks and community facilities and to undertake physical renewal works. The Private Partner will also undertake facilities management and potentially tenancy management. The Department recognises that sustainable renewal of Public Housing estates cannot be achieved by government or individual agencies acting alone. It can only happen through partnership, with tenants and other residents, the private and community sectors, local councils and government departments all working together. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.9)

This study is particularly focused on the final commitment outlined above, the social spaces created by Housing NSW and the private-sector contractor to involve public housing tenants in the BLCP and the redevelopment of their Estate. While a detailed analysis of the BLCP timeline, BLCP contract and public
housing tenant participation spaces is provided in subsequent chapters, the BLCP was broadly deployed in three distinct phases, outlined in Figure 6 below.

Figure 6 – The three phases of the BLCP

**Phase 1:** The period preceding BLCP announcement, including planning the redevelopment model and drafting the private-sector contracts by Housing NSW (until December 2004).

**Phase 2:** The period from BLCP announcement to the signing of the BLCP contract deeds by the private-sector contractor (December 2004 to December 2006).

**Phase 3:** The period from the signing of the BLCP contract deeds by the private-sector contractor for a 30-year contract period (from December 2006).

Source: Author (from NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, 2006a,f, 2007b).
The scope of this study: Tenant participation as an invited space

This study is about tenant participation as an ‘invited space’ in the context of neo-liberal discourses of urban governance (Cornwall, 2004, 2008; Cornwall and Schattan P. Coelho, 2007a; Jacobs et al., 2003). The analysis is therefore purposely targeted towards the involvement of public housing tenants in the redevelopment of their Estate by public–private partnership. The analysis, by design, does not engage with broader questions about the delivery of public infrastructure by the private sector, except where these questions relate to the involvement of public housing tenants. Even in these cases, the analysis is driven by tenant-related concerns and issues focused on their involvement in, or absence from, decision-making processes.

In this account of the BLCP, urban and social planners, economists, property developers, major financial institutions and non-government service providers all play important – indeed, central – roles. However, the fulcrum for this study, the pivot point on which the study is balanced, is citizenship. My analysis draws attention to neo-liberal conceptions of citizenship that view citizens of the state, who live in state-managed housing, as morally inferior to citizen ‘customers’ who source their housing in the marketplace. Barry Hindess (2002, p.140) argues, using the construct of the “neo-liberal citizen”:

If there is a common thread linking the many late twentieth-century projects of neo-liberal reform, both within particular states and in the international arena, it lies in the attempt to introduce market and quasi-market arrangements into areas of social life which had hitherto been organised in other ways – the corporatisation and privatisation of state agencies, the promotion of competition and individual choice ... These developments have striking consequences for both the political and the social aspects of citizenship; the political rights (such as they are) may remain but their scope is restricted as market regulation takes over from direct regulation by state agencies and the judgement of the market is brought to bear on the conduct of states, while the social rights of citizenship (where they exist) are pared back as provision through the market replaces provision directly or indirectly through the state.
Within this analytical frame, public housing tenants’ experience of citizenship can be traced over time through the different participation spaces created by the public and private sectors to involve them in the redevelopment project. These experiences can be traced along a dialectically connected continuum from a well-informed and politically powerful citizenry to subjugated social subjects (Arnstein, 1969; Foucault, 1969), drawing attention to the discursive strategies that constructed the participation spaces.

The aim is to identify and contrast the social subjects and social institutions that held decision-making power within certain decision-making spaces at specific moments in time. The analysis will uncover and make explicit the mechanisms by which social subjects were invited into or restricted from decision-making spaces.

Hence, the term ‘space’ is this study is not understood solely as geographical or physical space. Space also encompasses social and moral spaces, including community consultation, market, social and economic policy and other constructed or imagined spaces (Cornwall, 2004; Harvey, 1996; Lefebvre, 1991; Peck and Tickell, 2002). In this view, the Bonnyrigg public housing estate is understood as a moral space that brings people together through geographical, sociological and emotional relationships with other social subjects and institutions. In these spaces, social subjects’ identities are constructed through micro- and macro-cultures of values and meanings, and the coordination and demarcation of time and space become important factors within the analysis (Rose, 2003).

Therefore time and space are central to the theoretical framework of this study. Harvey (1996, pp.207–227) argues that space and time are not only social constructs, but that conceptions of space and time affect the way we understand the world to be. And they also provide a reference system by means of which we locate ourselves (or define our “situatedness” and “positionality” ...) with respect to that world. It is therefore impossible to proceed far with a discussion of space and time without invoking the term “place”. (Harvey, 1996, p.208)
Fairclough (2003, p.151) concludes, drawing on the work of Harvey (1996, 1990), that time and space “are differently constructed in different societies, change in their construction is part of social change, and constructions of space and time are contested”. Our experiences of time and space, relative to place, are therefore important areas for analysis when considering the contention and conflicts between citizenship and capital. Pierre Bourdieu (1985, p.46) contends that

[T]he structure of the distribution of the different types and subtypes of capital at a given moment in time represents the immanent structure of the social world, i.e., the set of constraints, inscribed in the very reality of that world, which govern its functionality in a durable way, determine the chances of success for practices. It is in fact impossible to account for the structure and functioning of the social world unless one reintroduces capital in all its forms and not solely in the one form recognised by economic theory.

Capital, as understood by economic theory, would equate to land and property owned by the state and accumulated capital and borrowing potential residing with private-sector entities and financial institutions in this case study (the analysis returns to other forms of capital in Chapter 3). These constructs, citizenship as a democratic activity and capital as an economic resource for use in the market, should be viewed as the key constituents in conflict over determining who had the right to exercise decision-making power in different invited spaces in the market-centric urban governance structure explored in this study.

Therefore, this thesis is not about the success or otherwise of the BLCP, the economics of the public–private partnership model or the capacity of the private sector to undertake public housing estate redevelopments. Similarly, the study does not determine whether public housing tenants were better or worse off after the BLCP, progressed socio-economically, remained in Bonnyrigg, moved away, gained employment or were satisfied or dissatisfied with the redevelopment project. Irrespective of the success or otherwise of the BLCP, measured using any number of evaluative mechanisms, the study is an analysis of how public- and private-sector actors involved public housing tenants in the decisions that affect their lives in a neo-liberalised space.
Consequently, I do not contend that the social subjects within either Housing NSW or the private-sector companies conceptualised the public housing tenant participation spaces in the same way as will be theorised in this study. Each social subject brings with them a different spatio-temporality to their assessment of the BLCP and tenant participation, partly constructed by the social institutions that they inhabited, but also by their social experiences and history (Carmody, 2001). So too, this account is structured by my own experiences with the BLCP and interactions with public housing tenants between 2005 and 2010, while working for the state housing authority (Housing NSW) and the local government authority (Fairfield City Council) involved in this redevelopment project and then as a university researcher with the University of Western Sydney.

Throughout 2005–2006, Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council employed me at different times within a locally based redevelopment team to manage a range of ‘community consultation’ and ‘capacity building’ projects. During 2006, I also completed an insider research project, a partnership project between the University of Western Sydney and Fairfield City Council, studying public housing tenant participation in the BLCP as part of an Honours degree. Then between 2007 and 2010, I undertook the current PhD study as a university researcher. As demonstrated throughout this study, these different subject positions and social experiences have shaped who I am as a researcher, the questions I chose to ask and the methods I deploy (Carmody, 2001, p.170).

The account of the BLCP offered in this thesis is thus partly an attempt to make sense of my own experience in the BLCP, as a researcher and consultant who worked closely with public housing tenants, Housing NSW and with the private-sector contractors on public housing tenant participation processes over the first 5 years of the BLCP.
The organisation of the thesis

To present this account of the BLCP, the thesis is structured in three parts. Part I includes Chapters 1–4 and further defines the central research task, reviews literature relevant to the study context and provides the research framework. To achieve this aim, in Chapter 2 citizenship and democracy are theorised as the *raison d’être* for including participation strategies in urban redevelopment processes, especially when these projects involve the urban poor. This discussion is positioned in relation to more direct forms of democratic practice (Cooke and Kothari, 2001; Cornwall, 2004; Gaventa, 2004; Sinclair, 1988) and participation conceived as democratic action (Nabatchi et al., in print; Keane, 2009). Finally, the BLCP public housing tenant participation spaces are defined and positioned within this analytical frame.

Chapter 3 outlines the political and policy context to be taken up in the data analysis chapters. This chapter reviews literature relating to neo-liberalism, with a particular focus on the political economy of public housing in the United States (USA), the United Kingdom (UK) and Australia. This discussion shows that social actors within neo-liberalised spaces make moral claims about ‘citizens’ and ‘community’, and this in turn shapes how social policy is formulated and deployed. The chapter concludes with a brief history of public housing estate redevelopment in Australia, to locate the BLCP in its historical and political context.

Chapter 4 reflects on the literature review and central research task – an investigation into how the actions of public- and private-sector actors in this public–private partnership were structured by neo-liberal ideology and how these actions subsequently shaped the public housing tenant participation strategies – to construct a theoretical framework and a set of methodological tools to investigate public housing tenant participation in the BLCP. The chapter puts forward a spatio-temporal research tool that is broadly Foucauldian in approach and uses
Andrea Cornwall’s (Cornwall, 2004, 2008; Cornwall and Schattan P. Coelho, 2007b) spatial metaphor of ‘invited space’ to demarcate and investigate specific public housing tenant participation processes. This chapter also puts forward reflective ethics as a theoretical apparatus for attending to researcher subjectivity within the study.

Part II includes Chapters 5–7 and provides a spatio-temporal analysis of the BLCP to investigate how the public–private partnership demarcated and regulated public housing tenant participation strategies in this urban redevelopment project. Chapter 5 covers Phase 1 of the BLCP, the period preceding BLCP announcement, to make explicit the spaces that Housing NSW created to plan the redevelopment project and to draft the private-sector contracts (before December 2004). This analysis shows that Housing NSW did not invite public housing tenants into these spaces, and demonstrates that a range of national and supra-national political and economic discourses shaped the framing of the BLCP.

Chapter 6 covers Phase 2 of the BLCP, the period from BLCP announcement to the signing of the BLCP public–private partnership contract by the private-sector contractor (December 2004 to December 2006). This analysis shows that Housing NSW created two macro-level invited spaces in Phase 2. Housing NSW created the first space to conduct community consultations with public housing tenants and the second space to conduct contractual negotiations with the private sector. The analysis demonstrates how the conditions of possibility within this neo-liberal urban redevelopment project mandated distance between these two spaces. In this phase, Housing NSW did not invite public housing tenants into the space constructed to negotiate with the private sector.

Chapter 7 covers Phase 3 of the BLCP, the period from the signing of the BLCP contract deeds by the private-sector contractor for a 30-year contract period (from December 2006). This analysis shows that Housing NSW withdrew from direct engagement with public housing tenants in this phase and required the
private-sector contractor to develop its own community engagement spaces. As in Phase 2, the analysis demonstrates how the conditions of possibility within this neo-liberal urban redevelopment project mandated this action. In this phase, Housing NSW did not invite public housing tenants into the space constructed to manage with the private-sector contracts.

Part III, Chapter 8 concludes the thesis by providing a discussion that links the central research task outlined in Part 1 to the findings of the study outlined in Part II. Chapter 8 draws together the research observations and researcher reflections of public housing tenants’ participation in the BLCP over the first 5 years of the redevelopment project.
CHAPTER 2 – Democracy, citizenship and economics: Are our modern dilemmas 2,500 years old?

[Ancient] Athenians fully recognised the importance of distinguishing the political from the economic, to prevent both leveling of economic differences and the ability of those with economic resources to subvert the will of the people. (Farrar, 2007, p.181)

In the middle of the fifth century BCE, Socrates, commonly regarded as one of the founders of Western philosophy, was living in Athens at a time of significant political change; the evolution of demos (the people) krátos (rule or power), or democracy (Tuominen, 2009). Over 2,500 years ago, it seems that the ancient Athenians and philosophers such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and Xenophon were grappling with similar dilemmas to those facing modern democracies – the relationship between power, economic resources and the demos (or people as citizens) (Sinclair, 1988). In the city-state of ancient Athens and in Aristotle’s view, one

who has the power to take part in the deliberative or judicial administration of any state is said by us to be a citizen of the state; and, speaking generally, a state is a body of citizens sufficing for the purposes of life. (Aristotle, 1988, p.19)

In many ways, the dilemmas and contradictions between delivering public infrastructure (and services) and the involvement of the people are as old, if not older, than democracy itself. The private financing of ‘public goods’ such as military infrastructure and equipment (i.e. naval vessels) and social events, including those funded through The Festival Committee, were key features that facilitated ancient Athenian democracy (Sinclair, 1988). It is within this system of governance that the ancient Athenians are also credited with creating one of the first strata of ‘public servants’. One of the first recorded examples documenting

---

9 For philosophical thought on the development of democracy, see also Democritus, Epicurus, Empedocles, Heraclitus, Parmenides, Protagoras, Pythagoras and Zeno (Cross and Woolley, 1989; Tuominen, 2009).

10 The Festival Committee was an important social institution charged with collecting public money and annual surplus for deposit into a festival or Theoric, fund (Sinclair, 1998, p.46). The institution has similarities with the contemporary state treasury.
the provision of state pay to citizens to participate in the peoples’ assembly, to serve on the juries within the law courts or for military services conducted to protect the *demos* and democracy more generally (Sinclair, 1988, p.134).

However, there is no clear historical point that signals the inception of *demoskrátos* (democracy), the comprehensive set of reforms that were enacted in ancient Athens that allowed thousands of Athenian citizens to engage in one of most direct democracies in history (Raaflaub, 2007b, p.3). Indeed, the origins of democracy are astutely contested (Cartledge, 2007; Frost, 1969; Raaflaub et al., 2007; Sinclair, 1988), with scholars of ancient Athenian democracy presenting different bodies of evidence, “from the limited number of literary and epigraphic sources”, in sharp contrast\(^{11}\) (Farrar, 2007, p.171). Cynthia Farrar (2007, p.171) suggests that

> Each commentator’s choice of a period and context in which to locate the emergence of democracy reflects the salience he [or she] ascribes to particular elements of governance.

Shaping contemporary debates about the preconditions and cause of Athenian democracy are questions about: citizenship; the full empowerment of the *demos* – in the Athenian case, the empowerment of citizens\(^{12}\) through the Assembly (*ekklesia*) or the Council of 500 (*Boule*); the role of law-setting by the *demos* and suggestions that this enabled the *demos* to exercise its own power; the role of institutional change and reform; and the spontaneous action of citizens in response to tyrant leadership (Cartledge, 2007; Farrar, 2007; Raaflaub, 2007b; Raaflaub et al., 2007; Rhodes, 2004; Sinclair, 1988). In summary, what separates the representative democracies of the 21st century from the more direct democracy of ancient Athens resides in the way in which people participated in

\(^{11}\) Scholars of ancient democracy widely debate the conditions and factors that resulted in the development of the world’s ‘first’ democracy. Differences in definition, membership and understandings of power, to name a few, mean that some scholars have traced the ‘first’ democracies back to before the sixth century BCE (see Cartledge, 2007; Raaflaub et al., 2007; Rhodes, 2004).

\(^{12}\) Not all social subjects were entitled to become citizens and participate in the democratic functions of ancient Athenian society. For instance, women and slaves were not granted citizenship rights (Sinclair, 1998).
political decision-making in democratic Athens. In Pericles’ famous fifth century BCE proclamation of ancient Athenian democratic ideals, he states:

It has the name democracy (demoskrátos) because government is in the hands not of the few but of the majority (es tous pleiónas oikein). In private disputes all are equal (pasi to ison) before the law; and when it comes to esteem in public affairs, a man is preferred according to his own reputation for something, not, on the whole, just turn and turn about, but for excellence, and even in poverty no man is debared by obscurity of reputation so long as he has it in him to do some good service to the State. Freedom is a feature of our public life (eleutheros politeuomen). (Thucydides' record of Pericles' Funeral Oration, cited in Herman, 2004, p.172)

In ancient Athens, citizens participated directly in the decisions that affected their lives (Sinclair, 1988) and they chose to participate because they had a right, as citizens, to do so. The citizen body in the fifth century BCE, through a range of political and social reforms, included some, but certainly not all, of the poorest members of ancient Athenian society, those without property or other resources (for a discussion on citizenship and exclusion in democratic Athens, see Sinclair, 1988, pp.191–220):

For Robert Wallace (2007), the key features in the creation of democracy are Solon’s ascription of legal and political standing – citizenships – to the plebeian [middle to lower classes] residents of Attica, the thetes [free men without property or other resources], and the creation of the “basic institutions of Athens’ democracy,” even through the citizens did not realise the potential of those institutions for more than a century. (Farrar, 2007, p.171)

The role of the navy and the reliance on poorer Athenians (thetes) as citizens to participate in military services and the Assembly (ekklesia) cannot be overstated here, a point explored further below. In a striking resemblance to the democracies of the 21st century, it is often argued that three factors were important to the

---

13 Unlike a representative democracy with elected representatives, in ancient Athens citizens decided to participate and were chosen randomly by lottery (lot).
14 The inclusion of thetes and other poor social subjects in the military (i.e. as citizen rowers in navy vessels) changed the way in which poor citizens were conceptualised within the political realm (Sinclair, 1998).
development and durability of ancient Athenian democracy: war, economics and the power of the *demos* (Cartledge, 2007; Farrar, 2007; Frost, 1969; Raaflaub, 2007b; Rhodes, 2004; Sinclair, 1988; Wallace, 2007).

In Athens in the middle of the fifth century BCE, the benefits of citizenship and democracy were directly linked to the increased economic activity associated with shipbuilding and the internal revenues collected “from harbour dues, mining concessions and royalties” (Sinclair, 1988, p.11), combined with the military power to protect these resources and governance structures.

However, these observations are not provided to satisfy my own antiquarian curiosity. Farrar (2007) and others show, when we compare and contrast contemporary experiments in ‘democracy’ with the ancient Athenian achievement, that the democratic intent of these governance mechanisms is brought sharply into focus (Farrar, 2007, p.184). This is especially the case with the more direct experiments with ‘democracy’ that states are deploying through social policy and urban governance, which are often termed ‘community participation’, ‘community planning’ or even ‘deliberative democracy’ (Carson, 2005; Dryzek, 2000, 2006; Gastil, 2008; Hartz-Karp and Carson, 2009). Aristotle (1988, p.60), by no means an avid supporter of ancient Athenian democracy, reflected:

> If liberty and equality, as is thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost.

Hence, it is perhaps no coincidence that the top of Arnstein’s (1969) *Ladder of Participation*, a theoretical framework focused on decision-making power that is widely cited in urban planning, is dominated by terms such as ‘citizen power’, ‘citizen control’ and ‘delegated power’. It should also not be surprising that Arnstein’s Ladder of Participation has been re-theorised and reconstructed by

---

15 War continues to be a key feature of democracy. Although in ancient Athens the *demos* fought to protect democracy, nation states now go to war in the name of democracy.
urban planners, community consultation consultants and government agencies from its inception in the late 1960s. The analysis turns to this type of re-theorising in Chapter 6 to show how the democratic intent and social utility of Arnstein’s Ladder of Participation can be realigned when citizenship is removed from the framework.

Grounding this study in terms of citizenship – or, more specifically, in terms of more direct forms of urban governance by citizens at the local level – directs the focus of the study towards questions that include the following:

Was the BLCP about the reorientation of a system of urban governance towards a more direct form of citizen power/control?

If not, what was the intention of ‘community participation’ (democratic or otherwise)?

And, is it worth considering whether it may be possible to adapt this core commitment to local-based decision-making to reorient our current system of urban governance?

Source: Author from Farrer (2007, p.170)

It must be noted that the latter question is by no means a new consideration. The question precedes Arnstein (1969) and its discursive roots go deep into many local governance structures in different locations, not all of them necessarily democratic. The Mabo case in Australia, for example, demonstrated that the Meriam people had operated a locally based land inheritance system on the Mer Islands in the Torres Strait long before white settlement of Australia (Loos and Mabo, 1996). Similarly, lembaga adat of Indonesia (a traditional community based institution connected to Islam), the powers of which have diluted over the last 50 years, has long been a local decision-making space for religious, cultural, social, economic and local issues including property (planning) matters (Wollenberg et al., 2006). Central to both these examples, and not to be explored here, is the importance of locally based decision-making and not the decision-making processes per se.

16 Although Wollenberg et al. (2006) argue that there has been a formalised resurgence of lembaga adat.
The point, highlighted by these examples, is that the cultural context structures our subjective experience of spatial locations, our spatio-temporalities. Public housing tenants, as citizens of the state, within a system of governance guided by representative democracy, will understand an invitation to be included in locally based decision-making within this cultural context – as a right of citizenship within a democratic state.

Therefore, if the objective of the public housing tenant participation strategy in the BLCP was to “inform affected people about the project, include them in project decision making structures ... to enable local people to make a meaningful contribution to the project” (Coates et al., 2008, p.3; emphasis in original) as suggested by Housing NSW, then the key features of Athenian democracy are again useful here. To facilitate the direct forms of democratic practice in ancient Athens, the prerequisites were: “the popular will to power” and a self-awareness of this power by the people; and institutional transformation to accommodate the (direct) democratic processes (Farrar, 2007, p.172). Put simply, Farrar argues that the essential features were:

1. the people’s awareness of their own potential power,
2. the creation of institutions that enable[d] them to realise that potential, and
3. the redefinition of status and power as political rather than social attributes. (Farrar, 2007, p.172)

Raaflaub (2007a,b) for instance, believes that the realisation by citizens who had fewer resources at their disposal (and at times no resources) of both their political rights and their important role in society were significant factors in the development of ancient Athenian democracy. Raaflaub (2007a,b) argues that when the thetes (free men without property or other resources) were brought into the navy, as rowers of the Athenian Fleet, both the thetes and the demos (the people) realised that their safety and democracy depended on naval supremacy in the region and therefore the rowers of these military vessels. The thetes (those without

---

17 Whose housing tenancies are also managed by the state.
capital) and the *demos* became politically aware of the *thetes* political power, resulting from their social role, facilitated through citizenship rights, and not their social position. As Farrar (2007, p.178) points out:

In a full democracy, citizen status and power are not dependent upon social or economic standing or education or talent or virtue ... The Athenians took the unprecedented step of including as full citizens individuals without property or status.

Certainly, the relationship between citizens with fewer resources (capital) at their disposal compared with those with more is starkly different between the ancient Athenian and contemporary examples. Indeed, not all residents in ancient Athens held citizenship rights. By contrast, as a requirement for being eligible for public housing, public housing tenants are required to demonstrate some form of legal status (Australian citizenship or a visa) and it can be broadly assumed that public housing tenants can exercise some rights, either as citizens or temporary residents, under this legal arrangement.\(^\text{18}\)

Similarities between the ancient Athenian and the current example reside in the acknowledgement by both public housing tenants and society more broadly (and especially housing authorities) of the political power, irrespective of social status, of public housing tenants as citizens or legal residents. Further, public housing tenants and state housing authorities have long been cognizant of the rights associated with citizenship. Public housing tenants have exercised their democratic right to be involved in the decisions that affect their lives, especially at times of large-scale urban redevelopment and often outside the structures created by housing authorities through independent activism and protest (see Chapter 3).

\(^{18}\) However, more recent debates about citizenship – especially those relating to international law and refugees – question whether the construct of citizenship masks powerful discursive forces that might demarcate and excluded social subjects on the basis of a range of ideological positions (Magner, 2004).
However, in contemporary governance structures, citizens are deemed equal in their claims but unequal in their ability to advance their own and the common good. The modern political realm is narrowly conceived and undemanding and makes limited attempts to build civic capacity. (Farrar, 2007, p.179)

When public housing tenants exercise their rights as citizens, the validity attributed to their actions is commonly at the mercy of the very institutions to which they wish to speak. The exception is, of course, when these rights and actions are exercised outside the narrow governance structures created by state housing authorities and other institutions. In most cases, these institutions get to decide what is ‘good’ for citizens, and when and how citizens can contribute to debates framed by the social institutions.

Over the last two decades in Australia, the ‘how’ to engage with citizens has been focused on more direct forms of ‘democracy’ that are both issue and place specific. These include the raise of ‘deliberative planning’ (see, e.g., Hartz-Karp and Carson, 2009) or ‘community planning’ (see, e.g., The Department of Local Government, 2002) in the public sphere, both of which refer to a form of participation by ordinary citizens in deliberative processes about matters that affect them (Farrar, 2007, p.184). They are both positioned in terms of (regaining) citizen power:

They include the belief that the traditional liberal conception of democracy does not deliver real equality of opportunity, accountability, or an equal say in decision making, in part because liberal proceduralism permits economic power to rule. (Farrar, 2007, p.184)

However, the democratic realities of these types of deliberative spaces are varied and require careful investigation, focused on the power and politics of these spaces (Cornwall, 2008; Cornwall and Schattan P. Coelho, 2007b; von Lieres, 2007). This is one aspect of this study, explored through the construct of ‘invited space’ put forward in Chapter 4 (Cornwall, 2008). Indeed, there were many
limitations to the Athenian democratic project that reside in the power and politics of the invited spaces. ‘Who wishes to speak’ was a call offering any citizen the right to address the Assembly (ekklesia) and was an important part of ancient Athenian democracy. Hearing all the voices was somewhat less certain as a matter of procedure. Sinclair outlines some of the politics of participation spaces by suggesting that

The extent of the impact of oratorical displays and clever arguments is difficult to gauge. Large gatherings are, however, not the only meetings where speakers may be inclined to say what their hearers want to hear. Such flatterers were in fact compared with the flatterers of a tyrant. Nor are small deliberating bodies immune to arguments of immediate self-interest as opposed to the long-term good of the community. (Sinclair, 1988, p.207)

It is perhaps no coincidence we find the word ‘rhetoric’ – the use of language with persuasive effect, and a favourite topic of reflection for Aristotle (1988) from his observations of the ancient Athenian Assembly (ekklesia) and the Council of 500 (Boule) – being used to describe political speak in the 21st century (Frost, 1969; Sinclair, 1988). However, a rhetor or orator in ancient Athens, and to which Aristotle referred, was one who spoke regularly and at times on behalf of citizens (Sinclair, 1988, pp.137–138). The term rhetor could be used as both a sign of distinction or as a derogatory slur, depending on the motivations – the power and politics – attached to the rhetoric of those who chose to address the demos.

So too it is the case that the discursive framing in the 21st century of political decisions, social ‘problems’ and their ‘solutions’ have to be interrogated to uncover the power and politics implicit in the social spaces that facilitate these discussions (Sinclair, 1988). Not only must we hold the rhetor to account for the rhetorical speech act, as was the case in ancient Athens; additionally, in contemporary political spaces, we must also hold the rhetor to account for the rhetorical written act, the texts that are also deployed to have a persuasive effect on citizens. In this study, critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1989, 2003; van Dijk, 1985) is deployed to attend to this research task.
In summary, the power and politics of citizenship and the philosophical ferment that was accruing in and around ancient Athens and the Peiraiás\textsuperscript{19} throughout the fifth and fourth centuries BCE were important reference points for this study. This research chronicle starts in and around the Greek polis of the fifth century BCE, and will return to this socio-political and philosophical space throughout this thesis.

\textsuperscript{19} The Peiraiás was located on the coast about 12 kilometres south-west of ancient Athens and was an important military stronghold throughout the classical period. The Peiraiás had three deep harbour ports protected by fortified walls, in addition to fortified ‘long walls’ connecting the city-state to the ports. Throughout the fifth century BCE, the Peiraiás was home to the Athenian naval fleet and shipbuilding yards, and these were key constituents in the development and maintenance of ancient Athenian democracy (for a map of the ancient city-state of Athens and the Peiraiás, see Appendix 1).
Questioning tenant participation in public housing redevelopment

The section above put forward an argument for at least conceptualising, if not positioning outright, public housing tenant participation as a function of citizenship, a democratic right, to be afforded to citizens irrespective of their social status or access to capital. This positioning is important for two reasons, outlined below as two expanded components of the central research task of investigating how neo-liberalised spaces shape and constrain citizen participation in the decisions that affect their lives.

First, investigating the democratic potential of various participations spaces (Arnstein, 1969) – or as this question is more commonly framed within public housing estate redevelopments, investigating the capacity for public housing tenants to influence housing policy or redevelopment outcomes – has long been a focus of public housing tenant participation studies (Atkinson and Cope, 1997; Cowan, 1998; Cronberg, 1986; Ming Yip, 2000; Somerville and Steele, 1995; Taylor, 1995; Wood, 2003). However, when positioned within the construct of citizenship, the BLCP brings into focus in a particularly clear way a new consideration, the market or the workings of capital.

Neo-liberalised spaces (Peck and Tickell, 2002) operate within certain ‘conditions of possibility’ (Foucault, 1969) that shape and constrain how public housing authorities, non-government organisations and the private-sector companies create ‘participation’ or ‘consultation’ strategies. “New institutions and modes of delivery are being fashioned, and new social subjectivities are being fostered” (Peck and Tickell, 2002, p.389) that normalise these new service delivery models and the ways in which social subjects conceive of their social roles (Foucault, 1969).

However, the political project of neo-liberalism is also spatially and temporally variegated. The timing or historical location of policy deployment (temporal factors) and the site of intervention (spatial factors) are diverse, for the political
The project of neo-liberalism is neither monolithic nor unified (Bondi and Laurie, 2005; Larner, 2009). Peck and Tickell (2002, pp.387–388) suggest that analyses of neo-liberalised spaces need to be time and place specific. They should take notice of the scale and scope of state intervention, forms of capital and labor market regulation, the constitution of institutions of social regulation, patterns of political resistance and political incorporation, and so forth.

This is the first task assigned to this study, to bring to the surface the ‘conditions of possibly’ for public housing tenant participation with a market-centric urban redevelopment project at a specific time and place: to show not only the spaces into which public housing tenants were invited, and the democratic potential or otherwise of these spaces, but also the spaces into which public housing tenants were not invited. Importantly, these uninvited spaces are often overlooked, rendered invisible by discursive neo-liberal discourses constructed around business accountability, intellectual property or commercial-in-confidence (Rogers, 2010a).

The analysis will show that the decisions, to invite or not to invite, and the democratic potential of the participation spaces, were shaped by a more recent political manifestation of neo-liberalism within local urban governance policy, whereby neo-liberal economic policy is taken for granted (Larner, 2009). This study investigates this normalisation of market-centric urban policy, to show how it was taken for granted and internalised by social subjects including employees of the state, private and non-government sectors, and public housing tenants involved in the BLCP. The use of the construct of citizenship as the pivot point for this study problematises the normalisation of market-centric approaches to urban governance by social subjects and social institutions.

This raises a further question, the second component of the central research task. If the conditions of possibility within market-centric urban redevelopment projects shape and constrain social subjects and the decisions they take within
various social institutions (an argument further developed in Chapter 4), then how does one rigorously investigate the capacity for public housing tenants to influence housing policy or redevelopment outcomes in the BLCP?

Again, the construct of citizenship is used as a reference point to frame the analysis, drawing attention to the social subjects who held or exercised decision-making power at specific moments in time. Certainly, then, in an urban redevelopment project contracted out to the private sector by public–private partnership, the other key constituent in an analysis of decision-making power within this neo-liberalised space must be the construct of capital: capital viewed in a narrow sense, as accumulated property or land value; or the financial resources of public and private intuitions; or the borrowing potential of private-sector entities (Bourdieu, 1985).

However, capital is not positioned as the antithesis of citizenship; it is not a matter of one construct over the other. Citizenship and capital should not be taken to be mutually exclusive in any given decision-making process. Rather, the constructs of capital and citizenship should be viewed as mechanisms through which social subjects came to exercise power (Foucault, 1975a). Citizenship and capital were political mechanisms that were used by social subjects, deployed either together or with other political tools, and at different places and times, to achieve political ends – but always constrained in the BLCP by neo-liberal conditions of possibility (Foucault, 1969, 1980).

While these two constructs, as deployed by social subjects as political mechanisms of power, may not be mutually exclusive to an exercise of decision-making power, this is not to say that citizenship and capital did not come into conflict in decision-making spaces. This is the theoretical contribution of the study, an analysis of the relationship between citizenship and capital, as political mechanisms of power deployed by social subjects, in conflict over the right to exercise decision-making power within neo-liberalised spaces.
The study context: A place called Bonnyrigg

Perhaps some of the first spatio-temporalities that can be ascribed to the geographical space that is now called Bonnyrigg are the social practices and land uses of the Indigenous Australians of the Cabrogal Clan of the Dharug Nation, who traversed these lands for thousands of years before colonisation in 1788 (Tobin, 1999).

There remains significant cultural, customary and language diversity among the different Indigenous clans and nations across Australia, each attaching often subtly different meanings to geographical, social and spiritual space (Read, 2000; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). These spatio-temporal meanings do not travel well across cultures, as our recent history demonstrates. Richard Mohr (2003) argues that Indigenous Australians’ socio-political laws of the land have remained almost invisible to the colonisers since deploying their own cultural reference to the land in 1788, *terra nullius*20 (Attwood and Markus, 1998; Australian Human Rights Commission, 2010). This is perhaps most vividly expressed not only by words, but also by images such as the one shown in Figure 7 overleaf, by artist Tobias Titz, taken from the *Marnti Warajanga* exhibition21.

While the geographical spaces might be the same, the cultural relationships to that land – rights or custodianship – “cannot be mapped onto the place using the same set of cultural referents” (Mohr, 2003, p.4):

The clash between Indigenous inhabitants and colonisers was played out at the level of representation as well as use of the land. Indigenous representations ... convey a rich picture of a land that is used and meaningful.

---

20 *Terra nullius* is a Latin expression deriving from Roman law, meaning *land belonging to no one*. In the Australian case, it was a term used by the colonisers to argue that the geographical space now known as Australia was never subject to the sovereignty of any state and therefore could be acquired through occupation (Attwood and Markus, 1998; Australian Human Rights Commission, 2010; Mohr, 2003).

21 The exhibition reflects on the 1967 Referendum held on 27 May, in which the Australian people returned a 90.77% ‘yes’ vote. The 1967 Referendum enabled Indigenous Australians to be counted in the national census and to be subject to Commonwealth laws rather than state laws (Attwood and Markus, 1998; Titz, 2007).
The opposing trope of the colonial society was to see the land as unimproved and uncomprehended. (Mohr, 2003, p.4)

Figure 7 – Tobias Titz artwork taken from the Marni Warajanga exhibition

This shows that cultural subjectivities are important to the way in which social subjects attribute meaning to geographical and social space (for a more detailed discussion on indigenous contestations over spatial meaning in Australia, see Jupp, 2002; McNamara and Grattan, 1999; Mohr, 2003). After defining the geographical spaces in Australia as *terra nullius*, the colonial power ‘instilled’ Governor Phillip, with the power “to grant land to emancipists” in April 1787, at an allocation of 30 acres for each male, with additional entitlements if married (NSW Government, 2010b, p.1). In 1789, these entitlements were increased for military personal and in 1791 the first land grants were issued in the Bonnyrigg area (Fairfield City Council, 2008, p.11). By 1825, the sale of land by private tender had begun, and in 1831 Viscount Goderich (the second) discontinued

---

Mohr (2003) argues that property law is also a site within which spatial struggles are mounted. Mohr (2003, p.2) shows that: “The project of developing a common law of the land (known in Roman law as
land grants in Australia to facilitate land sales by public and private interests (NSW Government, 2010b, p.1).

From 1791, the network of creeks and fertile soil around Bonnyrigg supported a range of pastoral properties, vineyards and orchards that prospered in the region for almost 80 years. Then during the 1870s, the larger parcels of land in the region were further subdivided into smaller farming lots suitable for extended family farming practices (Fairfield City Council, 2008, p.11). By the early 1900s, Bonnyrigg and the surrounding area was host to many family-run poultry, dairy, and fruit and vegetable farms (Fairfield City Council, 2008, p.11).

In 1942, The Housing Commission of New South Wales was established and granted powers by the state to acquire land to provide housing for thousands of citizens resettling in Australia following the Second World War (Australian Housing Research Fund, 2000; Fairfield City Council, 2008, p.11). Then, in 1980, The Housing Commission of New South Wales, hereafter called by the agency’s current name Housing NSW, acquired 294 acres (119 hectares), the current site of the Bonnyrigg public housing estate (Fairfield City Council, 2008, p.11) (see Figures 1 and 2 on page 8).

From 1981 to 1986, Housing NSW built 828 dwellings, a mixture of cottages, villas and townhouses, on the Western Sydney site now bounded by the roads Bonnyrigg Avenue, Cabramatta Road, Edensor Road and Smithfield Road. The Estate design was informed by the Radburn design principle (Housing NSW, 2008a).

---

a ‘lex terrae’), applying throughout the nation rather than to individuals as group members, was introduced as the law of the Norman Kings in England. It was to become one of the hallmarks of the modern state and a key constituent, along with terra nullius, in discursively constructing spaces in Australia as colonial assets.”

23 The Housing Commission of New South Wales changed its name to the New South Wales Department of Housing in 1986, after the introduction of the 1986 Housing Act. Then, following another review of the Housing Act in 2001, the agency underwent a further name change, becoming Housing NSW in 2008.
Bolstered by early theorising that would become New Urbanism (Katz, 1994; Southworth, 2003), the Radburn civil engineering design principle was used to design a selection of precincts across the USA, Canada and Australia between 1960 and 1990 (for an in-depth chronology, see Birch, 1980). In these sites, the design features tended towards reducing automobile transport by increasing walking and cycling transport routes and locating services nearer to housing. There was also the implicit aim of encouraging social interaction through the engineering of the intersection between public and private spaces (Birch, 1980).

However one design feature, colloquially termed *front-to-back* housing, has now become almost synonymous with the term Radburn in Australia. As the name suggests, the *front-to-back* housing component of the Radburn design principle orientates the fronts of the houses on to a communal open space, while the rears of the houses back on to the street. In Bonnyrigg, this design feature also consisted of “a series of open space systems connected via a series of walkways and cul-de-sacs” (Fairfield City Council, 2008, p.9), with high fences demarcating pedestrian thoroughfares. Fast forward 20 years and it is the Radburn civil engineering design feature, a feature of several public housing estates in Australia, that has more recently been discursively constructed as a significant contributor to the ‘failure’ of many large public housing estates in different locations (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c,d).

In 2001, the 81 hectare Estate site included 927 dwellings (Fairfield City Council, 2008, p.11). These consisted of 812 public housing, 13 Indigenous housing, three community housing and 99 privately owned dwellings, predominantly located in a small enclave in the south-west corner of the Estate (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.16).

Increasingly between 1981 and 2001, the Estate served as an entry point for refugees and other migrants, and by the mid-1990s it had a significant proportion

---

24 The Radburn urban design model takes its name from the unincorporated planned community of the same name in New Jersey, USA.
of public housing tenants from non-English-speaking backgrounds. In 2001, the Estate population was approximately 3,100, of which over 60% were born overseas (Rogers, 2005a,b). Therefore, cultural and linguistic diversity was a defining feature of the Estate until BLCP announcement in late 2004. The most common languages spoken in 2004 by public housing tenants included “English (30.3%), Vietnamese (26.4%), Khmer (7.0%), Arabic (6.4%), Chinese (5.6%), and Spanish (4%)” (Stubbs et al., 2005b).

Bonnyrigg has a number of cultural and religious sites within a 2-kilometre radius of the Town Centre that sits adjacent to and west of the Estate. These include a Khmer temple, Catholic church, Vietnamese temple, Turkish mosque, Chinese temple, Anglican church, Lao temple and Parkside Church (Gilbertson and Shepard, 2008). In 2004, the Town Centre was a single-level shopping district comprising Bonnyrigg Plaza, Bonnyrigg Community Centre, Bonnyrigg Youth Centre, Bonnyrigg Childcare Centre, Bonnyrigg Public School and Fairfield City Library (Fairfield City Council, 2008, p.9).

Several local primary schools,25 including St John’s Park Primary School, located north-east of the Estate, and Our Lady of Mt Carmel Primary School, located just east of the Estate, provide a range of schooling options for local residents. Further, the Bonnyrigg Town Centre is well connected to other regional cities, by way of two motorways (M7 Westlink and M5 Motorway) and a public Transitway,26 linking Bonnyrigg to two important ‘growth cities’, Liverpool (7 km from Bonnyrigg) and Parramatta (17 km from Bonnyrigg). Both of these regional cities are set to become major transport hubs and employment cities over the next 25 years under the Sydney Metropolitan Plan, as shown in Figure 8 overleaf (NSW Government, 2005a,b,c,e; Transport NSW, 2010).

---

25 In Australia, primary school refers to schooling from Kindergarten (5–6 year old children) to Year 6 (10–11 year old children). High School refers to schooling from Year 7 (11–12 year old children) to Year 12 (16–17 year old children).

26 The state-funded and -operated Liverpool to Parramatta Bus Transitway (T-Way) is a dedicated bus-only road network linking the train stations in these two regional cities with suburbs including Bonnyrigg. The T-Way is a rapid bus service on a dedicated road corridor, and is suggested to be more efficient as it provides more flexibility than a rail network.
 CHAPTER 2

Figure 8 – Sydney Metropolitan Strategy map

The Sydney Metropolitan Strategy is a 25-year plan aimed at increasing Sydney’s population by 1,100,000 people, building 640,000 new homes and creating 500,000 new jobs (NSW Government, 2005f). As shown above, the NSW Government suggests that the regional cities of Parramatta, Liverpool and Penrith will provide for more lifestyle and work opportunities close to the growing parts of Sydney. (NSW Government, 2005e)

Further, as shown by the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy map, both Fairfield (9 km from Bonnyrigg) and Prairiewood (5 km from Bonnyrigg) are set to become major shopping and business centres, with high-rise commercial districts, shopping districts, public department and council offices, and community service facilities (NSW Government, 2005f). Suffice to say, the geographical location of Bonnyrigg, when viewed in the context of the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and its spatial proximity to other urban centres, is well located both locally and regionally.

Regionally, the Estate is located within the key growth area of Sydney, often defined as the geographical space within the motorway loop. The Estate is well connected to two of the five key growth cities (no more than 20 km to each city) and the two proposed major centres (no more than 10 km to each major centre); while locally, the Estate is surrounded by the residential suburbs of St Johns Park (north-east of the Estate), Mount Pritchard (south-east and south of the Estate) and Bonnyrigg Heights (south-west of the Estate), all of which have experienced significant median house prices increases since 1998 (see Figure 9 overleaf).

---

27 The M7 Westlink, the M5 Motorway and the M2 Motorway.
A more detailed discussion about the diverse range of factors that contributed to the purported value of the land (accumulated capital) in the geographical space known as the Bonnyrigg Public Housing Estate is provided in Chapter 5. However, it is important at this point to flag the idle capital that had accumulated at the site, in purely economic terms, by 2004. This point is further explicated by comparing the median housing sale prices for Bonnyrigg\textsuperscript{28} with Fairfield, Sydney and NSW.

In 2001, the suburb of Bonnyrigg\textsuperscript{29} had a total of 2,519 privately owned dwellings within the suburb, less than 100 being located on the Estate with the additional 828 publicly owned dwellings (Fairfield City Council, 2005a). Five years on, in 2006, the suburb of Bonnyrigg had a comparable profile of 2,517 privately owned dwellings, with a similar number of publicly owned dwellings on the Estate and a slight increase in dwelling density across the suburb for the period (see Figure 10 overleaf) (Fairfield City Council, 2005a). Therefore, the public and private housing profile for the suburb was relatively consistent between 2001 and 2006.

\textsuperscript{28} The Bonnyrigg Public Housing Estate comprises approximately half of the suburb of Bonnyrigg.

\textsuperscript{29} That includes, but is not limited to, the Bonnyrigg Public Housing Estate.
Figure 10 – Bonnyrigg: Number of dwellings for suburb, 2001 and 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling structure (private dwellings)</th>
<th>Bonnyrigg 2006</th>
<th>Sydney Statistical Division 2001</th>
<th>Change 2001 to 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate house</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium density</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High density</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan, cabin, houseboat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL occupied private dwellings</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL unoccupied dwellings</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Dwellings</td>
<td>2,517</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fairfield City Council (2005a).

Importantly however, Figure 11 below shows that while the median house prices increases remained relatively comparable for Bonnyrigg, Sydney and NSW between 1998 and 2004, the median house prices also more than doubled in most cases during the same period. There was clearly an accumulation of capital (land value but not necessarily in the built form) within the Estate between the late 1990s and 2004.

Figure 11 – Median housing sale prices for the suburb of Bonnyrigg compared to Sydney and NSW


While land value and median house prices are not analogous, land value is used here as a representation of accumulating capital instead of median house price because the public housing stock was in an increasing state of disrepair during this period. As such, the tension between these two forms of capital, the built form and the land value, is outlined only briefly here, but will be explored further in Chapters 3 and 5.
The analysis returns to these two forms of accumulating (land) and depreciating (dwelling) capital, and the discursive construction of the Estate and dwellings as obsolete in policy documents (Weber, 2002), in Chapters 3 and 5.

Finally, the socio-economic indicators of the Estate in 2001 were as follows:

Not surprisingly, the Bonnyrigg Study Area [Estate] also differs considerably from NSW and SSD [Sydney Statistical Division] on a range of other socio-economic indicators. It has a much higher general unemployment rate, lower household income levels, and a much younger age structure. Levels of formal qualifications were also somewhat lower than for NSW and SSD. There were also slightly more people from an Indigenous background living in Bonnyrigg. (Stubbs et al., 2005b, p.19)

In 2001, the Estate fared poorly on a range of ‘socio-economic’ and ‘disadvantage’ indicators compared to both the broader Sydney population\(^{31}\) and NSW more generally (Stubbs et al., 2005b, p.19). Chapter 3 explores some of the reasons for the statistically high concentration of ‘disadvantage’ on the Estate by considering the political economy of public housing in the USA, the UK and Australia over the last 50 years.

---

\(^{31}\) Taken at the level of the Sydney Statistical Division.
CHAPTER 3 – Neo-liberalism, the political economy of housing and the BLCP

Neo-liberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterised by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. (Harvey, 2005, p.2)

While the history of neo-liberalism will not be rehearsed here in detail, several key features relating to the political economy of housing provision and the BLCP more generally require a quick exploration (for a detailed account see, for example, Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Harvey, 1990, 2005; Larner, 2009). As such, the analysis of neo-liberalism provided in this chapter will not follow the standard analytical trajectory that delves into the various schools of liberal thought, most notably: the individualism, state apathy and centrality of private property advocated by a school of Austrian economists associated with Ludwig von Mises (1912), Joseph Schumpeter (1927) and Fredrich von Hayek (1948); the economic theorising, in part a manifestation of the Austrian project, put forward by the so-called Chicago School (see Milton Friedman, 1963); or the normalisation of neo-liberalism resulting from the Washington Consensus (Barnett, 2010).

Instead, this précis of neo-liberalism is explicitly focused on the development and deployment of social policy under but one manifestation of neo-liberalism relevant to the BLCP. The final sections of the chapter move the analysis towards the rise of the neo-liberal citizen, to contrast this conception of citizenship with citizen participation conceived as democratic action within public housing redevelopment projects under the political project of neo-liberalism.

Under neo-liberal political economies, the central role of the state is conceived as the guardian of private property, the guarantor and protector of capital. As such, the state must establish a host of institutional apparatus to secure private property rights “and to guarantee, by force if need be, the proper functioning of markets”
(Harvey, 2005, p.2). In Australia, as in other countries, it seems that almost no social institution – military, police, legal, welfare and education – is impervious to market-centric policy. These social institutions have been used as technologies of the state in the pursuit of a neo-liberal agenda, although not with any consistency, spatially or temporally (Argent, 2005; Cooke, 2009; Cope and Gilbert, 2001; Ferguson et al., 2002; O’Connor et al., 1999).

There are many ways to track the spatio-temporal development of market-centric urban policy. However, the analysis put forward here has the explicit aim of showing how the place-based public housing tenant participation strategies deployed in the BLCP were positioned within a market-centric, technocratic and neo-communitarian (deFilippis, 2007) understanding of urban governance (for a detailed analysis, see Rogers, 2010a). Further, the analysis throughout this thesis will demonstrate that these place-based participation strategies render invisible the ideological effects of neo-liberalism, the market and the workings of capital by seeking to build a ‘consensus seeking community’ based on a functionalist approach to community building (Putman, 1995). As such, it has a focus on politics and social policy.

Peck and Tickell (2002, pp.388–389) plot three historical shifts in the development of the ideological project of neo-liberalism that provide a good analytical starting point for the purposes of this thesis.\(^{32}\) Conceiving of market-centric policy as a ‘neo-liberalised space’, Peck and Tickell (2002, p.380) suggest that “what began as a starkly utopian intellectual movement” was aggressively politicised throughout the 1980s, with a focus on the roles that Ronald Reagan in the USA and Margaret Thatcher in the UK played in inculcating a politicised form of neo-liberalism into the social and political spheres. From the 1970s, the more abstract intellectual projects developed by the Chicago School – including the contributions of Hayek (1948) and Friedman (1963) – were politicised and

\(^{32}\) Neo-liberalism has a longer and more contested history than the one provided here (see, e.g., Harvey, 2005). The analysis provided in this thesis shows how a particular conception of ‘community’ and a particular deployment of social policy, driven by neo-liberal morality, was developing prior to the BLCP and informed the BLCP model.
transformed into the state-authored restructuring programs typical of what has now become known as Thatcherism. This period was marked by a shift from an intellectual project of free-market economics in the 1970s to “an era of neo-liberal conviction politics during the 1980s” (Larner, 2009; Peck and Tickell, 2002, p.389).

The second historical shift that is important to the political economy of housing and social policy occurred at the beginning of the 1990s, when the limits of Thatcherism and Reaganomics became difficult to dispute. As the economic consequences of ‘market-centric’ policy and ‘social externalities’ became clearer in the UK and the USA, it seemed that the political project of neo-liberalism was set to implode (Larner, 2009). However, the Washington Consensus, often associated with a more technocratic approach to governance, had a major influence on the political motivation for continued global economic and political restructuring. Throughout the 1990s, a new wave of political figures, including Tony Blair in the UK, Bill Clinton in the USA and Paul Keating, then John Howard, in Australia, revived and reinvented the political project in a variety of manifestations (Argent, 2005; Peck and Tickell, 2002).

By the late 1990s, neo-liberalism had come to mean a political move towards the ascendancy of the market for the provision and distribution of resources and, increasingly, social services (Lazzarato, 2009; Peck and Tickell, 2002, p.388). The political ideology at this time was often characterised by deregulation, decentralisation and privatisation tendencies, and associated with the ‘roll-back’ of Keynesian welfare-state institutions (Bondi and Laurie, 2005; Larner, 2009).

Clinton and Blair reconstituted the political project of neo-liberalism to be more socially interventionist, driven largely by a range of moral claims about social subjects. A more ameliorative form of neo-liberalism was conceived, exampled by the promotion and policies that developed from Third Way\(^{33}\) politics from the

\(^{33}\) ‘Third Way’ is used here in a broadly European sense to mean a form of centrisn. This is in contrast the some American understandings that lean more towards laissez-faire policies.
mid-1990s in the UK and the USA. However, in Australia from the 1980s, the Hawke and Keating governments were also associated with Third Way economic policies, including floating of the Australian dollar, reductions in trade tariffs, moves from centralised wage fixing to ‘enterprise bargaining’, and the privatisation of the national airline carrier and bank (Fairbrother et al., 2002).

It is this third historical shift that developed from the late 1990s, sometimes termed ‘roll-out’ neo-liberalism and associated with Third Wayism,34 that is most relevant to the BLCP and this study (Dodson, 2006; Graefe, 2005; Larner, 2009). The key components include a reconstruction of Third Way policies that was no longer solely concerned with the market or market logic. In this reconstruction, neo-liberalism is

increasingly associated with the political foregrounding of new modes of ‘social’ and penal policymaking, concerned specifically with the aggressive reregulation, disciplining, and containment of those marginalized or dispossessed by the neo-liberalisation of the 1980s. (Peck and Tickell, 2002, p.389)

Additionally, The Third Way also resulted in a reconceptualisation of the concept of ‘community’ and the role of the individual in public affairs. The individual was seen as part of a “consensus-based community strategy” focused inwards, seeking to ameliorate social problems from the inside. However, this paid little attention to external factors, including the structural causes of social disadvantage (deFilippis et al., 2006, p.677):

Civil society is not only a ‘third way’ alternative to state and market, but the true way to improve both and advance democratic renewal. This situates the local community as the site and solution to social problems with emphasis on associational bonds as the social glue upon which a democratic polity rests. In reality, this ‘third way’ emphasis on civil society skirts the role of capitalism and the state. (deFilippis et al., 2006, p.676)

34 Wendy Larner (2009) uses the term ‘Third Wayism’ as a way of drawing attention to the colonisation of certain concepts (i.e. ‘good governance’) in the political manifestations of neo-liberalism.
‘Roll-out’ neo-liberalism is characterised by some (see Dodson, 2006; Graefe, 2005; Hackworth, 2008) as both the ‘normalising’ of neo-liberal economic policy, with a move from ‘soft’ neo-liberalism (i.e. a political mindset) to new institutional forms of ‘hard’ neo-liberalism (i.e. the political apparatus for social and economic change). Peck and Tickell (2002, p.389) discuss this transition in terms of a move from ideological ‘software’ to institutional ‘hardware’; while more recently the term ‘roll-out’ has been critiqued for being too monolithic in assessments of neo-liberalism. Dodson (2006, p.235), for instance, suggests that various states have simply reconfigured their exercise of control over social policy by moving from “direct and hierarchical to modulated, variable and diffuse governmental control”. In reflection of these critiques, Larner (2009) suggests that the analytical means by which neo-liberalism is interrogated need to better reflect the “multiple forms that political strategies, techniques, and subjects are taking”. In any case, and by whatever descriptive mechanism or analytical means, the third historical shift

is associated with a striking coexistence of technocratic economic management and invasive social policies. Neo-liberal processes of economic management ... are increasingly technocratic in form and therefore superficially “depoliticised,” acquiring the privileged status of a taken-for-granted or foundational policy orientation. Meanwhile, a deeply interventionist agenda is emerging around “social” issues like crime, immigration, policing, welfare reform, urban order and surveillance, and community regeneration. (Peck and Tickell, 2002, p.389)

It is within the latter spheres that new and disparate technologies of government (Foucault, 1991) are being developed and ‘rolled out’. These new technologies are particularly relevant to the BLCP, for the metaphors of ‘roll-out’ and ‘hardware’ have been used to describe new discourses of social reform (i.e. the discursive (re)construction of ‘community’, ‘welfare dependency’, ‘social capital’, ‘social exclusion’ or ‘partnership’) that are accompanying the now normalised economic policies of earlier neo-liberalised spaces. These discourses have been developed and deployed, in various forms, over the last three decades and in the process “new institutions and modes of delivery are being fashioned, and new social subjectivities are being fostered” (Peck and Tickell, 2002, p.389).
A range of new technologies of government or institutional ‘hardware’ has developed in countries that experienced dramatic state-sector reform between the 1970s and the 1990s (Foucault, 1994). These include those of Latin America, including Chile, Mexico and Argentina, and the former liberal welfare states of the UK, Canada, New Zealand and Australia (Larner, 2009). Therefore neoliberalism is an ideological and political process, although it is a process that is not coherent or unified, as Larner (2005, pp.12 & 17), paraphrasing Kingfisher (2002, p.60), explains:

neoliberalism is a contingent discourse and process, and is always in conversation with other discourses and processes. This suggests the need to pay careful attention to the specificity of neo-liberalising political economies … A whole new set of social relations is coming into being, only some of which are the direct offspring of neo-liberalism. In turn, these new social relations are reconfiguring economic and political terrains. (Larner, 2005, pp.12 & 17)

In Australia, neo-liberalism has driven much social policy and institutional ‘reform’, based on the belief that better ‘social housing’ and social welfare outcomes can be achieved “by maximising the reach and frequency of market transactions” (Harvey, 2005, p.3). Transitions of capital are valued in this new spatio-temporality and therefore substitute other conceptualisations of welfare provision. All forms of human action are subsequently brought into the domain of the ‘marketplace’ (Harvey, 2005, p.3) and the “unitary logic of the market” is positioned as a universal cure to a whole host of policy prescriptions (Peck and Tickell, 2002, p.40). Here, the contentions between the constructs of citizenship and capital linger just under the surface.

Venture underneath and our conceptualisations of the contemporary condition of citizenship become important. Barry Hindess (2002, p.136) contrasts the internalist view of citizenship, in which the focus is on the relationship between the individual and the state to which the citizen belongs, with that of the ‘neo-liberal citizen’. Hindess argues that to understand the character of the contemporary neo-liberal citizen, it is necessary to locate citizenship within a
supra-national governmental regime of power (Bevir, 2010; Burchell et al., 1991b; Foucault, 1994), within which the state resides and plays a fundamental role:

[T]he sovereignty of states should be seen as an artifact of the system of states to which they belong and ... it is therefore misleading to regard states as constituted essentially on the basis of formal or informal agreements among their citizens. The government of a state is never simply a matter of internal relations between the state and its own citizens or subjects ... [There are] important structural or systemic limitations on the role of citizens in the government of contemporary states, however internally democratic they might appear to be. (Hindess, 2002, p.136)

Hindess (2002, p.140) concludes that contemporary states are subject to external constraints, and that the further down the path of privatisation and corporatisation states travel, the more their institutional structures are subject to the regulation of international markets and other states. The analysis in this thesis builds on the neo-liberal citizen literature by removing the construct from the loci articulated by Hindess – at the level of international relations, international development and decolonising debates – to locate it within the Australian social policy context at the local level. Subsequently, the neo-liberal citizen is conceived of as one whose *internal* social rights of citizenship associated with a nation state need to be contrasted with the *supra-national* governmental regime of power to which the nation state is associated.

Internationally however, the effects of this supra-national governmental regime of power – the deployment of neo-liberal ideology – are variegated. Therefore, Peck and Tickell (2002, pp.387–388) suggest that assessments and comparisons of neo-liberal processes need to reflect this by engaging with the scale and scope of state intervention, forms of capital and labor market regulation, the constitution of institutions of social regulation, patterns of political resistance and political incorporation, and so forth.
In the BLCP case, this includes the external structures of the international market, the workings of capital, and the politics and policies of other powerful nation states.

Therefore, the theorisation of neo-liberalism is no longer constrained to political philosophy and the contributions of the Chicago School and Washington Consensus. For Marxists and neo-Marxists, the move towards the ascendancy of the market is tied up with the broader workings of capital and capitalism (Larner, 2009, p.375). Neo-Marxists in particular have used world-systems theory (Frank and Gills, 1999) to investigate inter-market capital accumulation. Gramscian (Gramsci, 1971) scholars point to the way in which various discourses associated with neo-liberalism appear commonsensical and appeal to a range of social subjects in different social positions (Larner, 2009, p.375). They point to the hegemonic political forces at work in different sites (Overbeek, 1993), while feminist scholars have turned to the inherent ‘struggle’ within the political sphere to point to the way in which new ideologies and political forms emerge from contestation, and are not simply imposed on social subjects from ‘above’ through top-down processes of governance (Larner, 2009, p.375).

While this thesis engages with these debates, it is broadly located within Foucault’s governmentality thesis and more recent Neo-Foucauldian work (Bevir, 2010; Collier, 2009; Lemke, 2001):

[G]overnmentality brings yet another perspective to accounts of neoliberalism. This literature argues that while neoliberalism may mean less government, it does not follow that there is less governance ... which show[s] how ‘advanced liberal’ strategies of rule, found in diverse realms ... encourage people to see themselves as individualised and active subjects responsible for enhancing their own well-being. It has encouraged commentators to move beyond the terrain of the state in explaining the exercise of new forms of power and the implications for governmental, political, and ethical processes. (Larner, 2009, p.375)

Therefore, the BLCP is viewed as a political and ideological response to an urban ‘problem’ that was defined through social policy in Australia. That is, the BLCP
can be seen as a manifestation of neo-liberalism that has been developed at a specific time and place due to a discernable sequence of events connected to external structures, including the international market, the workings of capital and the social polices of other powerful nation states (Barry et al., 1996; Burchell et al., 1991; Collier, 2009; Mckee, 2009). This study problematises the BLCP, to show that these new forms of governance “encourage both institutions and individuals to conform to the norms of the market” (Larner, 2009, p.376). This approach broadly suggests that political processes are contingent on time (history), space (institutional and social) and place (geographical and social). The analysis pays particular attention to how the state governs public housing tenants, possibly from a distance, through the market and the BLCP (Foucault, 1988).
Social reform: New technologies of governance for public housing

The construction of poverty as social pathology is linked to the supposedly restorative and disciplining effects of the market to promote individual responsibility and initiative, self-discipline, and regeneration of decaying public institutions. According to this neoliberal logic, while public housing and public schools breed dysfunction and failure, private management, the market, and public–private partnerships foster excellence through entrepreneurship, competition, and choice. (Lipman, 2008, p.123)

Social reform under the political project of neo-liberalism, while disparate in terms of time, space and place, was broadly united under Thatcherite reforms in the area of social policy in the UK on two points. The first was a particular manifestation of technocratic decision-making applied to the assessment and management of economic and social ‘concerns’. The second was the deployment of a range of social policies informed by neo-liberal notions of individual responsibility. When combined, these social policies represent a particularly invasive social interventionism driven by moral claims about the causes and solutions to poverty within the political project of neo-liberalism.

The concept of technocratic forms of government is associated with a partial transfer of decision-making power from those who have achieved political power through democratic elections – elected representatives – to those with ‘knowledge’ in a specific area (Njalsson, 2005). Technocracy is a rationality of professional bureaucracy which ensures that state agencies are administered by suitably qualified personnel and their practices are governed by the relevant expertise. (Hindess, 2002, p.137)

Peck and Tickell use the term ‘technocratic’ within the more recent experience and theorisation of normalised neo-liberalism, which has been associated with the

---

35 The word ‘technocratic’ is often attributed to William Smyth (1919), who used the term ‘technocracy’ in his 1919 article ‘Technocracy’ Ways and Means to Gain Industrial Democracy to argue for greater worker involvement in decision-making in the context of the industrial revolution in the USA.
“technocratic embedding of routines of neo-liberal governance” (Peck and Tickell, 2002, p.384). They draw attention to the specificities of economic and social policy development and management under a neo-liberal rationality. These new forms of technocracy, including processes facilitated by improvements in information technology on which modern governments rely, make social and economic policies increasingly mobile:

Such mechanisms of international and interlocal policy transfer – which take place along channels that have been created, structured, and lubricated by technocratic elites, think tanks, opinion-formers, consultants, and policy networks – have been rapidly established as one of the principal modes of policy development in strategically critical fields such as systemic financial stability, the management of urban “underclasses”, the regulation of contingent labor markets, and the displacement of welfare entitlements with socially authoritarian packages of rights and responsibilities. (Peck and Tickell, 2002, p.398)

Certainly, interventionism is a term used across a broad range of geo-political jurisdictions to attempt to describe the policy prescriptions of governments aimed at manipulating the economy or society. But under the political project of neo-liberalism in the UK, the USA and Australia, it has manifested as authoritarian state interventions focused on reforming property relations by imposing conditions on the discursive formation of social and economic policies. These policies in turn preference the market and individual responsibility over structural change when defining ‘problems’ and providing ‘solutions’.

Leaving aside constructs such as foreign interventionism, and having dealt with the inherent economic interventionism within the political project of neo-liberalism above, these authoritarian state interventions were informed by a particular morality associated with neo-liberal political reason, the most important of which were flagged above: market-centric social policy responses based on notions of individual responsibility masquerading as freedom (Barry et al., 1996; Foucault, 1991; Harvey, 1990, 2005).

---

36 Foreign interventionism refers to a state’s intervention in the affairs of another nation state(s) as part of its foreign policy.
Diverse literatures emerged from the 1980s relating to social interventionism and the morality of social policies deployed as a means of alleviating a range of social concerns relating to a population (Foucault, 1963; Lemke, 2001). These covered a range of epistemic contributions, including feminist scholars who considered state paternalism and intervention into the family, the rights of individuals and the politics of difference (Gordon, 1986; O'Connor et al., 1999; Saraga, 1998; Young, 1990). Literature from human rights scholars considered policy interventions in terms of individual freedom and human rights by focusing on issues including birth control, abortion and discrimination based on race, cultural identity, ethnicity, or political or religious affiliation (McIntyre-Mills, 2003; Wronka, 1998). Meanwhile, some economics scholars moved in a different direction, claiming that equal opportunity laws regarding equal and minimum pay conditions created economic inefficiencies for businesses and the economy (Lundberg and Startz, 1983).

Perhaps the most coherent and detailed investigation into the role of social interventionism within the project of liberalism is Foucault’s thesis on governmentality:

The semantic linking of governing (‘gouverner’) and modes of thought (‘mentalité’) indicates that it is not possible to study the technologies of power without an analysis of the political rationality underpinning them. In other words, there are two sides to governmentality. On the one hand, the term pin-points a specific form of representation; government defines a discursive field in which exercising power is ‘rationalised’ ... On the other hand, it also structures specific forms of intervention. (Lemke, 2001, p.191; emphasis in original)

Foucault also goes on to discuss governmentality as the ‘conduct of conduct’, using the term ‘government’ to not only discuss the political apparatus of the state, but also processes of ‘governing the self’. Therefore ‘government’ “also signified problems of self-control, guidance for the family and for children,
management of the household, directing the soul, etc.” (Lemke, 2001, p.191).

The theoretical framework for this thesis and the concept of governmentality are explicated further in Chapter 5. At this point, however, in terms of social (and economic) interventionism within the political project of neo-liberalism, Foucault’s governmentality provides two important insights that are particularly poignant to the BLCP case.

First, neo-liberal approaches to social reform delineate – draw borders around – specific social or physical sites for intervention. In the case of public housing, this could be the delineation of public housing tenants by tenure type or of public housing estates from other regional categories. Then a range of concepts are manipulated or borrowed to define the ‘objects’ of the intervention (Foucault, 1969), giving currency to terms such as ‘social exclusion’, ‘intergenerational disadvantage’, ‘social mix’ and public housing estates at the ‘end of their economic life’ (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c). Arguments and justifications are formulated based on both the delineation of these sites of action and the concepts used to describe them:

In this manner, government enables a problem to be addressed and offers certain strategies for solving/handling the problem. (Lemke, 2001, p.191)

Therefore, the second Foucauldian insight relates to the political rationality and morality underpinning neo-liberal forms of social interventionism. Through the processes of governing, the governor ascribes social or physical ‘realities’ to social subjects and geographical space and then deploys political technologies to tackle these ‘realities’ (Lemke, 2001, p.191). In the case of public housing, these political technologies include the agencies created to address ‘social exclusion’ in the UK and Australia, while more specifically they encompass public housing estate redevelopment projects such as the BLCP.

37 Here, Foucault refers to the classical Graeco-Roman concept of the soul (ψυχή) that had two parts: the irrational emotive component – emotions and passions – and the rational true self (Tuominen, 2009). The Graeco-Roman philosophical pursuit of knowledge (truth seeking) involved mastery of the emotions and passions to reveal the true self (Foucault, 2001).
These political technologies are understood to include “agencies, procedures, institutions, legal forms, etc., that are intended to enable us to govern the objects and subjects of a political rationality” (Lemke, 2001, p.191). The social ‘realities’ that are constructed to accompany these political technologies include suggestions that public housing tenants lack social capital or that the market has deemed that a public housing estate is obsolete, an inefficient market mechanism for addressing poverty. Therefore, while this might mean a move towards the market within the discursive framing of public housing ‘realities’ (problems and solutions), the state remains central in two important ways:

First, the state retains its dominant historical capacity to constitute, through discursive practices, the order of housing objects and subjects .... Secondly, government retains the capacity to affect the imagined order of housing through the institution of empirical practices of housing assistance and is the entity that is able through housing assistance practices to make “real” and apparent the abstract objects and subjects of housing discourse. (Dodson, 2006, p.239)

Foucault’s (1975b) governmentality draws attention to the ‘technologies of power’ within the political project of neo-liberalism, by exposing the political rationality underpinning the political project. A governmentality approach encourages us to look at the delineation of social subjects and physical space, to call into question discursive constructs presented as ‘realities’ and to problematise the framing of policy ‘problems’ by governments as well as their policy prescriptions.
Public housing policy and the revival of the ideal of community

Implicit in the discursive politics of housing policy are competing conceptions about what constitutes an ideal housing system. Every government programme presupposes an end of this kind – a type of person, community, organisation, society, or even world that is to be achieved. (Marston, 2004)

Changes abound within public housing policy documents regarding the delineation of social subjects, physical space, their suggested pathologies and policy responses. Public housing tenants are being reimagined as customers (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c), and entire public housing estate populations are being reimagined as socially excluded (Arthurson and Jacobs, 2003) or morally deficit (Levitas, 1998) through the deployment of concepts such as community building.

New subjectivities are being propagated, re-creating public housing estates as mixed communities (Galster and Zobel, 1998). As these policy metaphors are developed – to which social capital/exclusion/inclusion, social mix, community building/regeneration, disadvantage, partnership and participation belong – and various social interventions are deployed, so too have critical debates emerged regarding the contested nature of the constructs and their application in housing policy. Marston (2004, p.72) suggests that the homogenising tendency embedded within some of these discourses denies political contestation, obscures the relations that create social inequalities and clouds clear thinking about what could be done to create a more equitable housing system.

The BLCP was discursively constructed from a range of social and economic interventions being deployed to manage public housing tenants and redevelop to public housing estates in the UK, the USA and Australia. This section outlines the broad terrain around several of the key constructs that have been deployed to
frame and justify these interventions, including debates relating to neighbourhood effects, social exclusion, partnership and neo-liberal communitarianism.

Central to many public housing redevelopment projects in Australia, the USA and the UK, and despite the well-documented differences between these countries in terms of housing policy and housing markets, is a policy aim of ‘building mixed communities’ (Darcy, 2010a). The neighbourhood or place effects thesis (de Souza Briggs, 2003) has been thoroughly critiqued as an approach to large-scale public housing estate redevelopment. The theory suggests that a higher and more complex order of social problems arises from the higher concentration within a given geographic boundary of individuals or households exhibiting specific “problem” characteristics. The theory suggests that the geographic propinquity of numbers of disadvantaged households creates a social or cultural dynamic at the local level which compounds and perpetuates their disadvantage. (Darcy, 2010a, p.3)

Under various initiatives – for example, the Mixed Communities Initiative in the UK (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2005), HOPE VI in the USA (Naparstek et al., 2000) or the Living Communities Program in Australia (Housing NSW, 2008a) – housing authorities are deploying various market mechanisms to drastically change the ratio of public to private tenancies on former public housing estates. Over the last decade, the term ‘social mix’ has come to be associated with an approach to poverty alleviation that is focused on housing ‘tenure diversification’.

Put simply, public housing authorities reduce the housing tenancies managed by the state in a geographical space by introducing, often through the property market, other forms of tenure, including private properties available for sale or for rent from private or community landlords. These social mix policies are then charged with boosting socio-economic profiles or reducing crime, or other social outcomes, within a given population or area. Based on the neighbourhood effects thesis, the concept of social mix has also become integral to the justification for many public housing redevelopment projects in the UK, the USA and Australia:
A basic premise underlying support for social mix is the idea that mixed income communities result in milieus that lead to positive change for disadvantaged residents. The anticipated outcomes relate mainly to developing inclusive communities that provide positive role models of good citizens and lead to other advantages such as access to labour market networks. (Arthurson, 2002)

The international literature devoted to the theory of neighbourhood effects, the concept of ‘social mix’ (Sarkissian, 1976) and the impacts of redevelopment projects justified using these constructs are now well developed and will not be explored here in any detail (Arthurson, 2002, 2004b, 2005, 2008; Chaskin and Joseph, 2010; Darcy, 2010b; de Souza Briggs, 2007; deFilippis, 2007; Galster et al., 2003; Gwyther, 2008; Highsmith, 2009; Lipman, 2008; Lupton and Tunstall, 2008; McDermont, 2007; Morrison, 2008; Sarkissian, 1976). Instead, the theoretical terrain of these contributions will be broadly outlined before focusing specifically on the way in which the theory of neighbourhood effects has changed political responses to ‘community renewal’ and ‘community building’ in the context of the political project of neo-liberalism.

The neighbourhood effects thesis and its associated concepts are highly contingent on, but also mobile across, time and space within the project of neo-liberalism. Different meanings and applications of these concepts exist in specific sites, spaces and epistemic spheres. However, these concepts are not constructed and do not operate in isolation; they are always in conversation with other discursive processes within these alternative spaces. Nonetheless,

[m]ixing for regeneration originates in a neo-liberal analysis of the problems of low-income neighbourhoods, in which structural problems are individualised and spatialised, and disadvantaged neighbourhoods, particularly those with majority social housing tenure, are discursively repositioned as irredeemably problematic. (Lupton and Tunstall, 2008, p.18)

As a policy response framed within a functionalist appraisal of social capital theory, neighbourhood effects arguments are commonly operationalised by way
of one or more of the following. Social capital arguments suggest that public housing tenants living in what has been described as ‘concentrated disadvantage’ on public housing estates are further disadvantaged by the limitations of their ‘relatively closed’ social networks (Chaskin and Joseph, 2010, p.304). Social norms and expectations arguments suggest that the presence of higher-income residents on former public housing estates could result in the modelling of a ‘mainstream morality’, a particular conception of social norms and expectations (Chaskin and Joseph, 2010, p.304). These two are closely related to social control arguments that link crime and disadvantage to place and extrapolate various moral claims about public housing tenants from this data (Levitas, 1998). Finally, political and market arguments, justified under the premise that greater investment can be attracted to an area if higher-income residents are present, suggest that those with greater access to capital bring with them a market need for higher-quality services because of their financial resources (Chaskin and Joseph, 2010, p.304).

All four conceptions have attracted sustained critique, leaving Darcy (2010a, p.4) to conclude that

A rapidly growing international literature critiquing the impact of interventions based on the neighbourhood effects thesis has emerged ... Added to this are evaluative studies of mixed communities created under such policies which consistently conclude that physical mixing of the residences of household with different incomes does not, of itself, lead to social mixing and thus to the role-modelling or networking which is thought to help ameliorate poverty and disadvantage.

Darcy (2010a) draws attention to the provocatively named ‘Dispersal Consensus’ (Berube and Katz, 2005; de Souza Briggs, 2003), that argues for the ‘dispersal of disadvantage’ through the demarcation of place, namely public housing estate neighbourhoods, as sites where under the premise of ‘community renewal’ the
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38 Imbroscio (2008) coined the term ‘Dispersal Consensus’ as a paronomasia to draw attention to the ideological and moral workings of the group and similarities in this respect with the Washington Consensus.

39 Imbroscio lists Katz (2005) and de Souza Briggs (2003) as the ‘key leaders’ of the ‘Dispersal Consensus’. However, the discursive term itself refers to a much larger group, as outlined by Imbroscio (2008) in footnote 7 on page 124.
best way to ameliorate poverty is to disperse those who experience it into wealthier suburbs. There are also those who question such responses: one of the most prominent may be Imbroscio (2008), who suggests that the political outcome of the neighbourhood effect thesis has been as much about propounding middle-class morality and virtuous behaviour as ameliorating poverty. Imbroscio (2008, p.123) argues:

>[f]or there is, of course, a long history of middle class reformers who, whether consciously or not, have fashioned antipoverty remedies that are more about extending their particularistic set of values and norms to the urban poor than about ameliorating the urban poor’s social, economic, and political deficiencies.

In short, there appears to be very little consensus around many of the claims attributed to the neighbourhood effects thesis, leaving Imbroscio (2008, p.122) to suggest that the obsession with social mix overwhelms any “clear-headed analysis”, or Darcy, in Australia, reflecting in part on the BLCP, to conclude that

>[t]he vigour with which mixed income developments and dispersal of public housing concentrations are currently being pursued, in the apparent absence of empirical evidence requires further critical examination. (2010a, p.5)

Despite this, Chaskin and Joseph (2010) recently noted in the USA, the theory of neighbourhood effects is now well developed in redevelopment strategies that aim to ‘build community’ to transform urban neighbourhoods with high levels of ‘disadvantage’. This is based on the assumption that through the processes of ‘building community’, public housing estates will be transformed “into safer, more sustainable, better-functioning neighbourhoods that are meant to provide better quality of life for low-income families” (Chaskin and Joseph, 2010, p.300). The neighbourhood effects thesis also posits that public housing tenants will be afforded new opportunities for undertaking employment and accessing social services, and therefore the policy mechanisms will lead to greater capital accumulation as a result of tenants’ propinquity to a middle class citizenry. This was certainly the claim in the BLCP, as will be shown in Chapter 5.
Further, the construct of ‘community building’ was also deployed in the BLCP to involve public housing tenants in the redevelopment of their estates through tightly controlled processes of ‘community capacity building’ and ‘community consultation’. The discursive roots of these concepts, in the context of neo-liberal approaches to urban redevelopment, can be traced back to notions of social capital.

Initial theories of social capital,\(^{40}\) including the work of Loury (1977) and Bourdieu (1985), were originally deployed to challenge the “narrowly individualistic and atomistic understanding of human capital in neoclassical economic theory” (deFilippis, 2001, p.783). However Robert Putnam (1993, 1995, 1996) is perhaps the most well-known proponent of social capital (also see Coleman, 1988; Etzioni, 1997). The central tenet of Putnam’s functionalist approach to social capital theory is that social contacts and networks have value. Social interactions and networks affect the productivity of individuals and groups, which is not only beneficial for those individuals directly involved: these networks are also suggested to benefit an imagined ‘community’. Putnam (1995), for example, draws a distinction between bridging\(^{41}\) and bonding\(^{42}\) social capital. However, deFilippis (2007) argues that concepts such as social capital have resulted in a powerful reassertion of the ideal of community within neo-liberal approaches to housing policy:

This communitarian framework is one that posits a belief that there are shared interests among individuals in a community, and thus community development should be about creating the social relationships which allow those mutual goals to be realized. (deFilippis, 2007, p.274)

Where housing policies seek, for instance, to create a ‘social mix’ of residents to build social capital, deFilippis (2007, p.272) argues that these policies are premised on a move towards the market as an assumed necessity for addressing poverty and
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\(^{40}\) For a detailed account of the history of social capital in the context of community development, see deFilippis (2001).

\(^{41}\) Bridging Capital involves interaction across different types of groups.

\(^{42}\) Bonding Capital refers to contact within a particular group.
disadvantage (Arthurson, 2005; Chaskin and Joseph, 2010; Darcy, 2010b; de Souza Briggs, 2003; deFilippis, 2001; Galster and Zobel, 1998). As a result, housing policy is becoming increasingly entrepreneurial and market-based in its understanding of urban problems and poverty, and logically, in its programmatic responses to that poverty. (deFilippis, 2007, p.272)

In the USA and Australia, public housing tenants have been moved off public housing estates to implement various types of tenure mix strategies that are premised on building social capital and community:

Current theory and practice, in other words, are creating a framework where the displacement of the communities we are allegedly trying to develop is the logical and unsurprising outcome of community development. (deFilippis, 2007, p.272)

The other point that deFillipis makes relates to consensus seeking and is particularly important to the deployment of tenant participation programs in public housing estate redevelopments such as the BLCP. Drawing on the work of McKnight (1995) and Putman (1995), housing authorities develop policies to build shared norms and social networks in poor urban settings and between diverse social subjects (and institutions), and assume that these diverse groups can work towards mutual goals including urban renewal and community building. Despite the ambiguous and vague meanings applied to these terms:

[the basic goal is to mobilize assets to build community involving ‘virtually the entire community in the complex process of regeneration’. (Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993, p.345)

This sidelining of conflict suggests that these groups are not structured around or driven by interests, and therefore do not contain a kernel of conflict ... but rather are “features of social life – networks, norms, and trust – that enable participants to come
together to pursue shared objectives”. (deFilippis, 2007, p.274; citing Putnam, 1996, p.64)

This has led to the rediscovery of the ideal of ‘community’, calling for the “rebuilding of ‘social capital’ as a means of recreating civil society” (deFilippis et al., 2006, p.677). Under this ideological shift towards neo-liberal urban governance, the market is viewed as the appropriate vehicle for social service provision, whereby social services are increasingly delivered by public–private partnerships and other contractual arrangements. Therefore, the non-government and not-for-profit sectors are being drawn into this market-based contractual environment. This ideological shift, combined with the ‘consensus seeking community’ proposed by new communitarians, including Putnam (1993, 1995, 1996), has attracted critics. Jessop (2002) uses the construct ‘neo-liberal communitarianism’, and deFilippis (2007) uses ‘neo-communitarianism’, to describe the withdrawal of the public sector from social service provision across health, housing and workforce development, combined with the positioning of the community as both the site and the vehicle for social reform (deFilippis et al., 2006, p.675).

In terms of involving public housing tenants in the decisions that affect their lives (NSW Department of Housing, 2004a,b), Jessop (2002), Shragge (2003) and others suggest that these processes have stifled other forms of tenant activism and diverted attention away from the devolution of the state and the workings of capital(ism) under neo-liberalism:

An emphasis on ‘the bottom line’, building ‘partnerships’ with local businesses and corporations, developing ‘relationships’ and focusing on ‘community assets’ has narrowed conceptions of community activism; for example, squeezing out conflict models from the community organizer’s arsenal of strategies and tactics. Moreover, most contemporary models of community building and development focus exclusively on the local internal community, not the economic, political and social decisions, which rest outside the community and create community needs and concerns. (deFilippis et al., 2006, p.675)
Unsurprisingly, activism has become something of a dirty word within neo-liberal urban governance (Jessop, 2002; Shragge, 2003), with housing authorities developing strategies and policies aimed, in part, at reducing tenant ‘opposition’ to, by promoting tenant ‘participation’ in, public housing redevelopments. Activism is seen as an anachronistic response to addressing social problems and dealing with social change, and counter to the “focus on moderate strategies and tactics such as community building, asset and capacity building, or consensus organising” (deFilippis et al., 2006, p.677). In other words, neo-communitarianism flags, in part, a move away from activism and towards consensus building within neo-liberal urban governance. “This conception masks structural divisions, blurs political sides and interests, and eliminates dissenting voices” (deFilippis et al., 2006, p.676). This is important, for

[w]hile mobilising participation, the discourse of neoliberalism does not necessarily prompt the creation of alternatives. Rather, the discussion and generation of knowledge about neoliberalism can stymie participants’ hopes for other worlds and strengthen neo-liberal discourse. (Roelvink, 2009, p.1)

The conditions of possibility\(^\text{43}\) (Foucault, 1969) within the political project of neoliberalism place certain constraints on participation, and there is a growing body of literature (see Cooke and Kothari, 2001; Cornwall, 2004, 2008; Cornwall and Schattan P. Coelho, 2007a; Cornwell, 2004; Hickey and Mohan, 2004) that suggests that concepts such as capacity building, community development and participation are not the problem:

‘it is the context in which they are practices that is key’. It is that context which needs to be integrated into analyses and targeted by community efforts and theorists, not ignored or supported with adaptive theories about community intervention that implicitly adjust social change efforts to prevailing norms. (Shragge, 2003, p.123)

\(^{43}\) ‘Condition of possibility’ is used here with reference to Foucault’s adaption of the philosophical concept. Foucault (1969, p.xxvi) used the concept historically and with reference to ‘episteme’ by stating: “I am concerned, in short, with a history of resemblance; on what conditions was Classical thought able to reflect relations of similarity or equivalence between things, relations that would provide a foundation and a justification for their words, their classifications, their systems of exchange?” ‘Condition of possibility’ is perhaps more commonly associated with Immanuel Kant (1781; also see Martin, 1974).
The other term that has gained widespread currency in housing policy is social exclusion, a derivative from theories of social capital. Social exclusion has been readily adopted, especially by British governments, into a multitude of social policy programs, including health, employment, housing, education and transport (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004). However, social exclusion remains an ambiguous term, with divergent viewpoints on how it should be defined, measured or addressed (Boeck et al., 2007; Bryson and Mowbray, 2005; Chaskin and Joseph, 2009; Cox, 1995; deFilippis, 2001; Hulse and Burke, 2000; Hulse and Stone, 2006; Lazzarato, 2009; Levitas, 1998; MacLeavy, 2009).

Arthurson and Jacobs (2004, p.26) sketch the broad boundaries around social exclusion, relating to housing policy, by suggesting that the concept “is understood to denote a set of factors and processes that accentuate material and social deprivation”. This commonly includes indicators of disadvantage combined with factors of ‘exclusion’ from a range of other social processes – including, for example, social and employment networks:

It entails a focus on the local economy and employment issues (in particular welfare dependency and job creation); the renewal of the physical environment; social interactions within the neighbourhood (i.e. programmes of support for disadvantaged groups as refugees and sole parents) and political engagement (i.e. an emphasis on improved service delivery and participation activity). (Jacobs et al., 2004, p.4)

However, Arthurson and Jacobs suggest that the provision of ‘decent, secure, affordable, quality housing’ is a prerequisite for engagement in the labour market (Arthurson and Jacobs, 2004). They argue that policy that linked residualisation of social housing to social exclusion in the UK ignored those who no longer had access to social housing. But perhaps the most relevant contribution to the political deployment of social exclusion regarding (public) housing is Ruth Levitas’

---

44 The tendency for a service to become increasingly used by poorer or more ‘disadvantaged’ citizens. For example, in the UK social housing is said to have become residualised as a result of ‘less disadvantaged’ tenants buying their houses through the “Right to Buy” policy.
(1998) typology demonstrating the divergent ideological positions regarding the cause and effect of social exclusion. Levitas (1998) identifies three discourses associated with social exclusion and policy formation in the UK:

Levitas’ typologies illustrate that the grounding of the concept of social exclusion in competing ideologies renders the term amenable to appropriation by different political parties. (Arthurs and Jacobs, 2004, p.32)

Levitas’ work points to the way in which different representations of social exclusion came to be used in the UK to influence and justify a range of policy interventions. These included suggestions that the causes of poverty and social disadvantage could be attributed to individual morality and that part of the solution lay with individuals’ capacity for, and engagement in, employment. While we have not seen the creation of social exclusion units in Australia to the same extent as in the UK, Australia has established a Social Inclusion Unit in 2007 and the Australian Social Inclusion Board in 2009 (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2009), the ideological precursor of which can certainly be seen in the policy response in the BLCP. Table 1 below shows Levitas’ (1998) three discourses, with corresponding governmental policy prescriptions and responses. The discourse analysis throughout this thesis draws on and refers to Table 1 overleaf.
Table 1 – Public policy discourse typology: Pathology and prescription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redistributioanist discourse (RED)</th>
<th>Moral underclass discourse (MUD)</th>
<th>Social integrationist discourse (SID)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pathology in short</strong></td>
<td>They have no money</td>
<td>They have no work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pathology</strong></td>
<td>Emphasises poverty and the lack of full citizenship as the main causal factors of inequality</td>
<td>Highlights individual morality and the behaviour of people living in poverty as the principle cause of exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emphasis</strong></td>
<td>Implies that a reduction of poverty will result from increases in benefit levels</td>
<td>Economic reliance on ‘welfare’ is constructed as ‘dependency’, a pathological, moral and physiological condition created by the benefit system itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptualisations</strong></td>
<td>Turns to citizenship to address social, political and cultural disadvantage through a redistribution of resources and power</td>
<td>Focuses on the behaviour of the poor rather than on structural issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy deployments</strong></td>
<td>Critical of the private market to provide social services appropriate for the poor</td>
<td>Adopts sanctions to prevent inappropriate behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy examples</strong></td>
<td>(1) Government investment in social service provision (2) Government ownership and management of social services</td>
<td>(1) Privatisation of social services (2) Dispersal of the poor (3) Punitive forms of social control (1) Welfare reform focused on moving citizens into paid employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing policy examples</strong></td>
<td>(1) Open access to social housing</td>
<td>(1) Policies to change the tenure profiles of public housing estates through redevelopment and allocation of housing (2) Public housing tenant evictions for anti-social behaviour (1) Limited tenure arrangements attached to social housing (2) Skills training and job-seeking requirements linked to social housing allocation (through welfare reform)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (developed from Arthurson and Jacobs, 2004, p.34; Cooke, 2009, p.4; Levitas, 1998; Watt and Jacobs, 2000).

Darcy (2010a, p.7) suggests that, in Australia, “concentration of disadvantage” is largely unquestioned as a causal factor in the creation (or, at least, reproduction) of disadvantage”. Housing allocation policies are therefore absent in discussions of disadvantage and ‘exclusion’. Instead, social mix is prescribed as a conceptual counterpoint through public housing estate redevelopment policy. Darcy (2010a, p.7) concludes that social exclusion is “an idea which has been adopted and colonised by various political interests in order to further ideological projects”. The political metaphor of social mix, like other metaphors – neighbourhood effects, social capital or social exclusion – mask the structural dimensions to urban poverty, render the political divisions invisible and eliminate dissenting voices” (deFilippis et al., 2006, p.676).
In summary, analysis of neo-communitarian approaches to urban governance in the BLCP, and specifically the public housing tenant participation strategies, need to take account of: spatial factors including institutional, social and geographical spaces; and temporal factors including time/history. Further, the analysis should show how the discursive processes of neo-communitarian urban governance constructed particular notions of capacity building, community development and community participation.

Finally, the analysis should problematise models that are based on consensus and mutual interest to expose the discursive processes that animate these constructs. For, as neo-Foucauldian theorists (Barry et al., 1996; Collier, 2009; Lazzarato, 2009; Lemke, 2001) suggest, these constructions possibly render invisible a broader exercise of power, albeit an exercise of power by the state at a distance (Foucault, 1963, 1969, 1991).
The deployment of neo-communitarian urban policy

Jacobs, Kemeny and Manzi provide an important observation about the link between ideology, the discursive construction of objects and the formation of housing policy:

The work of Wildavsky (1979) is particularly interesting in this respect. He has argued that what becomes a problem is very often determined by whether or not there are practical courses of action that can be undertaken. Wildavsky’s assertion is important because it can help explain how problems remain entrenched. Policy problems are determined by pragmatic reasoning as much by rational decision making based on supposedly objective criteria. There is consequently an internal relationship between the definition of a problem and its practical solution. (Jacobs et al., 2003, p.434)

The international experience of deregulation and privatisation in relation to housing policy is variegated in terms of the geographical location (place) and policy rollout (history). The term ‘privatisation’ is now associated with a diverse range of political processes and housing outcomes in different countries and regions. The privatisation of state-owned public housing stock across parts of Eastern/Western Europe has broadly occurred through the transfer of stock to individuals or non-government cooperatives under a diverse range of schemes, policies and social housing programs (Gruis et al., 2009b; Muilligan and Randolph, 2009). In Eastern Europe:

[m]ass privatisation policies of public/state owned housing, mostly through transfer to sitting tenants (free of charge, through vouchers or sale at nominal fee) have reduced the size of the sector significantly. (Gruis et al., 2009a, p.4; paraphrasing Stuyk, 1996)

In Western Europe, in countries such as the UK and the Netherlands, housing authorities and associations have introduced various ‘new’ tenure types to encourage tenants to either purchase or part purchase former public housing dwellings (Gruis et al., 2009a). In the USA, under policy programs such as HOPE VI (Naparstek et al., 2000; Pokin et al., 2004), public housing assistance vouchers
have been widely used in an attempt to move residents out of public housing (estates and high-rise buildings) and into private housing; while in Australia, the privatisation of public housing is predominantly associated with the transfer of government-owned public housing stock to the private or not-for-profit sectors, either as a stock sale or transfer, or through contracts, such as public–private partnerships for an agreed period – although the privatisation of Australia’s public housing stock has occurred at a much slower rate than in the European countries, at a rate of about 2% of total stock per year (Gruis et al., 2009a).

The variety of political and market mechanisms and housing outcomes outlined above shows the importance of spatial and temporal factors to understandings of privatisation related to housing policy. However, while the political and market mechanisms are diverse and spatially and temporally specific, the housing policies that structure these programs are also discursively linked, in parts, to neo-liberal understandings of urban governance and urban ‘problems’. While the market mechanisms can be diverse across different regions at different times, these projects may have similar objectives. They might employ similar concepts or deploy similar terms to describe and understand various urban ‘problems’ and their ‘solutions’. In other words, these concepts and terms used in urban policy are politically mobile between diverse geographical regions and redevelopment projects despite their regional, market and housing form differences (Gruis et al., 2009b). This conceptual transfer is exemplified by similarities between the neo-communitarian approaches to urban ‘pathology’ seen in the UK, the USA and Australia, irrespective of the differences in the social, market and housing contexts of these three countries (Darcy, 2010a).

Darcy (2010a) argues that the socio-cultural composition of the residential communities living on public housing estates in the UK, the USA and Australia targeted by privatisation is often very diverse:

In major US cities public housing is occupied almost exclusively by African-American households ... or, as in the UK, very diverse immigrant families. (Darcy, 2010a, p.2)
In Australia some areas are predominantly of Anglo-Celtic background, while others have a higher number of Indigenous families. Or in the BLCP case, the public housing estate served as an entry point for refugees and other migrants and had a significant proportion of non-English-speaking families at the time of announcement (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c). Further, while there are also differences in the built form of public housing estates in the UK, the USA and Australia, all three locations have introduced a form of ‘mixed tenure’ through public housing estate redevelopment.

While common approaches to achieve this in all three locations included moving public housing tenants to wealthier neighbourhoods with private homeowners, or through the introduction and sale of new dwellings to private owners in the housing market, the housing density targets were not always comparable. Unlike many of the HOPE VI projects in the USA, that aim to reduce the housing density profiles through the demolition-and-rebuild process, the Australian and British projects commonly aim for comparable or even increased housing density during the redevelopment process (Darcy, 2010a).

The similarities between these privatisation programs under a neo-communitarianism approach reside with the discursive framing of the redevelopment projects using the constructs of ‘community building’ and ‘partnership’. In the USA, the HOPE VI projects have explicit community building objectives. Andrew Cuomo, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, argued in 2000 that community building makes public housing a bridge into a better future by ‘combating the isolation’ experienced by public housing tenants through a process of skills building, opportunity creation and involvement in redevelopment projects (Naparstek et al., 2000, p.1) ... It [HOPE VI] fosters partnerships among housing authorities, residents, local organizations, and the business community ... It’s the kind of government-community partnership that will help families get off welfare and get into the economic mainstream ... residents, in partnership with the housing authority, got a chance to move themselves and their community forward. (Naparstek et al., 2000, pp.i, 42 & 53)
While in the UK the Housing Renewals Pathfinder program had a similar approach to ‘community building’ and ‘partnership’, the discourse of social exclusion is, perhaps, better established in UK policy documents – a possible result of the political interest in the concept (see Levitas, 1998; Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004). It is suggested that through partnership arrangements involving the private, public and non-government sectors:

communities and neighbourhoods are transformed so that they are capable of meeting the needs of local people, attracting new residents, supporting economic growth, combating disadvantage and exclusion, securing community cohesion and creating opportunity ... This is securing the transformation of these neighbourhoods, promoting harmony and cohesion between different people ... It has focused substantially on community involvement in local master planning to ensure we fully engage local people in planning ways forward. (Market Renewal Pathfinders Chairs, 2006, p.3)

This neo-communitarian emphasis on the defining of housing and social ‘problems’, combined with the taken-for-granted acceptance of various policy prescriptions and responses to these ‘problems’ (Jacobs et al., 2003), has resulted in a community building approach that is focused in part on involving public housing tenants in redevelopment projects. However, Jacobs et al. (2003, p.430) argue that there are three necessary components to defining a housing problem, its acceptance as a problem and the development of a policy response to address the problem. First, a narrative of the social problem is deployed to construct a plausible story about the ‘problem’. Second, the narrative is promoted to develop a coalition of support. Finally, the coalition develops policy responses and implements programs to address the ‘social problem’.

In the UK, the USA and Australia, the discourse of community building, to which tenant participation belongs, was informed by the many narratives relating to social and housing ‘problems’. The next section will deal with some of the recent narratives that informed the BLCP relating to public housing and the rise of public housing tenant involvement in redevelopment projects as part of a process of ‘community building’ and ‘community renewal’.
The recent Australian experience of public housing redevelopment

While significant investment in public housing in the post-war period created major social and economic benefits, by 1990 Australian State and Territory housing authorities were facing increasing maintenance backlogs, a deteriorating housing stock and reductions in public spending. Public housing allocation policies tightened to target the most ‘disadvantaged’ within society and large public housing estates became increasingly associated – within policy and media texts, but also the public mind – with unemployment, civil disobedience and crime [for civil disobedience, see Lee (2007); for social housing allocation policies and disadvantage, see Hall and Berry (2004, 2007) and Berry and Hall (2009)].

Much of the political will and justification for moving to the market in Australia is tied up in the States’ and Territories’ (in)capacity to supply and fund public housing to meet demand. While public housing is a key component of affordable housing in Australia, Hall and Berry (2004, 2007) found that total public housing stock has continued to fall over the last decade. This trend has been attributed to a suite of compounding factors, the most significant including: increased operating costs for housing authorities; the tightening of allocation policies for public housing to the point at which public housing now only houses those with the ‘highest need’ within society; and a political commitment to the market for the provision of affordable housing (Housing NSW, 2005c, 2010; NSW Department of Housing, 2006g).

In Australia, operating budgets primarily come from two sources: the Commonwealth, through the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement (CSHA), a multilateral agreement between the Commonwealth and the States and Territories providing capital funding and; second, circulating funds from the existing asset base of each housing authority (Flood, 2004, p.23; Homewest, 2003). By the late 1980s, under the combined pressure of the points listed above, public
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45 Formerly as loans, but now as grants (Flood, 2004).
housing tenancy profiles on public housing estates were concentrated with low-income or unemployed persons, single-parent families, people with disabilities and aged pensioners. Throughout the 1990s, under the political project of neoliberalism, the Commonwealth began to move away from direct assistance to the States and Territories under CHSA to fund market-based rental assistance programs. Berry and Hall’s extensive reviews tracked the policy changes to show that total real Commonwealth State Housing Agreement (CSHA) expenditure from all sources [fell] in real terms by 30 per cent ... all the housing authorities [experienced a] move from small or moderate operating surpluses into deficits. Real rental, and total income, per dwelling remained either flat or declined for six of the nine housing authorities, and the rate of growth of real income for the remaining three authorities has been significantly slower than the rate of growth of real net expenditure. (Hall and Berry, 2007, pp.1–2)

Figure 12 below shows the slow decline in CSHA assistance to States and Territories, compared to the growth in Commonwealth rent assistance programs from 1986 to 1999.

Figure 12 – Comparison of CSHA funding to rental assistance funding 1986 to 1999

Throughout the 1990s, support for these policy changes spanned both sides of government (Jacobs et al., 2003). Under the centre-right economic policy of the Howard government, but built on the economic reform implemented by the preceding centre-left Keating government, by the mid-1990s deregulation and an increasing commitment to the competitive market positioned the private sector to be more involved in the provision of affordable housing. But it was perhaps Kevin Rudd’s first speech to the Australian Parliament in 1998, almost a decade before he became Prime Minister, that best summarised the political landscape at this time:

Some call this the ‘third way’ … What is important is that it is a repudiation of Thatcherism … a new formulation of the nation’s economic and social imperatives … Competitive markets are massive and generally efficient generators of economic wealth. They must therefore have a central place in the management of the economy … As we enter the new century, the nation is confronted with an array of opportunities and challenges of bewildering complexity in the economy, in education, in our international engagements, in the environment, in the collapse of our local communities … (Rudd, 1998)

This commitment to the market and the animation of ‘local communities’ as the site for social change, by both centre-left and centre-right political parties, was a key component of housing policy formation throughout the 1990s and into the early part of 2000. The neo-liberal citizen is central to this broadly Third Way logic that, and when combined with declining operating budgets and poorly maintained public housing estates, provided Australian State and Territory housing authorities with the political rationale and motivation for exploring a range of market-based public housing estate ‘renewal’ initiatives. These included: dwelling upgrades and sales, demolition and land sales, neighbourhood improvement programs, amenity upgrades, infrastructure enhancements, and the outsourcing of various redevelopment and management functions to the private sector (Australian Housing Research Fund, 2000).
By late 1999, social disadvantage was a defining feature of large social housing estates and the Victorian government began investigating private-sector venture options, including the identification of estates and sites for potential sale to the private sector (Hulse et al., 2004). Eventually, the significant shifts in public housing redevelopment policy were demonstrated by public housing estate redevelopment projects in South Australia (Mitchell Park, Hillcrest and The Parks), Victoria (Kensington) and later New South Wales (Minto). The Minto case is particularly important to the BLCP and is outlined in greater detail below.

Although these projects were different in scope and delivery, they broadly involved changes in public housing tenure profiles through the sale of new or refurbished housing stock in the private market, and involved a degree of tenant ‘involvement’ – albeit mostly ad hoc, post announcement and with vastly different outcomes. It is important to note that the word ‘involvement’ above is used in a broad sense to encompass all forms of citizen participation, including activism and community organising by non-government organisations and tenant groups, and not just strategies deployed by state and territory housing authorities or their partners. In NSW, the shift from the Minto to the Bonnyrigg redevelopment project was marked by a move from tenant organising by public housing tenants following the announcement of the redevelopment of their estate, to the deployment of ‘community participation’ strategies developed and deployed by Housing NSW to accompany the announcement of the Bonnyrigg project.

These ‘community participation’ strategies formed part of a much broader reconfiguration of public housing provision in NSW, outlined here by the Minister for Housing, Cherie Burton, in 2005:

This year, the Government also announced the most significant changes in the history of [Housing NSW] with the release of a reform plan, Reshaping Public Housing. These changes constitute a fundamental shift in the philosophy of public housing, and ensure the ongoing sustainability of the

---

Social disadvantage relative to social housing typically includes high unemployment, high rates of crime, low education and literacy, and an increasing tenant portfolio with complex social and medical needs.
public housing sector. They include: an end to tenure for life, changes to eligibility for public housing, and increases in rent for tenants most able to pay, amongst other reforms. The result will be a public housing system that is better targeted towards providing housing assistance for those most in need.\textsuperscript{47} As the housing stock ages, costs for repairs and maintenance also escalate. This places huge pressure on the housing budget. (Housing NSW, 2005f)

The Reshaping Public Housing reform was part of the discursive process used to justify the Bonnyrigg redevelopment project. These reforms introduced public housing tenure changes (the introduction of housing tenure timeframes attached to ‘social’ outcomes), changes to the eligibility criteria for public housing, resulting in the increased targeting of disadvantaged persons, disinvestment in public housing stock and the stigmatisation of public housing estates as places of disadvantage. These changes were further justified under neo-liberal and neo-communitarian discourses of urban governance that called for market solutions, and for public housing tenants to be held individually responsible for their own fates, irrespective of these structural issues.

As a result, new public housing acquisitions became rare and the focus moved to existing stock ‘upgrades’ and ‘better’ management systems. This meant that the approach generally aimed “to realise land value, and any residual building asset value, to provide a lesser number of high quality dwellings with low maintenance costs”, especially in suburban areas, which included many public housing estates (Australian Housing Research Fund, 2000, p.5). This flagged a distinct move away from an asset-based approach to public housing policy and further positioned the States and Territories for a move towards the market. The types of projects that the USA have trialled or are currently exploring (see above) give an indication of the move to the market and suggest that market approaches are set to continue (Australian Housing Research Fund, 2000; Berry and Hall, 2009; Hall and Berry, 2004, 2007).

\textsuperscript{47} In 2006, Ms Burton stated “... those in the most need. This especially includes the frail aged, people with a mental illness, people with a disability and the young homeless” (Housing NSW, 2005f).
In Australia, the move to the provision of physical and more recently ‘social’ infrastructure by the private sector through public–private partnerships (PPPs) is being led by the states of New South Wales and Victoria. Jefferies and McGeorge (2009) suggest that between 1988 and 2006, 133 public–private partnerships were in various stages of development or deployment throughout Australia. With a distinct move towards the market between 2003 and 2006, 101 of the 131 PPPs were recorded in this 4-year period. In 2006, NSW accounted for 59 and Victoria for 34 of the total 133 PPPs being explored between 1988 and 2006 (see Appendix 2 – Typology of public–private partnership project types across Australia from 1988 to 2006).

Jefferies and McGeorge (2009, p.433) suggest that NSW was exploring 24 ‘social’ and four ‘urban’ public–private partnerships (PPPs) by 2006. However, the BLCP and the Minto Public Housing Estate Redevelopment, at expression of interest and pipeline stages, respectively, were significantly different in terms of ‘social’ objectives compared to other PPPs across the state. This is a point to which Jefferies and McGeorge pay little attention in their analysis of using PPPs to procure social infrastructure in Australia. Indeed, these two public housing PPPs in particular deploy significantly different conceptions of ‘social’ within the context of PPPs in Australia. While Jefferies and McGeorge draw on the distinction between ‘social’ and ‘economic’ provided by Argy et al. (1999) – economic infrastructure (e.g. roads, tunnels, bridges); and social infrastructure (e.g. hospitals, schools, prisons) – these PPPs have specific social objectives related to ‘building community’ and reducing ‘social exclusion’, which were clearly outside the remit of the bulk of the other PPPs procured between 1988 and 2006.

Leone (1999, p.vii) argues that while privatisation is normally justified in Australia on the grounds of economic rationalism, competitiveness and efficiency, these narratives mask the “powerful discipline imposed by ... the media on the operations of government”. This is especially the case when redevelopments are being justified under neo-communitarian assessments of urban ‘problems’. In

48 For a complete list of PPP projects for this period, see Jefferies and McGeorge (2009).
NSW, the media coverage of two key events on public housing estates served to bolster public and political option that public housing estates across NSW were troubled and troublesome places around the time of BLCP announcement.

The first event to receive media attention was the so-called ‘Redfern riots’ that occurred in February 2004, just prior to the announcement of the Bonnyrigg redevelopment project. The ‘Redfern riots’ occurred close to Sydney’s central business district, in an area with a high concentration of Indigenous housing managed by an Aboriginal housing company. The second event to attract interest was the so-called ‘Macquarie Fields riots’, which occurred just after project announcement in February 2005 on a public housing estate less than 20 km from Bonnyrigg. Over four nights, up to 150 young people clashed with NSW police on the estate. The unfolding of both events was broadcast nationally, with news reporters often reporting in real time, with a backdrop of police in riot equipment, young people hurling bricks and Molotov cocktails, and fire in the streets (Lee, 2007). But, as Lee later suggested:

perhaps the most troubling aspect of the response [to the ‘Macquarie Fields riots’] was its proclivity to obscure more entrenched social problems related to the sense of social isolation and exclusion experienced by residents ... This public show of dissent sparked considerable moral outrage and panic with politicians, media commentators and others. (Lee, 2007, pp.53–54).

Media coverage of public housing estates, and more specifically the public housing estate ‘riots’, reinforced more entrenched views of troublesome public housing tenants and dysfunctional public housing estates. Further, there were also more enduring media representations of public housing estates at this time. The Minto redevelopment also attracted political and media attention just prior to the announcement of the Bonnyrigg redevelopment project. However, in this case there were significant tenant-led media representations, which resulted in challenges to the construction of public housing tenants and estates as

---

49 The Block is a colloquial, but universally applied, name given to a block of housing in Redfern, Sydney. The Block was purchased over a 30-year period by the Aboriginal Housing Company (AHC) for use as a project in Aboriginal-managed housing. This spatial location is currently being gentrified.
CHAPTER 3

problematic and needing redevelopment. The Minto redevelopment project announced in 2002 therefore had significant implications for tenant participation practices in Bonnyrigg.

Like Bonnyrigg, the Minto redevelopment project in South-West Sydney employed a ‘partnership’ approach including Housing NSW, the local council and a development corporation. However in the Minto case, a significant proportion of the public housing tenants were required to relocate off the estate permanently. There was limited, if any, communication with tenants prior to the announcement and many tenants reported learning of the redevelopment from news coverage (Darcy, 2010a; Stubbs et al., 2005a). As a result, the Minto redevelopment raised considerable tenant opposition consolidated around the Minto Residents’ Action Group, which was established in June 2002. Nonetheless, the first homes were demolished in July 2002 and Darcy (2010a, p.17), citing (Stubbs 2005), suggests that the lack of tenant involvement

... became a significant motivator in the initiation, by tenants, of the Leaving Minto study, which in turn forced the proponents of the redevelopment to dramatically modify their discursive strategy and practices. Consultation arrangements and mediating organisations were rapidly brought into being, and the [Housing NSW] funded the employment by a non-government organisation of an independent tenants’ advocate.

Darcy (2010a, p.14) (also see Stubbs et al., 2005a,c) suggests that in “Bonnyrigg, after public criticism of the Minto experience, an extensive program of community engagement was developed”, which included a proposal for a community consultation, community building and a tenant advocate service in Bonnyrigg. Stubbs suggested in the lead-up to the Bonnyrigg project that

The ‘Minto Renewal’ in its original guise was in many respects the antithesis of ‘best practice’ ... [and as a result] there has been a perceptible shift in the way that government talks about such estates, and a greater understanding of Minto as a complex web of social relationships, rather than the “dysfunctional community” it was said to be. This is already translating to work on other estates, most notably in the lead up to decisions about the imminent Bonnyrigg redevelopment. (Stubbs, 2005, p.11)
Therefore, the BLCP was developed in a specific socio-political space connected both internationally and locally to a whole host of institutional and social sites, a range of discursive practices and policies, and other important social events. In Chapters 5–7, discourse analysis will be used to investigate these social and institutional sites to bring to the surface the discursive strategies used by social subjects to construct the BLCP. The analysis will start at the ‘international’ and work towards the ‘local’, linking important neo-liberal discursive strategies to social subjects and social events.

In Chapter 8, the analysis shows how the broad political project of neo-liberalism manifest as neo-communitarianism in Bonnyrigg to construct public housing tenants as neo-liberal citizens. This study demonstrates, in the BLCP case, that the public housing tenant participation strategies and other decision-making spaces were discursively constructed by these political ideologies, and that these shaped and constrained what was possible within these spaces. Therefore, different social subjects were invited into different decision-making spaces in the BLCP. Following this, the analysis concludes by showing the degrees to which social subjects exercised decision-making power within, or were excluded from, specific decision-making spaces, by drawing on the constructs of citizenship or capital.

To undertake this analysis, Chapter 4 puts forward a spatio-temporal research tool drawing on Cornwall’s (2004) spatial metaphor of invited space. The chapter first develops a theoretical framework that allowed me to critically reflect on my own experiences as an employee of the state and as a university researcher, working closely with public housing tenants, Housing NSW and the private sector in Bonnyrigg. This chapter also outlines how the spatio-temporal research tool uses a timeline taken from the BLCP public–private partnership, divided into the three contractual phases outlined in Chapter 1. This is the broad temporal reference. The spatial delineation of various institutional or market spaces, as well as social policy and other social spaces, is added to the research framework gradually throughout the thesis, and will be elaborated on as the thesis proceeds.
CHAPTER 4 – A reflexive spatio-temporal analyses of the BLCP

In this chapter, the theoretical framework and methodology deployed in this study are provided to structure and inform data analysis in the next three chapters. Broadly, this chapter is divided into two parts. The first section shows that the research was conceived and understood as a social construct and provides a rationale for locating the study within this frame. This theoretical framework provides a particular orientation to ‘knowledge’ that was largely informed by my involvement at the research site with social subjects over a 5-year period.

The methodology therefore required that I critically reflect on my own actions and involvement. The second section outlines the methodology and the specific research functions and data analysis methods deployed in this study. This includes participatory action research, critical discourse analysis and semi-structured interviews. The chapter concludes by providing the structure for the three data analysis chapters to follow, based on the spatio-temporal research tool put forward. Therefore, time and space are the pivotal concepts upon which this theoretical framework is balanced. Not only is the data analysis structured to critically interrogate the significance of the spatial sites of action in relation to their temporal locations. So too, the literature review and the theoretical framework have been constructed to stretch back into the past to discover, concealed in the writings of historical philosophers and social researchers:

not only the most recent received opinion, but also some astonishing replica of the arguments used to support it ... and always in such a way as to lead to the recognition of new arguments, new difficulties, and new objections surrounding the position adopted. (Scruton, 2008, p.9)

Therefore, the analysis of each theoretical or social construct has been premised on an attempted to trace the construction of these social, cultural and intellectual artefacts back in time and space, to reveal not only their origin(s) but also a range of insights often rendered invisible simply by the passing of time or different subject positions.
Power, knowledge and participation: Research as construct

This study is broadly located in critical theory and a critical social science, a critical reconceptualisation of research that questions the assumption that societies such as Australia, the UK and the USA “are unproblematically democratic and free” (Kincheloe and McLearen, 2005, p.303). This understanding of research, and the qualitative research paradigm within which the study is constructed, are positioned within a broadly relativist ontology, a constructivist epistemology and attempt to use an interpretive/participatory methodology (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

The term ‘ontology’ is used here to refer to the set of ideas or worldview that a researcher brings to the research – a philosophical endeavour concerned with the nature of being, existence and reality. Throughout history, ontology has, with irregular significance and focus, raised important questions for philosophers and researchers “about the nature of reality and the nature of the human being in the world” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a, p.183). These questions have always been historically specific. Ontological understandings always reflect the knowledge that one holds about the world at a specific moment in time. One of the first philosophical attempts to question reality is often attributed to Parmenides, an ancient Greek pre-Socratic philosopher who was alive early in the fifth century BCE (Geldard, 2007; Vlastos, 1946). Parmenides’ allegorical proem provides an account of a man’s chariot journey, through a set of gates and towards a goddess. Bowra (1937, p.98) argues that this represents the transition from ignorance (represented as darkness) to knowledge (represented as light) in the proem.

However, Aristotle’s (1988) Metaphysics was perhaps the first system to examine an ontology of substance, the ‘being qua being’ to define the philosophical pursuit to understand what exists (Politis, 2004). Metaphysics introduced an examination and investigation of universals, be used to in the pursuit of knowledge that would continue throughout the Middle Ages (Funkenstein, 1989; Politis, 2004). By the time of René Descartes (1637) in the 17th century, Martin Heidegger (1927)
argues that Cartesian logic – a form of epistemology – and the metaphysical tradition had largely forgotten questions relating to the nature of being proposed by the ancient Greek philosophers. In the 17th century, while largely preoccupied with epistemological questions and highly immersed in scientific and mathematical phenomena known as natural philosophy at the time, Descartes theorised that there must be a set of fundamental physical laws by which everything could be explained. In the *Principles of Philosophy*, Descartes (1944) postulated such a set of physical laws. Moving forward with the rationalist project, Baruch Spinoza (Wilson, 1996) then argued that “access to the philosophical truth comes only when we rise above preoccupations with our own limited experience and mentality”: to acquire knowledge, one must become an impartial rational observer (Scruton, 2008, p.50).

Then in the 18th century, during the Age of Enlightenment, when philosophers were advocating *reason* as the primary source of legitimacy and authority, philosophers such as Immanuel Kant (1781) questioned reason itself (for a discussion of research in the Age of Reason, see Christians, 2005). Kant (1781) demonstrated the limitations of the Cartesian concept of reason, but attempted to bring together empiricist and rationalist epistemologies. The Kantian argument, defined under the doctrine of Transcendental Idealism, also demonstrated “the empirical reality of space and time, that is to say ... this empirical reality involves transcendental ideality; space and time are forms of human intuition” (Martin, 1974, p.41).

This theorising built on a long history of philosophical thought that had focused on time and space over many centuries (Lefebvre, 1991, p.73) (also see Aristotle, 1988; Heidegger, 1927; Leibniz, 1695; Spinoza in Bennett, 1996). Lefebvre argues that the historical roots of our current conceptions of space and time can be found in the philosophical contribution of Descartes, who – he believed – brought an end to the Aristotelian conception of space and time, which held that these were amongst the *a priori* set of laws with which metaphysics was concerned.

---

30 Named after René Descartes.
(Lefebvre, 1991, p.1). But let us remain with the Cartesian Moment\(^{31}\) and its importance to social research, returning to the philosophical constructions of time and space from classical antiquity later in this and subsequent chapters (see Chapter 6).

Throughout the 18th century, the concept of epistemology became better articulated and more interdisciplinary in its application. Kant (1781) theorised ontological and epistemological differences, while broader epistemological theorising continued to bring scientific and philosophical reasoning together. Different orientations to the creation of knowledge were theorised in the 19th century and a diversity of social enquiry paradigms emerged in the 20th century, including neo-Kantianism, positivism, neo-positivism, and constructivism.

More recently, critical and participatory theories have been gaining credibility as legitimate research paradigms (Cannella and Lincoln, 2004b; Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a, pp.193–196). But, while the positivist bias in research funding may be retreating, qualitative research findings continue to be called into question by a range of social actors on methodological grounds, based on rationalist assumptions about knowledge creation (Cannella and Lincoln, 2004a; Carmody, 2001; Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a; Lincoln and Cannella, 2004a). Therefore, these qualitative research paradigms construct very different epistemological “relationships between the inquirer and the known” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a, p.183). Every epistemology (\(\text{epistémé}^{32}\)) – the theorisation of knowing how to apply knowledge to know – “implies an ethical–moral stance toward the world and the self of the researcher” (Christians, 2005; Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a, p.183; Tuominen, 2009).

\(^{31}\) Foucault (2001) uses the term ‘Cartesian Moment’ to highlight not a chronological moment in time but, instead, a moment over time in the history of thought. The ‘Cartesian Moment’ draws attention to the point at which ‘philosophy’ and ‘spirituality’ were separated in our pursuit of knowledge, and therefore acquisition of knowledge was no longer connected to the Aristotelian notion of “care of the self”.

\(^{32}\) Knowledge (\(\text{epistémé}\)) refers here to epistemological knowledge within the modern fields of philosophy and particularly post-Cartesian epistemology. This notion of research epistemology, “philosophical research into questions of what are the methods, limits, objects or aims of a systematic study into the world around us” (Tuominen, 2009, p.41), is significantly different to older or pre-Cartesian philosophical notions that looked for \textit{a priori} or \textit{a posteriori} knowledge.
However, these epistemological associations are also historically specific. Denzin and Lincoln (2005a, p.3) argue that qualitative research needs to be understood in its complex historical field and they chart at least eight historical moments. The traditional (1900–1950) is associated with the positivist paradigm. The modernist (1950–1970) is associated with postpositivism. Blurred genres (1970–1986) is associated with discipline and method blending. Researchers then theorised researcher reflexivity within the crisis of representation (1986–1990). Within the postmodern and postexperimental enquiry (1995–2000) and the methodologically contested (2000–2005) moments, researchers theorised the enquiry process in terms of ethics and morality grounded in local knowledge. Finally, this qualitative study is broadly positioned within the fractured future (from 2005). It is therefore broadly understood, and theorised, as the assemblage of these historical moves, under the assumption that research is a construct (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a, p.3). Within this paradigm:

[the qualitative researcher may be described using multiple and gendered images: scientist; naturalist, field-worker, journalist, social critic, artist, performer, jazz musician, filmmaker, quilt maker, essayist. The many methodological practices of qualitative research may be viewed as soft science, journalism, ethnography ... these interpretive practices involve aesthetics issues, an aesthetics of representation that goes beyond the pragmatic or the practical. (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a, p.4)]

Over the last 10 years, I have held a number of different roles located in multiple sites, including international development, community health, local government and with Housing NSW, the state housing authority involved in this study. In all these roles, I have worked closely with groups marginalised by structural, religious, cultural, socio-economic and other discriminatory factors. I have worked with persons experiencing mental illness, persons living under a continual fear of religious or cultural persecution in a country at civil war, and with residents of large public housing estates representing many cultural backgrounds. I have developed close working relationships with ‘people’ in all these sites and I have observed – even experienced, in small and insignificant ways – how

---

33 Some theorists argue we are still in the postmodern moment (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a,b).
discrimination, class, policy, globalisation, capitalism, biology and social structures have shaped their worlds.

My work, either implicitly or explicitly, has involved resisting dominant beliefs and practices that discriminate by challenging assumptions and working with those who are marginalised and discriminated against, towards social justice. Over the last 5 years, research has become a key component of my work towards social justice and a part of my professional life. Like Carmody (2001, p.170), I recognise that my research is an interactive process, “shaped by my personal history, biography, gender, social class, sexuality, ethnicity and ability, as well as those elements in the people in the settings”. My professional and social (life) experiences have shaped who I am as a researcher, the questions I choose to ask and the methods that I deploy.

This has important epistemological implications for my research. More than accepting that my research will not be ‘objective’, in a Cartesian sense, I actively decided to take sides when I engaged in this research. I believe that research is a political process and that different sides (political, social, structural) of the research process can be roughly sketched out, but are often ignored or rendered invisible under the guise of objectivity (Cannella and Lincoln, 2004b, p.304). Denzin (1989, p.248) argues that

[w]hen sociologists do research, they inevitably take sides for or against particular values, political bodies and society at large. That is they act as agents of the state, for interest groups or for themselves. In doing so, they take sides, for it is impossible to do value neutral research.

This epistemological view of research as a value- and politically laden construct constitutes the research process with a focus on power and relationships. Research is “conceived and practiced as a political act that generates power for particular groups” (Cannella and Lincoln, 2004b, p.302). This is counter to the ‘apolitical illusion’ (a term used by Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a) of research that constitutes the process with a focus on reality, universal (a priori) truth or
objectivity while paying little attention to agendas, politics and other biases. “Research has always been political and to varying degrees politicised, representing particular sets of beliefs about the world and excluding others” (Cannella and Lincoln, 2004b, pp.302–303).

However, like most political processes, there are perils to engaging in this type of research. The ‘Dangerous Discourses’ theses (see the Qualitative Inquiry special issue: Cannella, 2004; Cannella and Lincoln, 2004a,b; Guillemin and Gillam, 2004; Lincoln and Cannella, 2004a,b; Popkewitz, 2004; Maxwell, 2004) and the ‘Dangerous Knowledge’ theses (see Carmody, 2001; Kincheloe and McLearen, 2005; Lee, 1993) show how relativist/interpretive qualitative research is often recognised as too dangerous in a research environment historically constructed by Cartesian/imperialist constructions of knowledge, ethics and research:

At best, the [relativist/interpretive] methods have been embraced as additional techniques for data collection; challenges to truth-oriented results have continued to be labeled as the so-called evil cultural relativism by large numbers of researchers and entirely rejected within some fields. (Cannella and Lincoln, 2004b, p.299)

Relativist/interpretive qualitative research and the vast number of research methods that have been deployed within this construction of research have attracted critique or outright rejection from academics, research partners, politicians, university ethics review boards and research funding bodies (Lincoln and Cannella, 2009), and with good reason. Research, in whatever form, is political, and diverse research “perspectives, methodologies, and products that through their very existence, embody direct challenges to dominant perspectives” create opposition (Cannella and Lincoln, 2004b, p.299).

However, in both a political and practical sense, opposition to these alternative forms of representation is often tantamount to opposition to a diversity of voice(s) (Lincoln and Cannella, 2004a,b). Further, it is precisely this diversity of voice – the multiple epistemologies and methodologies that can be used to construct
research, the challenging of dominant beliefs and practices, and the response to (mis)representations and assumptions – that are required “if policy, legislation, and practice are to be sensitive to social needs” (Lincoln and Cannella, 2004a, p.7):

Rather than a research that is dominated by attempts to determine individual and group characteristics, our public discourses could focus on how society produces forms of exclusion and how that exclusion can be countered, how domination is inscribed and coded, ways to foster and support decolonial, local and community research agendas, and negotiated research actions that transform the academic and public imaginary. (Cannella and Lincoln, 2007, pp.304–305)

Cannella and Lincoln (2004b, p.305) argue for a new discourse of qualitative research, based partially on questions like those proposed by Demas (unpublished work, cited in Cannella and Lincoln, 2004b, p.305). I used Demas’ list of qualitative research questions to frame my own research questions in an attempt to counter dominant research discourses relating to public housing estates and tenants (see Appendix 3). In framing and conducting the research, I continually revisited the following questions:

Is resistance placed at the centre of my research?

How are the research partners (re)constructing research collaboration?

Are multiple perspectives and interest positions being generated?

Is the research denying difference, perpetuating a discursive status quo or forcing consensus?

Is the research challenging the assumptions and discursive representations of reality constructed under ‘rigorous’ and ‘scientific’ neo-liberal/capitalist conceptions of public housing, community and public housing tenants?

Is the research pursuing social justice without imposing my own (predetermined) notion of emancipation and understanding of liberatory transformation on public housing tenants?

Is the research bringing to the surface and questioning the power relations implicit at the research site and generated by my research?

(Rogers, 2011)
CHAPTER 4

This epistemological positioning, not least because it challenges Cartesian notions of objectivity, positivist notions of researcher/researched relationships and rationalist claims to truth, also brings into focus a broader research ethic and the need to reflect on qualitative research ethics within this new paradigm. A new ‘rigour’ or ‘reflexive ethics’ (Cannella and Lincoln, 2007, pp.305–306) is required to validate the empirical work and to address the criticisms forwarded to the so-called evil cultural relativists. To discredit all knowledge under the mantra of ‘all is relative’ or to call into question every ‘truth’ is not the aim of this study. Such an approach would be an unethical mode of research in this and many other research sites. Rather, the point – as Isaiah Berlin (1980, p.101) poetically argued, reflecting on 18th-century European thought – accepts that

\[ \text{unless we are able to escape from the ideological prisons of class or nation or doctrine ... it is idle to tell men to learn to see other worlds through the eyes of those whom they seek to understand, if they are prevented by the walls of their own culture from doing so.} \]

Therefore, and taking a lead from Lincoln and Cannella (2009, p.280), the ethical purpose of this study was “rethought to reveal and actively challenge social systems, discourses, and institutions” that perpetuate inequity and possibly injustice towards public housing tenants – and, further, following Berlin (1980), to open our (by our I mean my, the private sectors’, public housing tenants’ and others) eyes to see the world from different perspectives, to attempt to escape, however short-lived or tenuous, from our own ideological or institutional positions. In the context of reflexive ethics as an epistemological endeavour in this study, Foucault’s work is useful here to my understanding of knowledge (Connaissance)\(^{34}\) in this thesis.

Any representation of Foucault’s work necessitates a subjective assessment and selective review of his, and others, theoretical corpus. Therefore, I acknowledge that the following is neither a complete, nor an accurate, representation of

\(^{34}\) Knowledge (Connaissance) – is a particular corpus of knowledge, a particular demarcation of knowledge on a given topic or within a given discipline. “By [Connaissance] I mean the relation of the subject to the object and the formal rules that govern it” (Foucault 1969, p.16)
Foucault’s life’s work (Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005, p.841). No such account exists, and neither can it\(^{35}\) (Lemke, 2001, p.190). Therefore, the following represents a subjective assessment of the Foucauldian project that is grounded in Foucault’s epistemological pursuit to further our understanding of the relationship between the enquirer and the known (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a, p.183). This account focuses specifically on Foucault’s (1994, 1977) power/knowledge (\textit{pouvoir-savoir})\(^{56}\) and governmentality. The theoretical framework section will return to reflexive ethics following this discussion.

The Foucauldian constructs of power/knowledge and governmentality are useful to studies interested in the role and functionality of governmental and corporate power in the social systems that constitute our society. A Foucauldian epistemology is particularly well suited to this study, as I have placed power and resistance at the centre of my research. Further, the redevelopment of the Bonnyrigg public housing estate is occurring within a neo-liberal rationality of government. This particular rationality of government, or governmentality (Foucault, 1991), constructs certain conditions of possibility and constitutes the various social subjects and social entities in particular ways. Foucault’s project challenges Western rational/liberalist representations of social realities, bringing to the surface issues of power and the dialectical relationships between power and knowledge creation that are intrinsic to neo-liberal approaches to social reform, including public–private partnerships.

Foucault has been called, amongst other descriptors, an activist, academic and historian: in any case, he was interested in the history of ideas, epistemology and discourse. “In the 1970s, Foucault appeared at the forefront of militant and

\(^{35}\) Accurate accounts of Foucault’s thesis are problematic because “[f]rom 1970 until his death in 1984, Michel Foucault held the Chair of ‘History of Systems of Thought’ at the Collège de France. In his public lectures delivered each Wednesday from early January through to the end of March/beginning of April, he reported on his research goals and findings, presenting unpublished material and new conceptual and theoretical research tools. Many of the ideas developed there were later to be taken up in his various book projects. However, he was in fact never to elaborate in writing on some of the research angles he presented there” (Lemke, 2001).

\(^{56}\) Knowledge (saviour) – is knowledge in general, the totality of all connaissance. Saviour “refers to the conditions that are necessary in a particular period for this or that type of object to be given to connaissance] and for this or that enunciation to be formulated” (Foucault, 1969, p.16).
intellectual activity in France drawing attention to social injustice” (O'Farrell, 2005, p.29), while Chair at the Collège de France. Foucault articulated a link between knowledge and power within various political, economic and institutional arrangements (O'Farrell, 2005, p.42) and in 1977, he rather provocatively outlined his interest in truth/power/knowledge as an epistemological pursuit by stating:

I am preoccupied by these relations of truth/power, knowledge/power. Now, this layer of objects, rather this layer of relations, is difficult to come to grips with; and so I don’t have a general theory with which to apprehend these relations, I am, if you like, a blind empiricist, that is, in the worst of situations. I have no general theory, and neither do I have a reliable instrument. (Foucault, 1977, p.404; cited in O'Farrell, 2005, p.84)

Foucault (1966) rejected the idea of a self-governing subject, and the construct of power/knowledge sets about defining the limits and arbitrariness of knowledge creation: the “limits, exclusions and constraints” placed on the production of knowledge, and the relationship between knowledge creation and power (O'Farrell, 2005, 1989). In Foucault’s (1969) The Archaeology of Knowledge, a direct allusion to Nietzsche’s (1887) A Genealogy of Morality according to Mahon (1992), and perhaps a ‘methodological’ response to his (Foucault, 1966) more abstract theorising in The Order of Things, Foucault was particularly interested in the epistemological construction of knowledge and ‘truth’ during the 20th century.

He focuses specifically on the Renaissance and the Age of Enlightenment to argue, “thus historical descriptions are necessarily ordered by the present state of knowledge” and are therefore a function of discursive practices (Foucault, 1969, p.5). Following Nietzsche (1887), Foucault argued that fact (truth) is already an interpretation (Mahon, 1992), a discursive construction of reality based on discursive regularities (Foucault, 1969, pp.23–79). Foucault was referring to the incorporation of ‘positivity’, born out of 18th-century Cartesian rationality, into so-called pseudo-sciences including psychiatry, “or sciences entirely penetrated with ideology (like political economy)” (Foucault, 1969, pp.151–196):
When Foucault declares “everything is interpretation,” he is not making a metaphysical claim about the nature of being, about the way the world is in its truth. Contrary to Heidegger’s interpretation, in which Nietzsche represents the last metaphysician in the Western philosophical tradition, Foucault reads Nietzsche as revealing the futility of metaphysics. (Mahon, 1992, p.116)

Foucault’s critique of the rise of scientific reason, and despite claims of “introducing an amoral and highly dubious relativism” (O'Farrell, 2005, p.83), points to the limits of the discursive practices deployed by political, economic and institutional entities that constitute individuals in society. Foucault contends that knowledge is not created through the “systematic accumulation of self-evident ‘true’ ‘facts’” (O'Farrell, 2005, p.184). Instead, Foucault demonstrates that “knowledge in fact accumulates and organises itself strategically and politically” (O'Farrell, 2005, p.87):

I made an effort, in particular, to understand how man had transformed certain of these limit-experiences into objects of knowledge – madness, death, crime. It’s always a question of limit-experiences and the history of truth. (Foucault, 1994, p.257)

Institutional and political objects of knowledge, the ‘truth’ that is generated to represent social subjects for instance, are constructed through processes of accepting and rejecting knowledge and by way of the discursive regularities (Foucault, 1969) within these institutional and political sites. Foucault highlighted the importance of discourse and discursive formations within institutions – the link between discourses (bodies of knowledge) and what Foucault (1988) describes as ‘games of truth’, a term used to describe the process by which institutions “authorise their activities by claiming to be speaking the truth” (Danaher et al., 2000, p.40):

Ideas and words have a material and historical existence and they can be analysed alongside other historical artifacts and events. People’s very lives and whole existences have been, and are, at stake in these words and these ideas ... “I don’t mean they were represented, but their liberty ... in any case
their fate, were decided at least in part.” (O’Farrell, 2005, p.86; citing Foucault, 1994, p.160)

Foucault’s epistemological approach to analysis, power/knowledge, resonates with my research aims of placing resistance at the centre of my research, and bringing to the surface and questioning the power relations implicit at the research site and generated by my research. Foucault, moving away from the concept of hegemony posited by Gramsci (1937), contends that since the ‘knowledge’ and ‘truth’ about ourselves, as social subjects, are constructed “through the ideas, discourses and institutions that constitute society” (Danaher et al., 2000, p.48), the exercise of power, by the state or corporations, is maintained largely because power is hidden and unquestioned (Barry et al., 1996; Burchell et al., 1991; Foucault, 1963). For Foucault, there is a relationship between: the discursive practices of the state, corporations and other social entities; the knowledge created through the discursive practices within these sites of action; and power. Therefore, Foucault proposes that claims of truth and knowledge production are used to legitimate power and vice versa, and are therefore interconnected:

As far as Foucault is concerned, power now functions in terms of the relations between different fields, institutions, and other groups within the state. What characterises these relations of power is that they are not set in stone, power can flow very quickly from one point to another, depending on changing alliances and circumstances … power is mobile and contingent. (Danaher et al., 2000, p.71)

Foucault used power/knowledge as part of a broader philosophical project focused on a ‘genealogy of the modern state’ (Lemke, 2001, p.191). However, governmentality (the rationality of governing) is an historical analysis of the political rationality underpinning government at different points in history from the Ancient Greeks through to modern neo-liberalism (Lemke, 2001, p.191). Governmentality and the rise of a ‘liberal attitude’ are significant to this study, as the focus is on challenging the assumptions and discursive representations of reality constructed under ‘rigorous’ and ‘scientific’ neo-liberal/capitalist conceptions of public housing, community and public housing tenants. Governmentality describes the process of government as
an activity or practice (Sterne, 2003), interested in not only how governments’ regulate citizens, but also the processes and mechanisms by which citizens are brought to regulate themselves:

A rationality of government will thus mean a way or system of thinking about the nature of the practice of government (who can govern; what governing is; what or who is governed), capable of making some form of that activity thinkable and practicable both to its practitioners and to those upon whom it is practice. (Burchell et al., 1991, p.3)

Lemke (2001) provides a detailed account of the historical development of neo-liberalism outlined by Foucault in his lectures on a History of System of Thought while Chair of the Collège de France. Lemke (2001, p.192) shows how Foucault concentrated on two forms of neo-liberalism: German post-war liberalism (Ordo-liberalism) and the “liberalism of the Chicago School, which derives from the former, takes it a step further and gives it more radical form”.

Foucault (Lemke, 2001) argued that post-war German liberalism presented capitalism as a contradictory social construct, historically specific and open to political manipulation. The Ordo-liberals’ theorised a ‘social market economy’ (Lemke, 2001) in which the market would be “constantly supported by political regulations and had to be flanked by social intervention”, including housing and other welfare policies (Lemke, 2001, pp.195 & 197). By contrast, suggests Foucault, the Chicago School redefined the social sphere within an economic rationality of government. Lemke (2001, p.197) summarised Foucault by arguing:

US neo-liberals attempt to re-define the social sphere as a form of the economic domain. The model of rational-economic action serves as a principle for justifying and limiting governmental action, in which context government itself becomes a sort of enterprise whose task it is to universalize competition and invent market-shaped systems of action for individuals, groups and institutions (Foucault, 1997a, p.78–79; Burchell, 1993, p.274) ... The focus is therefore no longer on reconstructing a (mechanical) logic, but on analysing a form of human action governed by a specific unique (economic) rationality. From this angle, the economic is not a firmly outlined and delineated area of human existence, but essentially includes all forms of human action and behavior (Lecture, 14 March 1979; Gordon, 1991, p.43).
Foucault (Lecture, 21 March 1979, cited in Lemke, 2001, p.198) called this “a kind of permanent economic tribunal” – an epistemological shift, whereby economic categories and measures are used as analytical tools in non-economic social spheres.

Under neo-liberal governmentality, social relations and pathology, individual behaviour and corrective measures are assessed and determined using economic terminology, criteria and rationalities (Lemke, 2001, p.198). According to Foucault (1963, 1975a,b; see also Barry et al., 1996), neo-liberal governmentality introduced profit and loss and cost–benefit analysis into the social sphere. A type of Cartesian economic rationality, applied to the social sphere, assumed social subjects to be rational beings, capable of making rational decisions by weighing up the social benefits, in the context of any negative social costs: “It focuses not on the players, but on the rules of the game, not on the (inner) subjugation of individuals, but on defining and controlling their (outer) environment” (Lemke, 2001, p.200).

This represents a shift of power, a move from centralised state power to an environment of free market economics theorised by the Chicago School and implemented by various states. This demonstrates, according to Foucault, that instead of the state regulating the market, the market is now controlling the state (Barry et al., 1996; Burchell et al., 1991b; Foucault, 1997a, 2001a). Therefore, the action by, and intervention of, states and corporations into the lives of social subjects – that is, how governments act on citizens – are no longer constructed under the notions of social justice and freedom of a prior era (Gordon, 1991): “instead it posits an artificially arranged liberty: in the entrepreneurial and competitive behaviour of economic-rational individuals” (Lemke, 2001, p.200), the neo-liberal citizen.

The strength of Foucault’s thesis, for this study, resides in an analysis of the BLCP that shows how the deployment of a particular manifestation of neo-liberal ideology and rhetoric by Housing NSW attempted to create a range of social,
political and economic ‘realities’ – to show how Housing NSW and the private sector attempted to bring public housing tenants into these ‘realities’, with various degrees of success. At the macro level, the BLCP was framed in this study within governmentality and was therefore viewed as a neo-liberal technology of government (power):

In this way, we can decipher the neo-liberal harmony in which not only the individual body, but also collective bodies and institutions [public administrations and research institutions] corporations and states have to be ‘lean’, ‘flexible’ and ‘autonomous’: it is a technique of power. The analysis of governmentality not only focuses on the integral link between micro- and macro-political levels ... it also highlights the intimate relationship between ‘ideological’ and ‘political-economic’ agencies.

At the micro level, the analysis will show how the formal knowledge about public housing tenants, the public housing estate and the type of intervention required in Bonnyrigg emerged from a “broad array of irrational sources or conditions” (Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005, p.847). This complex array of messy and at times ambiguous ‘conditions of possibility’ (Foucault, 1966) was broadly structured by a meta-narrative of modernist reason (Canguilhem, 1988; Foucault, 1963), which in turn created certain ‘conditions of possibility’ for tenant participation in Bonnyrigg within a neo-liberal governmentality. Therefore, the study investigates the power exercised by various social entities at various points in time, and in various social spaces, to understand and articulate the conditions of possibility for tenant participation within the BLCP.
CHAPTER 4

Methodology: Reflexive ethics and participatory action research

The methodology required an ethical stance that was reflexive and collaborative, and reconceptualised the notion of research rigor. I developed an approach to the research consistent with *reflexive ethics* or *reflexive critical ethics* (Cannella and Lincoln, 2007; Carmody, 2001; Christians, 2005; Coghlan and Shani, 2005; Cunliffe, 2009; Eikeland, 2006; Guillemin and Gillam, 2004) to attend to the issues of research rigor and researcher reflexivity. In keeping with the ethos of reflexive ethics, action research was proposed in an attempt to develop a collaborative research project involving public housing tenants, the private sector and myself. In short, the proposed methodology included reflexive ethics and participatory action research (PAR), guiding a range of qualitative research methods that included critical reflexivity as an insider, participant observation, semi-structured interviews and critical discourse analysis of BLCP and other texts. These are discussed in turn below.

The Declaration of Helsinki and the development of the Helsinki Protocols, written in 1964 in response to the horrors of the Second World War revealed at the Nuremberg Trials, outlined a set of guiding principles for medical practitioners and other researchers regarding the ethical and humane treatment of human participants (Lincoln and Cannella, 2009, p.274; Bosnjak, 2001). These principles, under continual amendment and review, formed the basis of the formal ethics review processes in place within research institutions, and to which qualitative researchers have been asked to conform in the pursuit of ethical research practice over the last four decades.

Critical debates have emerged over the last two decades regarding the capability of biomedical assessments of research ethics to address the ethical issues specific to qualitative research, which there is little space to explore here (Christians, 2005; Lincoln and Cannella, 2009). One of the key debates focused on methodological conservatism, a preference for ‘truth’-orientated forms of knowledge production
within research funding structures and the ethics review process across a range of institutional sites (Cannella, 2004; Cannella and Lincoln, 2004a,b; Guillemin and Gillam, 2004; Lincoln and Cannella, 2004a,b; Maxwell, 2004; Popkewitz, 2004). In response to this so-called ‘methodological conservatism’ (Lincoln and Cannella, 2004a), reflexive ethics emerged, in the first instance, as a retheorisation of the role of formal ethics review processes in relation to qualitative research within research institutions. This problematisation of formal ethics review, in the context of qualitative research, created space for a reconceptualisation of research ethics and research rigor, noting the epistemological framing of new qualitative participatory research paradigms.

Through this discussion, the theorisation of reflexive ethics (Chiu, 2006; Christians, 2005; Cornwall and Schattan P. Coelho, 2007b; Lincoln and Cannella, 2009; Reason, 1999) gained considerable currency in the qualitative research literatures of education and management (see Cunliffe, 2004, 2009; Holmes et al., 2005; Pavlovich et al., 2009; van Woerkom, 2010), and increasing currency in broader areas of social research (for reflexive ethics in Indigenous research, see, e.g., Nicholls, 2009; Tuhiwai Smith, 2005). Advocates of this new research rigor proposed a new approach to qualitative research, in which:

> [c]onceptualisations of rigor would be unrecognisably transformed to include the continued use of reflexive critical ethics, open and constant public communication with negotiated, multivocal critical activism, and the appreciation of and support for intellectual diversity in ways that create a more inclusive community. This new “rigor” would require recognition of the micro- and macro-political context surrounding the particular inquiry and a willingness to engage in critique and transformative action. No longer would we speak of issues of validity or reliability. Rather, reflexive ethics, public communication, contextual (sometimes even historical) knowledge, and critical actions would represent quality. Our research epistemologies, methodologies, and judgments of quality would be socially transformed for purposes of critical liberation. (Cannella and Lincoln, 2004b, p.305)

In Bonnyrigg, I developed a reflexive research ethic in an attempt to establish a PAR project with public housing tenants and the private-sector contractor, to facilitate a process of critical self-examination and dialogue through social
practice. PAR departs significantly from Cartesian approaches to research and rationalist orientations to knowledge generation. In many ways, it is perhaps more closely aligned with earlier Socratic conceptions of knowledge creation that focused on care of the self\(^{57}\) (Foucault, 1986), that posit that to know the world one must understand the self through rational thought (Cross and Woolzley, 1989; Plato, 1993; Scruton, 2008; Tuominen, 2009). Throughout antiquity, the philosophical question of how to gain access to knowledge, the truth about the world, was inseparable from the moral pursuit to care of or knowing thyself (Foucault, 2001b, p.xxiv):

The so-called Cartesian moment allows Foucault to characterise the modern age of the relations between the subject and truth ... the Cartesian moment is the event that disqualifies the care of the self and requalifies the gnothi seauton,\(^{58}\) dissociating a philosophy of knowledge from a spirituality\(^{59}\) of the transformation of the subject’s very being by his work on himself. (Foucault, 2001b, p.xxiv)

Prior to the Cartesian moment, argues Foucault, an act of pursuing knowledge was conceived as such that one would never be granted access to the truth unless the subject was willing to undergo a transformation, “not of the individual, but of the subject himself in his being as subject” (Foucault, 2001b, p.xxiv). In this study, I have conceived of care of the self\(^{60}\) as the pursuit towards my own critical reflexivity undertaken in the process of seeking knowledge about the external world.

This ethos is reflected in PAR, which is focused on generating knowledge through collaboration and reflection of social practices of others and the self; and in which

\(^{57}\) I have used epimeleia heautou, or care of the self, here following Foucault’s reading of classical antiquity. “The epimeleia heautou is an attitude towards the self, others and the world” (Foucault, 2001b, p.10). This is in contrast to gnothi seauton (see the definition below).

\(^{58}\) The term gnothi seauton is the famous Delphic prescription know thyself (Foucault, 2001b, p.3).

\(^{59}\) By spirituality Foucault means the ancient Greek concept of the soul (psyché). To know thyself or to care of the self, one would know or care for the soul. The soul, furthermore, had two parts: the irrational emotive component – emotions and desires – and the rational true self (Tuominen, 2009).

\(^{60}\) It is worth noting, in Foucault’s reading of the philosophy of antiquity, that “in order to have access to the truth, the subject has to undergo a conversion or transformation and therefore his very being is at stake” (Foucault, 2001b, p.xxvi). The reason for this, in classical antiquity, is that the subject was seeking salvation of the soul through access to the truth. I am not proposing, therefore, that such a transformation is a necessary or a desirable objective in contemporary philosophy or social research.
the value and utility of the knowledge is tested through the research process in a sequence of action research cycles (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2005):

In action research, community or organisational stakeholders collaborate with professional researchers in defining the objectives, constructing the research questions, learning research skills, pooling knowledge and efforts, conducting the research, interpreting the results, and applying what is learnt to produce positive social change … Action research ignores the boundar[y] between academia and society as a basic principle of operation. (Greenwood and Morten, 2000, p.94)

Action research (AR) is often attributed to Kurt Lewin’s (1946) research in the USA in the 1940s. However, this so-called first generation of AR soon became difficult to justify under the “prevailing positivistic ideology” in the USA in the middle of the 20th century (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2005, p.560). Then second-generation AR emerged in the late 1960s in the UK, morphing into third-generation AR in Australia and Europe, which was focused more explicitly on emancipation and critical action.

By the mid-1970s, social activists such as Paulo Freire (1973) were deploying “critical emancipatory action research and participatory action research” (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2005, p.560) in the developing world in fourth-generation AR. More recently, AR has been moving away from activism and more traditional forms of PAR by focusing on the role of civil society organisations (see Cornwall and Schattan P. Coelho, 2007a) as a way of “gaining legitimacy for contentious knowledge, and gaining a stronger basis to intervene in policy issues” (Action Research Journal, 2010, p.1).

However, in late 2006, when I invited the private-sector contractor to become a collaborative research partner on this study, the research methodology was outlined with general reference to Kemmis and McTaggart’s (2005, pp.559–603) and Reason and Bradbury’s (2001) extensive theoretical contributions and guidelines for conducting PAR. The key principles of PAR, it was generally

---

61 Although this is disputed by Altricher and Gstettner (1997).
thought in 2006, involved a spiral of self-reflective cycles of the following (see Appendix 4).

- **Planning** a change
- Acting and *observing* the process and consequences of the change
- **Reflecting** on the processes and consequences
- **Replanning**
- Acting and *observing* again
- Reflecting again, and so on ...  

(Kemmis and McTaggart, 2005, p.563; emphasis in original)

Hilary Huang argues that PAR “is research *about* practice, not [simply] *with* practitioners” (Huang, 2010, p.94; emphasis in original) and it is therefore often a messy process. PAR rarely progresses as a neat progression of spiral cycles consisting of planning, action, critical reflection, revision and further action. In the field, PAR more commonly progresses as an overlapping set of stages.

Research questions become obsolete and new questions are posed, while the participation of ‘co-researchers’ may fluctuate and the processes, therefore, are likely to be fluid (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2005). In short, building research momentum can be time-consuming and difficult. PAR also dispenses with the researcher/research dichotomy, replacing it with a set of alternative research relationships. Participants often collectively identify as ‘co-researchers’, ‘research teams’ or ‘collaborative researcher partners’, depending on the social research context. PAR is therefore a social process of collective action whereby a group of people come together to change the practices through which they interact (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2005). However, it has long been acknowledged that all research, including PAR, takes place in complex socio-political environments (Reason and Bradbury, 2001). Cornwall and Jewkes (1995, pp.1672–1673) observed in the mid-1990s that PAR
in which the visibility of the researcher and the transparency of their intentions are significantly greater than in conventional research, presents a number of challengers. Control over the research is rarely devolved completely onto the ‘community’; nor do ‘communities’ always want it ... participation is time-consuming ... Research processes can have unintended negative consequences for those who participate.

My interest in PAR originated from an Insider Action Research (IAR) project that I conducted with Fairfield City Council in 2006, at the same site as this study. The IAR project focused on the involvement of public housing tenants in the BLCP bidding process and was conducted as part of an Honours degree. During the bidding process, Housing NSW developed a range of tenant consultation processes to ‘involve’ public housing tenants in the public–private partnership, which were developed and coordinated by the Community Building Team. In 2008, Housing NSW (Coates et al., 2008, p.23) described the Community Building Team in retrospect as “a local multi-skilled engagement team ... made up of seconded Housing NSW staff, contractors, consultants and staff from other agencies [primarily Fairfield City Council]”. The Community Building Team was responsible

for the local delivery of the engagement strategy including communication, consultation, tenant liaison (in conjunction with the Housing NSW client service team), capacity building and community development. (Coates et al., 2008, p.23)

The core members of the Community Building Team were Housing NSW staff who were “trusted in the community and staff from other agencies [Fairfield City Council] with a history and commitment to community involvement and development in the locality” (Coates et al., 2008, p.23) and then additional staff, including myself, were employed for specific ‘community building’ projects. I worked within the Community Building Team from mid-2005 until early 2007, originally employed by Fairfield City Council and then by Housing NSW, to conduct and manage a range of capacity building and community consultation projects. The 2006 IAR study, a research partnership between the University of Western Sydney and Fairfield City Council, was a critical reflection of my, and
the Community Building Team’s, attempts to ‘involve’ public housing tenants in the redevelopment of their estate by public–private partnership.

IRA differs from PAR in that it involves “multiple role identifies” (Coghlan and Holian, 2007, p.6): the researcher is both an insider of one or more particular groups or work units and an outsider by way of association to a university. Like Caroline Humphrey (2007, p.12), “I was also one of these insider–outsiders, and in the process of researching us–them, I was plunged deeper into the insider–outsider abyss” in my 2006 study. Humphrey (2007, pp.12–13) worked the hyphen and drew attention to the contradictions that were brought into focus when her consciousness of the insider–outsider duality was heightened, rather than on other moments where [she] was able to continue with [her] usual modus operandi as an insider.

In Bonnyrigg, I made a formal transition at the beginning of 2007 from employee within the Community Building Team – albeit a critical team member by late 2006, after the circulation of my final IAR report – to university researcher. What became clear in retrospect, and exemplified by the practical, ethical and political dilemmas that I will discuss in this thesis, is that I remained an insider–outsider (Humphrey, 2007) to the people I had worked with previously, including public housing tenants, Housing NSW staff and employees in the newly formed private-sector local team.

Throughout the PhD, I came to occupy multiple identities (Fine et al., 1994): I was conceived as friend, foe, colleague, advocate, activist, academic and more by different social actors and groups. Therefore, I too

tottered on the tightrope of the insider–outsider hyphen, torn between the views and values of academics and activists camped on either side of me, and overlooking some murky waters below. There is no Code of Ethics which could have offered a safety net in this situation. (Humphrey, 2007, p.16)

Fine, Denzin and Lincoln (1994) originally put forward the Working the Hyphen critique.
I spent the 4 years of my PhD research either somewhere in between PAR and IAR, or outside these participatory research paradigms altogether at other times. The deployment of a methodological tool located within a clearly defined participatory research paradigm was not achievable in this study, because of a range of compounding factors. The most significant include: my inexperience as an early career researcher; the complex stakeholder dynamics within the private-sector contractor company, and between this company, Housing NSW and tenants; the highly politicised nature of the public–private partnership; the different understandings attributed to the research; and the timing of the research processes and the metamorphic nature of the institutional site.

While researching the BLCP, I quickly found myself on tricky ground (Tuhiwai Smith, 2005, p.85), in “the spaces between research methodologies, ethical practices, institutional regulations” and working with human subjects as individuals and colleagues, and as socially constructed and contested:

The ground is tricky because it is complicated and changeable, and it can play tricks on research and researchers. (Tuhiwai Smith, 2005, p.85)

I was researching sensitive topics with cautious stakeholders, and when the research findings challenged dominant views or threatened stakeholders’ perceptions or understandings of the work in which they were engaged (Carmody, 2001, p.177), a broader research ethic was required to understand the political dilemmas that developed.

In the first instance, reflexive research ethics directed me to analyse the behind-the-scenes action by reflecting on the processes and politics of researching a sensitive topic, the negotiation of relationships and the politics of negative findings (Carmody, 2001, p.177). Second, I came to accept, and not without feeling fear, trepidation and apprehension, that qualitative research is inherently messy and needs to be adaptive in design and practice. Objective reality can never be captured and qualitative research methodologies should not be viewed as a “tool
or a strategy of validation, but an alternative to validation” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a, p.5).

Instead of validation, PAR, IAR and other qualitative research methodologies have political intent and create space to engage in ethical conversations about ourselves and others, to investigate practice through practice, and to “understand and think about research, or the ethical practice of research within systems of interconnected power” (Lincoln and Cannella, 2009, p.282). In these spaces, reflexive ethics pays attention to:

(a) new forms of imperialism as exhibited in contemporary global hypercapitalism that construct research and ethics as related to market philosophies;

(b) the multiple life positions, locations, and voices of those who have been research participants and created as the Other historically, whether indigenous people, poor women, prisoners, children, or anyone who has been “represented” through some form of research;

(c) academia itself and the ethical research perspectives and practices of those who conduct research and train others in those practices; and

(d) the contemporary legislative, policy, and enforcement environment that would impose particular behaviors \textit{a priori} on individual researchers.

(Cannella and Lincoln, 2007, p.317)

Qualitative research paradigms deploying reflexive ethics and researching ‘sensitive topics’ (Lee, 1993) – sensitive in that the research potentially presents a substantial threat to those who are involved in the research or study area – do not seek formal or informal consensus, but rather “ethical practices of care, understanding, and multiplicity of interpretive voices are assumed (Benhabib, 1992; Denzin, 1997; Reinhart, 1993)” (Lincoln and Cannella, 2009, p.278).

Lee (1993) and Carmody (2001) argue that this conception of research ethics, in the context of researching sensitive topics, is required when the research impinges on political alignments, vested interests and financial imperatives, to consider the ‘political’. Like Carmody (2001, p.177), this study paid particular attention to the vested interests of powerful institutions and considered their exercise of power in
the context of coercion or domination of comparatively less powerful neo-liberal citizens.

Managing the research relationships presented significant dilemmas throughout, and beyond, the research process. That is to say, managing the research ethics was a continual reflexive process that was fraught with ethical, practical and institutional dilemmas. Therefore, the various research methods, including critical reflexivity as an insider, participant observation, semi-structured interviews and critical discourse analysis of redevelopment project and other texts, were contingent on and shaped by a range of research relationships that were deployed sporadically and opportunistically to achieve the broad research aims. Consistency resided, however, with being embedded at the research site between 2005 and 2010, and the close involvement that I maintained with public housing tenants and public and private employees involved in the BLCP over that period.
The spatio-temporal research framework: Investigating the BLCP

This section provides the methodological tools for investigating public housing tenant participation in the BLCP and the data analysis methods deployed in this study. At the macro level, the analysis uses Cornwall’s invited space to demarcate various spaces within the BCLP relative to time. Cornwall argues that

The broader configuration of political institutions within which these [invited] spaces are located clearly impinges on what happens within them, making them sites that are constantly in transformation as well as potential arenas of transformation. (Cornwall, 2004, p.75)

A spatio-temporal research tool was developed, using a temporal timeline taken from the BLCP public–private partnership contract (NSW Department of Housing, 2007) and spatial references including the identification of tenant participation spaces and other BLCP management processes. The spatial references were theorised using Cornwall’s (Cornwall, 2004, 2008; Cornwall and Schattan P. Coelho, 2007a) spatial metaphor of invited space to focus the analysis on the dynamics of power and difference within the new participation spaces and between social entities in Bonnyrigg (Cornwall, 2004, p.75). The broad temporal reference was divided into the three contractual phases delineated by Housing NSW (Gilbertson and Shepard, 2008; NSW Department of Housing, 2007b) as outlined in Figure 6 on page 14. The three macro-level temporal references outlined in Figure 6 were represented diagrammatically as temporal phases in this study as outlined in Figure 13 below.

Figure 13 – Temporal phases: Three phases of project deployment in the BLCP
The construct of invited space framed the analysis to look outside the structures of the BLCP to consider tenant participation in the context of the political project of neo-communitarianism, and to show how each space was discursively constructed from a range of ideological or interest positions. The use of invited space also focused the analysis on the type of activities tasked to specific spaces and identification of the social subjects invited into each space:

Talking in terms of spaces for participation conveys the situated nature of participation, the bounded yet permeable arenas in which participation is invited ... It allows us to think about the ways in which particular sites come to be populated, appropriated or designed by particular actors for particular kinds of purposes; its metaphorical qualities allow attention to be paid to issues of discursive closure, ... to the absence of opportunity as well as to the dynamism of political agency in forging new possibilities for voice. By illuminating the dynamics of power, voice and agency ... (Cornwall, 2004, p.292)

Therefore, Cornwall suggests that the claims that are made about the transformational potential of one invited space – for example, the capacity for a community consultation event to change a particular project directive – are contingent on the decisions taken in other sites and spaces. The conditions of possibility within neo-liberal approaches to urban governance affect the decisions to include or exclude particular social subjects. Including or excluding social subjects are interest-laden decisions and can therefore be viewed as the exercise of power (Foucault, 1969), although these decisions are also dialectally related to the institutional structures and supra-national structures that discursively construct them. When thinking about conceptions of spaces, Lefebvre’s (1991) work can be particularly insightful and Cornwall (2004, p.292) draws on Lefebvre to suggest that

... the boundaries between such spaces are unstable: those who participate in any given space are also, necessarily, participants in others; moving between domains of association, people carry with them experiences and expectations that influence how they make use of their agency when they are invited to participate, or when they create their own spaces.
The construct of invited space is used at two levels of abstraction in this research tool. At the macro level of the BLCP, it is used to delimit the broad redevelopment processes within three phases of redevelopment project deployment. These redevelopment processes include those outlined above; framing the redevelopment project; community consultation and selection of the private partner; and private-sector management of the redevelopment project. Invited space is also deployed at the micro level of the BLCP to delimit specific ephemeral or long-term processes within these macro spaces and to investigate specific state, private-sector or independent tenant initiatives (Cornwall, 2004). These include individual public housing tenant consultation events, specific private partner selection processes, public housing tenant or other resident groups.

The deployment of invited space in this study also moves beyond the theorisation outlined by Cornwall. While Cornwall commonly uses the construct to discuss the spaces created by government departments and non-government organisations designed for formal and semi-formal participation by citizens, and Cornwall does draw attention to who is invited and not invited, little attention is paid to the construction of parallel spaces for participation by different social subjects, for different purposes, within a single project. This study extends the concept of invited space to include processes that may not have been identified as consultation or participation spaces by Housing NSW, the private sector or public housing tenants, but that represent important participation sites. The creation of parallel spaces within neo-liberal urban governance, for public housing tenants (neo-liberal citizens) and the private sector (those with capital) to engage independently with the state housing authority, were important sites for analysis, as these were structured by the conditions of possibility within this neo-liberal urban governance structure.

Exploring whether public housing tenants requested involvement in these uninvited spaces, or reflecting on their non-participation in these spaces, became important research tasks. Therefore, while some spaces have been defined as invited in the
study, they have been defined as such to draw attention to the invitees: outlining who was invited and who was not invited by focusing on who created and controlled these processes. An important research function was to show how the technocratic embedding of routines of neo-liberal governance in urban policy-making (deFilippis et al., 2006) in Australia shaped the BLCP model, community building strategies and tenant participation spaces.

The assumption that all the processes defined as invited spaces had the potential for public housing tenants to be involved or to participate at some level will be explored by showing how these invited spaces were constructed based on conditions of possibility relating to neo-communitarianism and neo-liberalism as deployed in urban governance in Australia. The relationship between “what is structurally possible and what actually happens, between structures and events” (Fairclough, 2003, p.23) is significant in this regard. Norman Fairclough (2004, p.115) argues that

[e]vents are not, in any simple or direct way, the effects of abstract social structures. Their relationship is mediated: there are intermediate entities between structures and events. I call these ‘social practices’. Social practices can be thought of as ways of controlling the selection of certain structural possibilities and the exclusion of others, as well as the retention of these selections over time ...

The analysis of the micro- and macro-level invited spaces will use Fairclough’s approach to textually orientated discourse analysis. Fairclough distinguishes between non-critical approaches, those that describe discursive practices, and critical approaches that also investigate how relations of power and ideologies shape social practices:

and the constructive effects discourse has upon social identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and belief, neither of which is apparent to discourse participants. (Fairclough, 1992, p.12)

Fairclough (1992, 2003) argues that language is a form of social practice and, as such, this analysis used three levels of language practice to structure the analysis
to investigate: the social or institutional structures; the discursive practice within these institutional sites; and the social events that followed. Therefore, the analysis will be examining social structures, social practices and social events, including contract management functions, community consultation processes and capacity building events that were developed based on a range of BLCP project texts, at different levels of language practice. Table 2 below outlines the level at which various analytical tools will be deployed as the analysis moves from structural to agency considerations.

Table 2 – Analysis of different levels of language practice: Social or institutional structures, discursive practice and social event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language level</th>
<th>Analytical focus</th>
<th>Structure/agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social or Institutional Structures</td>
<td>Master discourses and conditions of possibility (The Formation of Enunciative Modalities)</td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Practice</td>
<td>Text production, distribution and consumption (The Formation of Objects)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Events</td>
<td>Social practices relating to the texts (The Formation of Concepts)</td>
<td>Agancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (developed by author from Fairclough 1992, p.74; Fairclough, 2003, p.24; Foucault, 1969).

Each of the three analysis chapters is structured by the language levels outlined above, to show how discourse and ideology traversed different social spaces, at different levels of language practice over time. Data analysis is temporally structured in this thesis as follows:

Chapter 5 analyses Phase One of the BLCP;
Chapter 6 analyses Phase Two of the BLCP; and
Chapter 7 analyses Phase Three of the BLCP.

of critical discourse analysis and his understanding of discourse. However, Foucault has uses the term ‘discourse’ for different purposes, at different times, throughout his corpus. Foucauldian notions of discourse are therefore slippery, but these different deployments of discourse are broadly associated with three key Foucauldian projects: archaeology; genealogy; and his work on ethics, or care of the self (Foucault, 1969, 1975a, 1997b).

In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault (1969) was concerned with discursive formations or orders of discourse. For Foucault, discourses are constitutive; they construct representations of the world. Discourses can define social subjects (public housing tenants) or reinforce social relationships (landlord and tenant) (Fairclough, 1992). However, these discursive representations of the world are not disconnected from other social processes. Foucault demonstrates that discourses are interconnected; discursive representations are historically located and discursively constructed from other discourses and social practices (Fairclough, 1989, 1992, 1995, 2001, 2003, 2006; Foucault, 1969, 1975a). In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault explains that

> It would certainly be a mistake to try to discover what could have been said of madness at a particular time by interrogating the being of madness itself, its secret content, its silent, self-enclosed truth; mental illness was constituted by all that was said in all the statements that named it, divided it up, described it, explained it, traced its developments, indicated its various correlations, judged it, and possibly gave it speech by articulating, in its name, discourses that were to be taken as its own. (Foucault, 1969, p.35)

In this study, the term ‘discourse’ is used as an abstract noun to refer to the master discourses that have shaped public housing estate redevelopment projects and tenant participation processes. These include the master discourses of partnership or neo-liberalism that have been deployed in Australia at the level of social and institutional structures. These discourses are brought together, shaped by conditions of possibility, to form the discursive constructions of social problems and their remedies, such as redevelopment of public housing estates by public–private partnerships.
This deployment of discourse can also focus attention on the intertextuality of discursive constructions of social life (Fairclough, 2003; Foucault, 1969) at the level of discursive strategies – how languages, visual images, conversations, texts and other social practices are brought together, but shaped by master discourses and other conditions of possibility, to represent a particular aspect of the world:

Discourses can therefore be seen as not just ways of representing with a degree of commonality and stability, but such ways of representing where they constitute nodal points in the dialectical relationship between language and other elements of the social. (Fairclough, 2003, p.126)

At the level of discursive strategies, the analytical focus moves to discursive formations to determine which languages, visual images, conversations, texts are brought together, and as a consequence which are omitted, to create discursive representations of a social reality. Discursive strategies structure the processes by which a text is produced, the method and style of distribution, and by whom and how the text was consumed. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault (1969) suggests that discursive formations have rules, discursive regularities within institutions and other social places that construct ‘objects’ at specific moments in time:

By ‘objects’ Foucault means objects of knowledge, the entities which particular disciplines or sciences recognise within their fields of interest, and which are targets for investigation. (Fairclough, 1992, p.41)

However, Foucault (1969, p.44) was using the formation of objects with more abstraction within his archaeology of knowledge than will be used in this study. Foucault’s project was an historical pursuit to track the formation of objects and the truth claims attributed to objects such as madness throughout history. However, this study is neither a Foucauldian *archaeological* (1969) nor *genealogical* (1975a) endeavour. Instead, like Fairclough (1992, p.41), in this study the formation of objects has been expanded to include all “entities recognised in ordinary life”, to draw attention to more tangible redevelopment processes and social subject descriptions. These include the discursive construction of various
social subjects, or the formation of tenant participation as an object of knowledge, and to which claims of truth have be attributed.

Whereas the enunciative modalities focus attention on the discursive ‘rules’ within institutions and other social spaces that shape discourses at specific moments in time, the types of discursive activity are used by social subjects to describe, regulate or teach, but are shaped by the institutional or social site. Enunciative modalities are constrained by, and interrelated with, other master discourses, discursive activities and texts. Foucault (1969, p.55) outlined enunciative modalities by stating:

Who, among the totality of speaking individuals, is accorded the right to use this sort of language (langage)? What is the status of the individuals who – alone – have the right, sanctioned by law or tradition, juridical defined or spontaneously accepted, to proffer such a discourse? (Foucault, 1969, p.55)

Further, Foucault (1969, p.62) also provides, with The Formation of Concepts, “the basis for systematic investigation of relations within and between texts and types of discourse” (Fairclough, 1992, p.47). As Fairclough (1992, p.47) shows, the social identity of the ‘speaker’63 – for example, a state housing authority employee, a private-sector employee or a public housing tenant – is likely to have a significant influence on how members of these social groups attribute meaning to various redevelopment processes and functions:

The associated fields is also made up of all the formulations to which the statement refers (implicitly or not), either by repeating them, modifying them, or adapting them, or by opposing them, or by commenting on them; there can be no statement that in one way or another does not reactualise others (ritual elements in a narrative; previously accepted propositions in a demonstration; conventional sentences in a conversation). (Foucault, 1969, p.98)

63 In Foucault’s annual lecture at the Collège de France in 1981, while outlining his care of the self thesis, he put forward “a body of work defining a way of being, a standpoint, forms of reflection, and practices which make it an extremely important phenomenon not just in the history of representations, notions, or theories, but in the history of subjectivity itself, or if you like, in the history of practices of subjectivity” (Gros, 2001, p.11).
Analysis of texts: Discourse analysis hierarchy within chapters

This section outlines the discourse analysis hierarchy and chapter structure that is consistent across the three data analysis chapters. The data analysis chapters that follow, Chapters 5–7, have identical section headings that correlate with specific data analysis tasks. Then the analysis within each of these sections – institutional structures, discursive practice and social events – is undertaken using the approach to power/knowledge and critical discourse analysis outlined above (Fairclough, 1992; 2003, p.26). Therefore, the analytical framework is also largely positioned within a Foucauldian (1969) epistemology and understanding of language and discourse.

Fairclough (1992; 2003, p.26) outlines three dialectically related focal points within his approach to the analysis of a discursive practice. However, as his work progressed from the early 1990s to mid-2000, he has articulated these focal points with slight variations. In 1992, Fairclough provided the following three-dimensional conception of discourse that attempted

to bring together three analytical traditions ... the tradition of close textual and linguistic analysis, the macrosociological tradition of analysing social practice in relation to social structures, and the interpretivist or macrosociological tradition of seeing social practice as something which people actively produce. (Fairclough, 1992, p.72)

Fairclough represented this diagrammatically as shown in Figure 14 overleaf. By 2003, Fairclough (2003, p.26) had developed this framework into a more coherent analytical tool specifically focused on analysing “discourse as an element of social practice”. In this analytical tool, discourse figures in three main ways in social practice: Genres (ways of acting); Discourse (ways of representing); Styles (ways of being).
In this study, the analysis draws on both Fairclough’s earlier and later articulations of the analysis of discursive practice and subsequently uses *genres*, *discourse* (as used here by Fairclough) and *styles* to draw attention to: the way in which the text was constructed and presented; the way in which the text was constructed by and constructs the physical and social world; and the way in which the text identifies and positions social subjects. In this study, these are conceptualised as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3 – Analysis of discursive practice: Genres, discourse and styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genres</th>
<th>Ways of acting</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>The way information is presented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse</strong></td>
<td>Ways of representing</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Representing relationships between social entities or features of a social entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Styles</strong></td>
<td>Ways of being</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Subjectivity – how social subjects’ identity shapes how they identify, classify or make judgements about social subjects or social events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (developed from Fairclough, 2003, pp.26–27; Foucault, 1969).
Genres, as forms of social interaction, constitute a particular sort of social relations. The analysis uses this understanding of genre, in the context of social relations, to analyse how different genres were been brought together in Bonnyrigg to shape social events and interaction at specific moments in time (Fairclough, 2003, p.65). For example, any number of genres would have been brought together to create a one-day community consultation event in Bonnyrigg. These could include, at least, the genres of: public administration (public housing and public participation); private-sector (market) rationalities; media and communication; event management; and intercultural communication.

Therefore, the construction of this social event would draw on many texts, including: Housing NSW policy documents, academic discourses of participation and intercultural dialogue, the public–private partnership contractual negotiations occurring in Bonnyrigg, media coverage of other public housing redevelopment projects, and the interaction between Housing NSW and social housing tenants in other forums.

Important considerations regarding the analysis of genres, within specific social events, in this study include:

(a) analysis of ‘genre chains’
(b) analysis of genre mixtures in a particular text
(c) analysis of individual genres in a particular text

(Fairclough, 2003, p.66)

Fairclough (2003, p.159) defines styles as ‘ways of being’:

Styles are the discoursal aspects of ways of being, identities. Who you are is partly a matter of how you speak, how you write, as well as a matter of embodiment – how you look, how you hold yourself, how you move, and so forth. Styles are linked to identification – using the normalisation rather than the noun ‘identities’ emphasizes the process of identifying how people identify themselves and are identified by others. (Fairclough, 2003, p.159)
CHAPTER 4

The concept of styles brings issues of structure and agency back into focus. Certainly, in Bonnyrigg, there are particular ‘ways of being’ that structure, to a degree, the social subjects. These could be the work roles associated with being an employee of Housing NSW or an employee of the private-sector contractor. The housing tenure relationship that tenants have entered into with the state housing authority is partly predisposing in this regard. This housing tenure ‘status’ constitutes a particular social identity. Further, in Bonnyrigg, these structural issues need to be considered in the context of the agency and subjectivity of individuals as citizen employees of the state or private sector, or as neo-liberal citizen tenants (Fairclough, 2003, p.225).

Therefore, these three analytical points are dialectically related and it makes better sense to conceptualise these three analytical distinctions dialectically (Fairclough, 2003). This can be investigated by seeking to understand: how representations are enacted in genres; how representations are inculcated in styles; and how actions and identities are represented in texts (Fairclough, 2003, p.29).

Therefore, while in this study the analysis (chapter sections) is demarcated by the three dialectically related levels of language practice outlined in Table 2 on page 115 – social and institutional sites, discursive practice and social events –, the analysis will also show how each of the three analytical distinctions outlined in Table 3 on page 120 – genres, discourses and styles – are dialectically related throughout the data analysis chapters.

To achieve this, the data analysis chapters will depart from a strictly Faircloughian analytical framework. Instead, each data analysis chapter will build from the institutional structures that created the conditions of possibility that structured the creation of texts, towards the social events that these texts produced. Each data analysis chapter is structured as shown in Figure 15 overleaf.
Figure 15 – Analytical hierarchy for data analysis chapters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>An overview of the data for analysis, including the BLCP phase.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social and Institutional Structures</td>
<td>A largely descriptive presentation of the political landscape, organisation or other structural factors that may have created certain conditions of possibility that influenced the creation of texts. The analytical focus is on master discourses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive Practice</td>
<td>Presents the significant texts relevant to the invited space. An analytical process focused on genres, ways of acting, by the various social entities. This section also concludes with an analysis of the representations (discourses) inherent in the texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Event</td>
<td>Describes the social events that were constructed from the texts and various subject positions. The analytical focus is on the subjectivity and agency of social subjects and seeks to understand the way in which identity shapes how various social subjects identify, classify or make judgements about social subjects or social events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To track the invited spaces temporally, each chapter begins by outlining the invited spaces within a temporal frame. This is presented diagrammatically as a macro-level spatio-temporal representation of the BLCP timeline with the various invited spaces superimposed. In each subsequent data analysis chapter, the
previous invited spaces are retained while the new spaces are added. Throughout
the study, a diagrammatic representation of the various invited spaces, as well as
notes about which social subjects were invited into each space at specific points in
time, will be developed. Further, a more detailed micro-level spatio-temporal
representation of the BLCP timeline and invited spaces is provide for each phase
of the BLCP at the beginning of the “Social Event” section of each data analysis
chapter.

**Identifying texts for analysis: Identifying the corpus of discursive samples**

Following Foucault and Fairclough, texts are viewed as ‘elements of social events’;
texts can shape our understanding of social subjects, social events and social
processes. Under this view, our knowledge about others and ourselves is shaped
by the production, distribution, consumption, regulation and rejection of texts.
Texts shape our ‘beliefs, attitudes, values, actions and social relations’ (Fairclough,
2003, p.8).

The corpus of texts selected in this study is “a series of discourse samples which
can give adequate information about the ‘archive’” (Grant et al., 2004, p.227), the
broader collection of possible texts. In selecting the corpus, “Fairclough (1992,
p.230) advocates a focus on ‘moments of crisis’ that problematise struggle (Grant
et al., 2004, p.227):

> Such moments of crisis make visible aspects of practices which might
> normally be naturalised,\(^64\) and therefore difficult to notice; but they also show
> change in process, the actual ways in which people deal with the
> problematisation of practices. (Fairclough, 1992, p.230)

The analysis uses specific ‘moments of crisis’ to problematise both the practice
and reported outcomes of participation in Bonnyrigg. Some of the ‘moments of

---

\(^64\) *Naturalised* is used here in a similar way to the deployment of *normalised* in Chapter 3 when discussing
*normalised* neo-liberal practices.
crisis’ relate to long-term project initiatives such as the Independent Tenant Advocate Service, while other moments of crisis occur within otherwise normalised processes of neo-liberalism. Others still are related to ephemeral processes, including specific community consultation events. In this case, the organisations that were accorded the right to define the scope of these services or events through legal right, or the construction and reconstruction of funding agreements at specific moments in time, were significant.

Therefore, the analysis draws on a range of texts, including Annual Reports from the community organisations, Housing NSW reports, public submission texts to the local government authority, interview transcripts and observation notes, to problematise important tenant initiatives in order to shed more light on the dynamics of power in projects contracted out to the private sector. One way in which the concept of *enunciated modalities* is put to work in this study is by drawing attention to the process of mediation:

Mediation according to Silverstone (1999) involves the ‘movement of meaning’ – from one social practice to another, from one event to another, from one text to another. (Fairclough, 2003, p.30)

In this study, the term ‘texts’ is used in a very broad sense to mean any form of printed material, recorded information, transcription or visual image (Fairclough, 2003, p.3). Texts are divided into four broad categories for analysis throughout this study: (1) written and printed documents; (2) visual images; (3) interview transcripts; and (4) research diary entries. These texts make up the ‘archive of statements’ drawn on in this thesis.

The term ‘archive’ is used here in terms of Foucault’s archaeology works to refer to “the general system of the formation and transformation of statements” (Foucault, 1969, p.146) that exist at a given moment in time (Smart, 2004, p.48). Therefore, the “archive should be seen as the set of discursive mechanisms which limit what can be said, in what form and what is counted as worth knowing and remembering” (Mills, 1997, pp.56–57). The archive of texts produced in
Bonnyrigg were authored by a wide range of social entities, including Housing NSW, the private-sector contractor and subcontractors, public housing tenants, the media, general members of the public and myself, in a diverse range of formats. These include the following.

**Written and printed texts:**
- Public–private partnership contract documents produced by Housing NSW
- Public and tenant meeting minutes recorded by tenants, Housing NSW and the private partner
- Community newsletters produced by Housing NSW and the private partner
- Consultation reports produced by Housing NSW, the private partner and private consultants
- Social impact assessments and other redevelopment reports produced by private consultants
- Public and public authority submissions to Fairfield City Council
- Research publications commissioned by Housing NSW
- Independent research project documents, including my Honours research
- Research reports from this action research project between the private partner and university

**Visual images:**
- Web pages produced by Housing NSW and the private partner
- Promotional and advertisement material produced by the private partner
- Photographs of redevelopment processes produced by Housing NSW and the private partner
- Maps and sales brochures for the BLCP
Semi-structured interviews:

- Interview transcripts from semi-structured interviews conducted with private partner staff, social housing tenants and private consultants involved in the redevelopment project.

Research diary entries and reports:

- Research notes describing observations from meetings, consultations and tenant projects.
- Research notes describing observations of ‘transition’ (associated with commercial close of the public–private partnership) between Housing NSW and the private partner.
- Research notes describing my coordination role for the Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group, conducted as part of the action research process.
- Reports commissioned by Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council.

A note about text selection. As I had access to confidential texts between 2005 and 2010, I deployed reflexive ethics to determine text selection. As such, I have not cited confidential texts and have sought to use only publicly available texts for textual analysis. However, I do critically reflect on my role as an insider–outsider in this study and therefore refer to some personal communication, research negotiations, research functions and other processes and texts where deemed important to critical self-reflection.

Finally, this marks the end of Part I of this thesis, in which the research question, theoretical framework and research tools have been put forward. From this point, Part II of the thesis moves on to the specificities of the BLCP and data analysis within the three data analysis chapters. Following this spatio-temporal analysis of the BLCP, Part III of the thesis, provided in Chapter 8, draws together the broad theorising and data analysis within Parts I and II, to highlight the key contributions of this study related to citizenship, neo-liberalism and public housing tenants.
Part II

Part II provides a spatio-temporal analysis of the first 5 years of the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project. As previously described, each of the following three data analysis chapters deals with a temporal phase of the project: Phases 1, 2 and 3. Within this temporal structure, the analysis is then organised by spatial sites of language practice. Therefore, each chapter has identical headings: Social and Institutional Structure; Discursive Practice; and Social Event. The structure is intended to facilitate comparison between the various spatial and temporal considerations in the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project. This format and structure allows for multiple readings of the data presented in this study, the two most important of which are a temporal reading and a spatial reading. The data analysis has been presented in this thesis temporally, or as the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project progressed chronologically, because the reader intuitively thinks about project progression in this way. However, it is also possible and perhaps productive to engage in a spatial reading of the data. This would entail, for example, reading the Social and Institutional Structure sections of Chapters 5–7, and repeating this process with the Discursive Practice sections and then the Social Event sections (see Appendix 6 – Data analysis matrix). This spatial reading will be made explicit in the conclusion in Part III.
CHAPTER 5 – Phase 1: The Discursive Framing of the BLCP by Housing NSW

At the macro level, the spatio-temporal analysis shows one invited space in Phase 1 of the BLCP. This invited space will be defined as Framing the redevelopment project in this study. A diagrammatic representation of the macro-level invited space for Phase 1 is provided in Figure 16 overleaf.

This chapter focuses specifically on this invited space to show how Housing NSW discursively constructed the BLCP within the supra-national discourses of neoliberalism and neo-communitarian conceptions of public housing. The chapter concludes with a discussion focused on the announcement and reception of the BLCP from a number of different subject positions. These include the reaction of public housing tenants and narratives in the media, and the responses by Housing NSW.

Invited Space 1: Framing the Redevelopment Project

Temporal location: Prior to and concluding in December 2004

Description: ‘Framing the Redevelopment Project’ focused on the period leading up to the announcement of the BLCP public–private partnership. In this space, Housing NSW set many of the infrastructure and social objectives of the redevelopment project.
Figure 16 - BLCP Phase 1: Macro-level timeline with invited space

INVITED SPACE 1
Framing the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project

BLCP Announcement

PPP Contract Commencement
Social and institutional structures: The political landscape at BLCP announcement

Describing the social and institutional site in Phase 1 of the BLCP is largely a descriptive process, provided to broadly locate the political landscape at BLCP announcement. In 2004, Housing NSW (2005f) provided housing assistance in various forms to over 420,000 people in NSW. In the same year, under the centre-right Howard government then in its third term, an acute social interventionism was established around a range of politically sensitive issues in Australia, including immigration and welfare reform.

This deeply authoritarian agenda had been developing for some time and in the lead-up to the federal election in 2001, the Howard government claimed that sea-faring asylum seekers en route to Australia, in a vessel north of Perth, had thrown children overboard as a suggested manoeuvre to gain passage to Australia. In what would become an alarming piece of wedge politics, the Howard government managed to politicise Australia’s approach to immigration policy and the children overboard affair to secure re-election to office. However, it should noted that a Senate inquiry (Senate Select Committee on the Scrafton Evidence, 2004, pp.49–50) would later cast serious doubt on the claims relating to the children overboard affair, and other social commentators would accuse the Howard government of politically misleading the Australian public by “exploit[ing] voters' fears of a wave of illegal immigrants by demonising asylum-seekers” (Le Cheminant and Parrish, 2010, p.33).

Despite the legalities and political manoeuvring, the children overboard affair led to the Pacific Solution, supported by both the centre-left and centre-right of the political spectrum. By 2004, the Pacific Solution represented a punitive immigration policy for intercepting sea-faring asylum seekers while at sea and

---

65 A wedge issue is a divisive or controversial social or political issue that is used politically in an attempt to weaken the unity of political constituency. The discursive exposition of wedge issues gives rise to wedge politics.
processing their claims to asylum in various countries in the Pacific, the legalities of which have been widely disputed (see Magner, 2004).

In a similar vein in the 2005–2006 Federal Budget, and modelled on the US Workfare (Bertram, 2004) and British New Deal (Millar, 2003) welfare-to-work programs, the Howard government introduced the Welfare to Work policy reform package. Like its US and UK counterparts, and in the of face a mounting body of literature calling the ideological footings of this approach into question (see Arthurson and Jacobs, 2004; Levitas, 1998), the Howard government’s welfare reforms had expressed aims of reducing ‘welfare dependency’ by moving the most disadvantaged within society into employment, as highlighted below:

Furthers welfare reform

This Budget introduces a comprehensive reform of the welfare system for working age Australians. In doing so, it tackles the twin goals of lifting workforce participation and reducing welfare dependency. (Commonwealth Government, 2005, p.1)

Levitas’ (1998) analysis of social exclusion, a dominate discourse associated with the Welfare to Work programs that concentrated on issues of (un)employment, poverty and welfare provision in the late 1990s in the UK, shows how the social integrationist and moral underclass discourses were central to policy formation (see Table 5 on page 157).

In Australia, different discourses of social exclusion also influenced, either directly or indirectly through policy transfer from the UK and the USA, welfare reform in Australia. The Howard government’s welfare reforms were targeted on reconfiguring welfare provision to focus on employment by making moral claims about welfare dependency as shown above. However, the welfare reforms also had strong neo-communitarian themes in 2000, built on moral underclass and social integrationist appraisals of community building, exemplified by the following statements in the Final Report of the Reference Group on Welfare Reform (2000):
Building community capacity is a term ... used to describe the process of accumulation of human, financial and social capital within disadvantaged communities ... social partners can work together to discharge their mutual obligations by helping strengthen communities and thereby increase opportunities for social and economic participation ... governments, business, not-for-profit organisations and communities work together to maximise opportunities for economic and social participation by individuals (2000, p.45) ...

Under this broad view of mutual obligations there should be a recognition that government, business, communities and individuals are held together by a web of mutual expectations which, in some cases, should be made requirements (2000, p.32) ... Governments work together to identify ways to mitigate the negative financial effects of paid work on public housing tenants, with the aim of improving incentives for people in public housing to take-up paid work. (2000, p.31)

This approach to welfare reform was soon distilled into a range of State and Territory policies throughout Australia. In NSW, the State government’s public housing reforms, amply named Reshaping Public Housing (NSW Government, 2005d), shows that the State’s welfare reforms were build on a moral underclass and social integrationist appraisal of community building. In keeping with the social integrationist discourse, the reforms were focused on ‘renewing communities’ by encouraging public housing tenants to seek employment to facilitate a transition into alternative tenure arrangements.

In 2005, the State government was piloting “neighbourhood-based technology centres in four public housing estates in Sydney, providing access to internet facilities, community on-line learning and assistance to seek employment and training” (NSW Government, 2005d, p.5). This approach was coupled with an end to “public housing for life” (NSW Government, 2005d, p.5) by introducing three types of rental leases: short-term (up to 2 years); medium (2–10 years); and long-term (10 years). Public housing was reimagined as a short-term arrangement to assist those ‘of strongest need’, in their pursuit to gain employment, to facilitate their search for alternative housing.
However, the NSW Government (2005d, p.6) defined those ‘of strongest need’ as “the frail elderly (over 80 years) and aged pensioners, people with a disability, families with children, young people under 20 without family support, homeless people; and unemployed and low waged adults”, a group with many structural and individual barriers to employment. In NSW, this neo-communitarian and social integrationist approach to community building was not confined to the cities; the NSW Department of State and Regional Development’s Main Street Program also had these discursive features in 2000:

The NSW Department of State and Regional Development aims to revitalise and promote rural centres throughout the state. It helps communities to develop their vision for the future and implement a practical community plan. An important part of the program is the skilling of local people to make decisions about their community’s economic future. Community planning projects include an initial community workshop, a business retention and expansion survey, the development of an economic profile, strategic planning workshop and specialist workshops for local businesses. (Reference Group on Welfare Reform, 2000, p.47)

Both the Reshaping Public Housing and Main Street Programs sidelined broader structural issues by positioning the ‘community’ as both pathology and the vehicle through which a solution could be implemented. The frail elderly, people with disabilities, homeless people, the regional poor, as well as unemployed and low-waged earning adults became the objects of the intervention (Fairclough, 1992; Foucault, 1969), to which a range of State and Federal Departments were afforded the right to discursively construct, draw borders around and assign, collective titles and realities.

For example, the NSW State Government’s Reshaping Public Housing Plan discursively constructed some public housing tenants and estates as ‘anti-social’ by “promoting responsibility ... to reduce anti-social behaviour and roll-out the use of acceptable behaviour agreements across NSW”. Under this plan, all public housing tenants were also asked to “take responsibility for their water usage charges” and encouraged to participate in a range of skills training and
employment programs connected to “Community Contracts and employment clauses in maintenance contracts” (NSW Government, 2005d, p.7).

However, in 2006, the Tenants’ Union of NSW (Martin, 2006), an interest group that often advocates on behalf of public housing tenants, investigated the cumulative effects of the Welfare to Work and Reshaping Public Housing reforms using two hypothetical public housing tenants, a single parent with two children and a single person with a disability. The report (Martin, 2006) concluded that the reforms could result in disincentives for public housing tenants to seek employment or could move these tenants into low-paid employment with little security.

Similar issues associated with Welfare to Work programs were explored in greater depth in a range of studies throughout the 1990s (see Burke and Wulff, 1993; Keating and Lambert, 1998; Millar et al., 1997). However, Hulse and Randolph’s 2004 study concluded that public housing tenants in Australia, in the year of BLCP announcement:

face a considerable unemployment trap which means that it is difficult to move into work, and a poverty trap in terms of getting ahead financially when in work in the context of the low wages typically earned by this group (Hulse and Randolph, 2004, p.ii) ...

The benefits of public tenancy include security of tenure, affordable rents, a less financially driven landlord and, often a more settled, if probably more disadvantaged, community. The findings reported here indicate that public renters value these benefits and clearly make decisions in the light of how they can be retained when getting a job. (Hulse and Randolph, 2004, p.53)

Further, in 2004 community development in NSW was conceived as a moral space (Marinetto, 2003; Meredyth et al., 2004) through which a range of new policy mechanisms could be deployed – the demarcation of a new sector of governance (Marinetto, 2003, p.109), a form of government whereby the capabilities and resources of communities were drawn into policy programs that placed the onus on communities to be responsible for their own self-help; or as
Rose (1996, p.328) argues, government through community via a “range of rationalities and techniques that seek to govern without governing society”.

In this moral space, citizens would be governed through the regulated choices made by the various Federal and State government policy reforms centered on their responsibility to ‘community’ and facilitated through new modes of neighbourhood participation, empowerment programs and employment initiatives (Rose, 1996, p.335). These were discursively constructed as community engagement or community renewal, and anticipated the reactivation of self-motivated, responsible and self-reliant citizens (Rose, 1996, p.335) – the neo-liberal citizen.

Further, these shifts in social governance and policy were paralleled with the shift in urban governance outlined in Chapter 3: the shift to neo-liberal urban governance. The Sydney Metropolitan Strategy (NSW Government, 2005a,c) is perhaps the best example of the State’s commitment to the market for the provision of affordable housing combined with a focus on ‘local communities’ as the site and vehicle for social change. In 2005, the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy (NSW Government, 2005a) provided a broad framework for sub-regional planning over 25 years and was guided by seven broad areas of focus, each associated with a strategic aim (these aims are summarised in Appendix 5).

In terms of urban governance, the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy (NSW Government, 2005b, pp.74–76; 2005c) is significant to the BLCP on three points:

(1) a commitment to the private sector for urban redevelopment financing;
(2) a commitment to the private sector for the management of urban renewal projects; and
(3) a focus on providing employment opportunities for ‘disadvantaged communities’.
The NSW Government aimed to develop employment opportunities for public housing tenants through major infrastructure projects being managed by the private sector in NSW, as suggested below:

Increasing employment and workforce participation is an important component of reducing the significant economic disadvantage facing vulnerable groups ... Action is required to ensure that, wherever possible, major development projects include skills training for local people in the field ... The Department of Housing [Housing NSW] has been working with the developers [private-sector property developers] to develop specific strategies to engage local social housing tenants ... (NSW Government, 2005b, p.74).

However, the commitment to employment outlined above was a minor focus in the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy. The NSW Government’s core focus was to further orientate major infrastructure project provision and management in Sydney towards the market and the private sector, as outlined below:

The Metropolitan Strategy will inform infrastructure investment priorities in the State Infrastructure Strategy and will create certainty for private investment (NSW Government, 2005c, p.250) ... Involving the Office of Infrastructure Management (NSW Treasury) in the packaging of projects for partnership with the private sector for financing and project delivery. (NSW Government, 2005c, p.264)

Private-venture projects have a long history in NSW, extending back over two decades. In 2004, prior to the announcement of the BLCP, the NSW Government was engaged in a range of private-sector venture projects across Sydney. Following the suggested success of the Sydney Harbor Tunnel66 and M4 Western Motorway67 projects of the 1990s, over the next decade a range of
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66 The Sydney Harbour Tunnel is a motor vehicle road tunnel in Sydney. The Harbour Tunnel was a ‘partnership’ between the NSW State Government and private investors, undertaken by contract. Transfield Pty Limited and Kumagai Gumi formed a joint venture company to construct the tunnel on a 30-year lease, and will be handed back to the NSW State Government in August 2022 (Grimsey and Lewis, 2002).

67 The M4 Motorway is a motor vehicle road connecting Sydney to the western suburbs of Sydney. In 1989, the final section of the motorway was contracted out by the NSW State Government as a Build–Own–Operate–Transfer project to a private-sector company, StateWide Roads. The private company collected tolls on the motorway until the end of the contract term in February 2010 (Czerwinski and Geddes, 2010).
private-venture road and rail projects were rolled out across the city (Czerwinski and Geddes, 2010; Grimsey and Lewis, 2002).

In 2000 the Airport Link project, a public–private partnership rail project linking the city centre to the airport, was opened to coincide with the Sydney Olympics. Under this public–private partnership contract, the centre-right government paid for the construction of the rail line, while the private company, Airport Link Pty Ltd, funded five new stations. The contract proposed that the private company would operate four of the new rail stations, including the two airport stations, for 30 years, collecting a Station Access Fee as part of the financing model (State Rail Authority of New South Wales, 2000).

Then in 2002, a consortium company was selected to manage the Cross City Tunnel public–private partnership project and construction was under way by 2003 (Phibbs, 2008). By mid-2004, work had also begun on the Lane Cove Tunnel project, a private-sector venture project managed by Connector Motorways Pty Ltd, linking a series of motorways in Sydney’s north. At one level, these projects were not new. Governments have a long history, spanning centuries according to some (Farrar, 2007), of using the private sector to provide infrastructure and services, while competitive bidding for government contracts has been around for decades (English, 2006; Malone, 2005; Watson, 2006; Wettenhall, 2003).

What changed in the early 2000s in Australia was the rhetoric that surrounded these private-sector venture projects, exemplified by the rise of ‘partnership’ as a master discourse. Wettenhall’s (2003) review of public–private partnerships at this time captures the political landscape around the time of BLCP announcement:

The term partnership is now a dominant slogan in the rhetoric of public sector reform, arguably capturing that status from privatisation which held similar dominance through the 1980s and 1990s. As privatisation captured the

---

68 Farrar (2007) argues that the private financing of public infrastructure can be traced back to the ancient Athenians and the fourth century BCE.
minds of so many would-be reformers over those decades and produced its own huge literature, so, it would seem, partnership – especially in the form of public–private partnership (or PPP) – is about to do the same. (Wettenhall, 2003, p.77)

The public–private partnerships being explored in Australia at this time not only sought private-sector services, but also private-sector finance. However, there has been much debate about whether these projects actually ‘take the financial pressure off the government’ or if they simply realign payment structures (Hodge, 2006; Quiggin, 2006). The rhetoric of ‘partnership’ serves to mask the governance structures and many of these projects retained the features of previous privatisation initiatives.

Most importantly, under this neo-liberal rationality of governance, the state moved to govern at a distance through these privatisation initiatives, but also negotiated new financing arrangements through these public–private partnership contracts. Hodge (2006, p.320) argues that these new financing arrangements often replaced a one-off capital sum payment with a complex set of recurrent payments by the state to the private sector contractors, guided by public–private partnership contracts (for a discussion on fiscal arrangements, see Hodge, 2006; Newberry and Pallot, 2003; Noble, 2006).

While English and Guthrie’s (2003) review of new public management trends in Australia demonstrated that a range of private financing and delivery models – that is, ‘build, own and operate’ (BOO), ‘build, own, operate and transfer (BOOT) and the United Kingdom’s ‘private finance initiative’ (PFI) – were discursively reconstructed in policy documents as public–private partnerships from 2000 (English, 2006).

Hodge and Greve (2007) counter this conflation of various financial and political strategies, under the discourse of partnership, by highlighting two important and spatially significant elements to the discursive construction of public–private partnerships. The first relates to the institutional arrangement or governance tool
and the second focuses on public–private partnerships as a discursive term (Hodge and Greve, 2007, p.546), and the analysis returns to these two points, as discursive strategies, below. However, English (2006, p.254) provides a third consideration, the ‘purpose’ of public–private partnerships in Australia in the early 2000s:

Initially, there was debate about the nature and purpose of PPPs. Was their primary purpose to avoid public debt, or to achieve VFM [value for money] for the state? Since 2000, as articulated in PPP steering mechanisms, the official rationale underlying their use has been that they deliver VFM; ostensibly, their accounting treatment is not important. (English, 2006, p.254)

To understand the purpose of the BLCP, it is important to locate Housing NSW and the BLCP within this broader political landscape. The analysis will now show how the key features of the BLCP were formulated and discursively constructed by Housing NSW by location of the institution within the supra-national and political space outlined above.

**Mediation between the social and institutional sites: Locating Housing NSW within the broader political landscape**

What separated the Bonnyrigg public–private partnership from almost all the other public–private partnerships in Australia in 2004 was the ‘social purpose’ attached to the project aims. Unlike other ‘social’ public–private partnerships deployed in Australia, which provided social infrastructure such as hospitals, schools and prisons (Argy et al., 1999; Jefferies and McGeorge, 2009), the BLCP included a suite of social deliverables linked to ‘community building’ as outlined below:

**3.6 Key Outcomes**

The Department is interested in housing outcomes and is therefore focused on the functional requirements of its tenants ... The tenant and community outcomes that the Department is seeking to achieve are as follows:
Create a community that facilitates social interaction and neighbourhood support...

Actively promote social cohesion, the development of social networks and social interaction in the Estate...

Significantly improve the physical and social environment in the Estate and ensure a sustainable community...

(NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.11)

The key outcome of ‘building community’ has its discursive roots in a range of texts and social events both within Australia and internationally, and will be explored further in the discursive framing of the BLCP below. Before moving to that analysis, the final task in this section is to outline the institutional site that was accorded the right to discursively construct the BLCP; to define the objects of the intervention, to outline the financial mechanisms for project implementation, and to whom the role of justifying the BLCP was tasked (Foucault, 1969, p.56).

Housing NSW was accorded this right within the bureaucratic structures of the Australian governance system, although not without limitation. Foucault argues, discussing the formation of enunciative modalities in relation to the institutional site of medicine, that

The status of doctor involves criteria of competence and knowledge; institutions, systems, pedagogic norms; legal conditions that give the right – through not without laying down certain limitations – to practice and to extend one’s knowledge ... Medical statements cannot come from anybody; their value, efficacy, even their therapeutic powers, and, generally speaking, their existence as medical statements cannot be dissociated from the statutorily defined person who has the right to make them ... (Foucault, 1969, pp.55–56)

The conditions of possibility – what it was possible for Housing NSW staff developing the BLCP to place value on, to define, to speak of, or dismiss – were shaped by supra-national discourses of redevelopment and the institutional site within which they operated. The BLCP texts would, in one way or another, come to reactualise other texts (Foucault, 1972, p.98) and it was Housing NSW that was
afforded the right to make claims, define *objects* and identify social pathology, not
public housing tenants and others.

Housing NSW’s Annual Reports provide an insight into the discursive rules
within Housing NSW; the rules that allowed certain master discourses and texts
to be brought together, while excluding others, at the time of BLCP project
announcement. In the 2004–2005 Annual Report (Housing NSW, 2005c), the
Minister for Housing, Cherie Burton, identified four objectives that Housing
NSW was seeking to fulfil under the Reshaping Public Housing reforms:

“Objective 1 – Provide flexible and sustainable social housing responses for
clients” (Housing NSW, 2005a, p.1), was tied into the Reshaping Public Housing
reforms and focused on placing limits on public housing tenure combined with
the increasing targeting of people on low incomes, persons at risk of homelessness,
persons experiencing mental illness, and the frail and elderly. There were also
clear aims to involve external agencies and community services in the
managements of Housing NSW’s clients, with a focus on ‘supporting
communities’. Housing NSW (2005a, p.1), suggested that

> Our highest priorities are to target assistance to those with the greatest needs
> and to work with other agencies to support individuals and communities.

“Objective 2 – Work more effectively with the private market, local government
and the non-government sector to provide housing solutions in NSW” (Housing
NSW, 2005b, p.1), outlined Housing NSW’s commitment to the market and
private sector for the provision of housing ‘options’ for current, but also eligible
public housing tenants. This included financial mechanisms, including RentStart
(Housing NSW, 2010), that redirected eligible public housing tenants applying for
housing into the private rental market by way of financial assistance to meet
rental bonds, advance rental payments and other requirements necessitated by
the private rental market. However, it should be noted that there is a growing
body of literature suggesting that the private rental market in Sydney is now
becoming the site of a new concentration of urban poor (Randolph and Holloway, 2005a,b; Yates and Wulff, 1999).

This objective also outlined Housing NSW’s commitment to the private and non-government sectors for “exploring ways of redeveloping and regenerating major housing estates through public–private partnerships” (Housing NSW, 2005b, p.1). The 2004–2005 Annual Report lists the BLCP as a case in point and what will become “the largest social housing PPP in Australia” (Housing NSW, 2005b, p.4).

Partnership was also a dominant theme in Objective 2, with Housing NSW seeking to engage in ‘partnerships’ with local government and the non-government sector in the pursuit of ‘community regeneration’. The move to the private and non-government sectors under the discourse of community regeneration was further explicated in Objective 3, with the stated aim to “Strengthen local housing communities to help address social and economic disadvantage” (Housing NSW, 2005b, p.5). Objective 3:

covers the Department’s initiatives to build social housing communities, enhance tenant employment and training opportunities and increase their participation in decisions affecting their lives. (Housing NSW, 2005c, p.1)

Under this new approach, not-for-profit organizations, including religious groups and housing associations, local governments and other community bodies, became part of the discursive strategy to position the ‘community’ as social pathology and the mechanism through which community regeneration can be achieved.

Housing NSW stated, under the title ‘community regeneration’, that “the Department has established important relationships with councils [local government] to assist in the regeneration of housing estates” (Housing NSW, 2005b, p.4), while the non-government sector and community organisations will “provide invaluable support through community knowledge and expertise,
assisting the Department to implement many new initiatives and programs” (Housing NSW, 2005b, p.5).

This strategy is located within neo-communitarian and social integrationist appraisals of ‘community’ and public housing tenants. The discursive features are clear in Objective 3, with many references to building strong communities through partnerships and employment programs, some examples including the following:

... strategies and initiatives aimed at building strong communities and assisting individual tenants to overcome social and economic disadvantage ... (Housing NSW, 2005c, p.1)

[The] Department will work with residents to strengthen their community, make their suburb a safer and more attractive place to live, and improve community services, education and employment opportunities. (Housing NSW, 2005c, p.4)

Community regeneration aims to build strong and sustainable communities in disadvantaged social housing estates by working in partnership ... (Housing NSW, 2005c, p.1)

The aim of the program is to build opportunities for community participation, boost well-being and a sense of belonging ... (Housing NSW, 2005c, p.2)

... statewide tenant participation programs and support for tenants through partnerships with other agencies. (Housing NSW, 2005c, p.2)

Finally, Objective 4 had the stated aim of guiding reform that would flag a move from asset and service management by Housing NSW to increasing asset and service management by the non-for-profit and the private sectors. In this vein, the key focus included ‘strengthening the community housing sector’ and investigating new asset management processes to be delivered by the private sector (Housing NSW, 2005d).
These objectives draw attention to the guiding principles that shaped the institutional sites in Phase 1 of the BLCP, but also to how these were connected to broader national and supra-national discourses of community building and urban governance. It brings more sharply into focus the reasons why various social entities promoted these types of interventions, the reasons why they were undertaking such initiatives, and the resources that the different social entities were required to bring to public housing estate redevelopment projects; or, as Fairclough argues:

Discursive practice is constitutive in both conventional and creative ways: it contributes to reproducing society (social identities, social relationships, systems of knowledge and belief) as it is, yet also contributes to transforming society ... It is important that the relationship between discourse and social structure should be seen dialectically if we are to avoid the pitfalls of overemphasizing on the one hand the social determination of discourse, and on the other hand the construction of the social in discourse. (Fairclough, 1992)

In the next section, the discursive strategy deployed by Housing NSW, which came to known as the BLCP and mandated the creation of a range of BLCP texts, will be investigated in the context of the previous discussion. In other words, it will consider text production in the context of the social and institutional structures; a relational process between language and power that Fairclough (1992) describes as text in context.
Discursive practice: The discursive framing of the BLCP by Housing NSW

This section uses Fairclough’s *discursive practice* (1992, p.78) and his more recent theorisation of *social practice* (2003, p.21) to show how the institutional site outlined above partly controlled the selection of certain master discourses and project functions over others to produce two guiding BLCP texts in Phase 1. The analysis focuses on describing the way in which the political and policy environment and the broader national and supra-national discourses of community building and urban governance outlined above framed ‘community engagement’ in Phase 1 of the BLCP. The texts are presented within specific genres, ways in which Housing NSW acted, to show the author of the texts, to whom the texts were distributed, how social subjects and other social elements were represented in these texts and the type of engagement process being advocated by the authors.

The two texts central to this analysis are the *Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project Public Private Partnership Request for Expression of Interest* (EOI) and the *Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project Fact Sheet* (BLCP Fact Sheet). These texts were developed in Phase 1 of BLCP deployment and are two of only a few publicly available texts that document the discursive framing of the BLCP project prior to 2004. The EOI (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c) and BLCP Fact Sheet (NSW Department of Housing, 2004d) provide insights into the type of governance tool, discursive strategy and the suggested purpose of the public–private partnership around the time of BLCP announcement.

Genres: Texts that framed the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project Public–Private Partnership in December 2004

Before moving on to the textual analysis specifically, first a quick note about genres. The term ‘genre’ is common in literature, film and art, and is loosely applied to a vast array of social sites as a way of categorising and separating
artistic forms into groups with recurring features; in the case of linguistics, this could be a stylistic, tonal or another textual feature at any moment in time. However, there is no single or correct method for defining texts in terms of genre, and Fairclough is careful not to constrain his definition of genre within his broad approach to discourse analysis, although he does provide empirical examples of text genre to which the researcher can refer.

The use of genre is specific to the type of analysis that the researcher (or film or art critic) is undertaking. By choosing to deploy the term genre, and categorise texts in terms of *ways of acting*, researchers are choosing to demarcate texts in specific ways and for specific purposes. Certainly, this can be viewed as an exercise of power by the researcher, although it is necessarily a conscious decision to draw attention to a specific *way of acting*, often to the exclusion of others, for the purpose of bringing some element of the social world, represented by the text, to life.

Some of the broad genre categories, or *ways of acting*, to which the analysis in this thesis refers, are fact sheets, reports, contracts, narratives, expositions, seminars, workshops, meetings, manuals, public exhibitions, consultation events, service encounters and news broadcasts (Fairclough, 2003; Paltridge, 1996). However, like Gustavo Pérez Firmat (1980, p.16), my focus is not specifically on the text or *genre* to which the text can be assigned. Instead, it is directed at the reception of the text by social subjects, through an analysis of how the text was shaped by a range of *genres* that reflect the social and institutional site, the authors and their imagined audience:

... instead of inducting a definition from the novels [texts] themselves or of imposing on them a grid of modal distinctions, one would piece together the scattered critical observations of the day [the social site] in order to recover the conception of the genre that oriented the composition and reception of such works. (Pérez Firmat, 1980, p.16)
The BLCP texts bring together a range of genres related to the institutional site. The various social actors within Housing NSW involved in text production introduced – carried with them – different ways of acting mediated by their own historical fields of knowledge (Foucault, 1966). These historical fields could include law, economics, urban planning, community development or business management. This association with a historical field of knowledge means that more than one genre may be present in any given text.

Fairclough (2003, p.31) uses the term “genre chain” to describe the process of linking different genres together within a text. However, Housing NSW’s intended audience, whether the text was prepared for public housing tenants, private-sector bidders, the general public or any combination of these, directly influenced the dominant genre that the text occupied. Therefore, the analysis of texts in Phase 1 begins by locating the EOI and BLCP Fact Sheet within dominant genres related to Housing NSW’s intended audience, before moving on to genre chains within the individual texts in the following section.

The 44-page EOI (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c) is a legal text outlining the contractual arrangement – the public–private partnership – that Housing NSW was seeking to engage in with the private sector in 2004. It has three core text functions (Fairclough, 1992, 2003; Hammond et al., 1992; Paltridge, 1996): describing the nature of the proposed public–private partnership; presenting the problem-solution; and providing a preliminary outline of the legal constitution and procurement process for the public–private partnership.

Fairclough (2003, p.32) argues that “genres are important in sustaining the institutional structures of contemporary society”. The EOI is an important example in the BLCP case of a genre of governance linking the local and particular to the national and supra-national (Fairclough, 2003, p.32). Following from Fairclough (2003, p.32), ‘governance’ is used here to describe the discursive
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69 In this study, Wildavsky’s (1979) thesis that the definition of social problems is often regulated by the courses of action available to address them has been abbreviated by the author as the problem-solution nexus.
activity of Housing NSW directed at managing the public housing estate redevelopment.

The EOI presents information for a predominantly private-sector audience that will constitutes a social, and in this case legal, relationship between Housing NSW and a private-sector contractor. Although, in this text, the relationship is hierarchical, it is a one-way mediated (Young, 2007) text in which Housing NSW is defining the problem, providing a solution and outlining the legal relationship between the parties (Marston, 2004). Housing NSW alone created the text and private-sector contract bidders alone were invited to respond to the text, as outlined below:

The Proponent [private-sector contract bidder] is invited to submit a response in accordance with this Request for Expressions of Interest ... The purpose of the Request is to:

• Outline the background, guiding principles and objectives of the Project.
• Invite Responses from Proponents with the skills, knowledge, experience, capability, resources and approach necessary to deliver the PPP Services.
• Identify Proponents that understand the Department’s aims and objectives and demonstrate an appropriate approach to delivery of the PPP Services.
• Allow the Department to select a short-list of up to three Proponents to submit Proposals in response to a RDP.

(NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, pp.1 & 7)

Similarly, the BLCP Fact Sheet (NSW Department of Housing, 2004d) is a one-way mediated text. However, this three-page text is providing ‘information only’ to a predominantly public housing tenant audience. There are comparable differences between the two texts in the way in which the problem, solution and the legal relationship between the parties is articulated and represented. Unlike the focus on legal arrangements, the bidding procedure and the procurement processes that are found in the EOI, the BLCP Fact Sheet seeks to broadly communicate a description of the BLCP and problem-solution in Housing NSW’s
terms. There was little detailed information about the legal arrangement or the public–private partnership in the BLCP Fact Sheet.

Public housing tenants were provided with the more generic *Public Private Partnerships: Renewal through Partnerships Fact Sheet* (NSW Department of Housing, 2004f) text, that accompanied, and was certainly informed by, the BLCP, to provide them with information about the redevelopment of public housing estates by public–private partnership. This two-page text, a one-way mediated text, is predominantly descriptive, outlining the ‘benefits’ of using the private sector to “invest in social housing infrastructure” (NSW Department of Housing, 2004f, p.1). This text further referred tenants to the *NSW Government’s Guidelines for Public Private Projects* (NSW Government, 2001) for additional information.

By comparison, the EOI referred private-sector bidders to a whole host of texts, including *NSW Government code of practice for procurement* (NSW Government, 2004) and other governance and development regulations. But perhaps a more important consideration than how these texts were constructed was the reception and response by social subjects to these texts. While a more detailed assessment is provided in the Social Event section of this chapter below, a few contextual points are required here on how different social subjects might have attached meaning to tenant participation through their interpretation of these BLCP texts.

Housing NSW referred public housing tenants to two texts around the time of announcement, the BLCP Fact Sheet and *Public Private Partnerships: Renewal through Partnerships Fact Sheet* (PPP Fact Sheet). Further, Housing NSW also sent a letter to public housing tenants to accompany BLCP announcement (for a copy of this letter, see Appendix 7: NSW Department of Housing, 2004b) and public housing tenants would have almost certainly looked outside of, or been exposed to, BLCP texts from broader sources, including media texts.

In any case, the EOI, BLCP Fact Sheet and PPP Fact Sheet texts represent the commitment made by Housing NSW to tenants and private-sector bidders in late
2004. These texts can be summarised in terms of *genre* and text function as shown in Table 4 below:

Table 4 – Genre and text function: Phase 1 BLCP texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Text function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOI</td>
<td>Legal/contractual document</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information document</td>
<td>Problem-solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure (legal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLCP Fact Sheet</td>
<td>Communication document</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information document</td>
<td>Problem-solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Fact Sheet</td>
<td>Communication document</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4 shows how each text is broadly located within one or two *genres*. It also shows how each *genre* is tasked with a different text function, and these text functions are important to how different social subjects attach meaning to concepts in two ways. First, there is an external factor: we attribute meaning to concepts based on the type of information provided to us. Or if we turn this around, our construction of concepts is constrained by the available information.

The second is an internal factor: we also attribute meaning to the information that we are presented with based on our own subjectivity and social reality. The latter places the subjectivity and social reality of the social subject as a pivotal factor in knowledge generation. Whether a social subject is a public housing tenant, Housing NSW employee, private-sector employee or member of the media structures their interpretation of these texts. The relationships between information and meaning are highly dependent on the lived experience of the social subject and therefore participant subjectivity is important. The analysis returns to subjectivity below, but now focuses on how *representations* were enacted in the different text *genres*. To do this, the following section further articulates the three main text functions of the texts outlined above: description of the BLCP; presentation of the problem-solution; and the public–private partnership process.
Representations: How Housing NSW defined the problem, solution and public–private partnership

The description of the BLCP in the Fact Sheet and EOI is dialectically related to the articulation of the problem-solution (Wildavsky, 1979) – so much so that they are often inseparable, and it makes sense to view the description of the BLCP as the presentation of the problem, to which the BLCP will provide a solution. While public–private partnerships are often publically justified as either providing value for money or some other financial benefit to the government, Housing NSW also justified the BLCP in social terms. That is to say, it was suggested that it would realise a social benefit in addition to any financial benefits.

The EOI provides a description of the BLCP that focuses on demographic data including population statistics, socio-economic profiles, language proficiencies, religious affiliations, employment rates, crime levels and urban design features of the estate. The problem-solution is partly constructed from these features in the EOI text, while the community is positioned as the site through which the solution will be implemented. As shown in identical excerpts taken from both texts below:

The Living Communities program aims to make public housing estates safer and more attractive places to live, to improve services and provide residents better access to better education and employment opportunities, and to support and strengthen local communities (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.1; 2004d, p.8) ...

The Department will work with the Bonnyrigg community, Fairfield City Council, a private sector partner, other government departments and community organisations to renew the public housing estate and help create a stronger community in Bonnyrigg. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.1; 2004d, p.9)

Housing NSW constructed the ‘community’ as social pathology by drawing borders around the social and physical site. Housing NSW also identified public housing by tenure type, and the social subjects who occupy this form of tenure, both as problematic. Therefore, the problem-solution was positioned within a
‘community building’ approach in the BLCP that incorporated the
neighbourhood effects thesis, by way of ‘social mix’.

‘Social mix’, as defined by Housing NSW, was assumed to be a social normality
within the urban landscape that the BLCP should restore. In the process, public
housing as an affordable housing option was reimagined as abnormal. Moreover,
it was imagined to be part of the problem, a contributor to the ‘shared problems’
experienced by public housing tenants living on public housing estates. The
deployment of ‘social mix’ in the BLCP had the stated aims of addressing the
“negative social impacts on tenants of highly concentrated Public Housing by
increasing the proportion of private housing in the Estate area” (NSW
Department of Housing, 2004c). These types of statements appeared in both the
EOI and BLCP Fact Sheet:

Public housing estates are communities with real strengths but some are also
burdened with more than their share of problems, made worse by a high
concentration of public housing. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.8; 2004d, p.1)

However, the EOI is the only text that articulates a percentage of the final
housing stock to be sold in the private market, stating that 70% of the stock would
be a compromise between two related ‘issues’. The EOI lists these ‘issues’ as:
“The greater the proportion of private housing, the greater the need to relocate
existing tenant households to housing outside the Estate area”; and the
“significant financial impacts associated with acquisition of housing outside the
Estate area” (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.18).

Both of these seem to be financial considerations dislocated from the
neighbourhood effects arguments used to justify ‘social mix’ in other parts of the
text. Therefore ‘social mix’ was, in part, a financial consideration attached to the
project and financial modelling, but justified under neo-communitarian rhetoric.
The strong neo-communitarian themes throughout both texts also relate to
building social cohesion and social networks that might facilitate a social
integrationist agenda focused on employment and volunteering. The EOI outlined, under a section on the BLCP contract, that the private partner would be required to

Actively promote social cohesion, the development of social networks and social interaction in the Estate ... Create a community that facilitates social interaction and neighbourhood support and makes it possible for residents to be involved in neighbourhood and volunteer activities (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.11) ...

to build the skills of residents, improve communication and strengthen community networks and leadership. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.9)

This demarcation of public housing tenants and the public housing estate, as a site that lacks the types of shared norms and social networks that are assumed of ‘sustainable communities’, can be viewed as part of the narrative that was constructed to tell a plausible story about the ‘problem’ (Jacobs et al., 2003). This narrative is similar to the narratives used to describe urban ‘problems’ and the ‘community building’ responses (problem-solutions) that have been deployed in the USA and the UK (MacLeavy, 2009; Mathers et al., 2008; Naparstek et al., 2000; Pokin et al., 2004).

Housing NSW positioned ‘community building’ as the master narrative through which the BLCP would gain legitimacy both within Housing NSW and with the private sector and public housing tenants. Or to put it another way, without the need for ‘community renewal’, there was little justification for the extensive disruptions and changes that would be imposed on public housing tenants in Bonnyrigg. Therefore, ‘community renewal’ or ‘building a stronger community’ became the narrative through which the BLCP would be positioned and justified.

This is evidenced by the structure of the EOI, more so than the BLCP Fact Sheet, which is almost exclusively positioned as a ‘community building’ text. The EOI, a legally orientated text outlining the contractual terms, used the construct of ‘community renewal’ to frame the aims and objectives of the urban governance
tool that Housing NSW was seeking to engage in with the private sector. Housing NSW discursively constructed the BLCP around three main objectives, to be guided by a ‘Community Renewal Plan’:

(1) Providing better services and creating new opportunities. In partnership with other agencies and community leaders, the Department will identify ways to upgrade public safety, improve health and community services and create new opportunities for residents, in particular to improve their education and skills and find work.

(2) Building a stronger community. The Department will work with the Bonnyrigg community to help build the skills of residents, improve communication and strengthen community networks and leadership. In doing so, the Department hopes to reflect and build on the rich cultural diversity of the Bonnyrigg community.

(3) Renewal of houses and public areas. In partnership with a Private Partner, Fairfield City Council and the community, the Department will replace or upgrade poor quality Public Housing and improve street layouts and public areas, increase the proportion of private housing and better match the type, size and configuration of Public Housing to tenant needs. Many new houses and apartments are expected to be built. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.9)

However, in the EOI, and beneath the warm rhetoric of neo-comunitarianism, is the governance tool, the mechanism for which Housing NSW developed a problem-solution narrative and through which the problem will be resolved. This legal mechanism was represented using the discourse of ‘partnership’, or more specifically ‘public–private partnership’. The BLCP public–private partnership would provide new infrastructure in the form of new housing, with an option for the private sector to manage the public housing tenancies through a not-for-profit housing provider.

In Australia, various State and Territory governments had experimented with different models for the provision of infrastructure by the private sector, combined with social service outsourcing (English, 2006; English and Guthrie, 2003; Jefferies and McGeorge, 2009). The difference in the case of the BLCP public–private partnership contract was that Housing NSW packaged up the infrastructure aims, and provided an option for the private sector to manage
public housing tenancies, with a suite of social deliverables to be managed by the private sector for 30 years.

The EOI broadly outlined the infrastructural and social purpose of the BLCP by way of seven key outcomes (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, pp.11–15). Four of these related to infrastructure provision – Housing Portfolio Outcomes; Sustainability Outcomes; Affordable Housing Outcomes; and Design and Development Outcomes. Two related to the suite of social deliverables: Tenant and Community Outcomes; and Consultation and Communication Outcomes – while the final key outcome, Tenancy Management Outcomes, related to the option for outsourcing tenancy management services to the private-sector contractor during the contract period.

These seven key outcomes align neatly with four master discourses – domains of knowledge – relating to urban governance in NSW and therefore public housing estate redevelopment projects, which could be broadly summarised as: (1) neo-liberalism and the promotion of ‘partnership’ in various (legal) forms and between a diverse range of social actors; (2) neo-communitarianism with a focus on ‘building communities’, as both a means and an end to addressing social pathology; (3) environmental sustainability; and (4) urban planning, see Table 5 overleaf.
Table 5 – Phase 1: Master discourses and genre chains within EOI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master discourse(s)</th>
<th>BLCP objectives</th>
<th>Key features in BLCP EOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Neo-liberalism with strong social integrationist and ‘social mix’ themes | Housing portfolio outcomes | Promotes:  
• Value for money for Housing NSW  
• Social and private housing that is interspersed and integrated  
• The creation of tradable stock  
• Optimisation of property maintenance and capital expenditure across the property life-cycle  
• Optimisation of land utilisation |
| Environmental sustainability | Sustainability outcomes | Promotes:  
• Sustainable development  
• Environmental protection |
| Neo-liberalism deployed as a urban governance tool for the provision of infrastructure | Affordable housing outcomes | Promotes:  
• 3% to 5% of the private housing stock will be Affordable Housing (either for sale or rent) |
| Environmental sustainability Urban planning | Design and development outcomes | Promotes:  
• Sound master-planning, urban design and sustainable development principles |
| Neo-communitarianism with strong social capital and social integrationist themes | Tenant and community outcomes | Promotes:  
• Social interaction  
• Social networks  
• Social cohesion  
• Volunteer activities  
• Sustainable community  
• Employment activities |
| Neo-communitarianism | Consultation and communication outcomes | Promotes:  
• Consultation and communication will continue in parallel with and inform the EOI and RDP processes  
• Following execution of a Project Deed, the Department expects that the Proponent will assume communication and consultation responsibilities |
| Neo-liberalism | Tenancy Management Outcomes | Promotes:  
• Delivery of tenancy management services by the private sector through a community housing provider  
• A single point of responsibility (private sector) for all tenant matters |

Source: Author (from NSW Department of Housing, 2004c).

The discourse of ‘partnership’ was deployed to describe various relationships in the EOI (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c) and the BLCP Fact Sheet (NSW Department of Housing, 2004d) texts. Housing NSW used the term ‘partnership’ in some instances to describe legal, contractual or other formal arrangements.
The EOI stated that

Department is seeking to fulfil a range of key Project objectives and believes that significant private sector involvement in the Project will bring enhanced outcomes by harnessing private sector expertise, innovation and experience ... over the term of the Project Deed. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.19)

The Department and Fairfield City Council have recently established a partnership agreement to assist in the delivery of a range of services and projects where there are common objectives, such as this Project. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.24)

In other excerpts, the state housing authority uses the term ‘partnership’ to describe arrangements without legal or contractual security. The following excerpts are taken from the EOI and the BLCP Fact Sheet, respectively:

*Providing better services and creating new opportunities.* In partnership with other agencies and community leaders ... (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.9; emphasis in original)

... so that the people of Bonnyrigg can be full partners in the renewal program, the local community will be invited to nominate members to a Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group. This group will advise on and contribute to planning and implementation of the project. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004d)

In another excerpts, the state housing authority uses the term ‘partnership’ to describe a relationship with a range of stakeholders, some of which were legal relationships while others were informal arrangements. The following excerpt is taken from the EOI:

The Department recognises that sustainable renewal of Public Housing estates cannot be achieved by government or individual agencies acting alone. It can only happen through partnership, with tenants and other residents, the private and community sectors, local councils and government departments all working together. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.9)
These three deployments of the term ‘partnership’ – as a legal arrangement, as an informal arrangement and as a conflated legal/informal arrangement – in the BLCP texts produced before announcement, while ill defined in terms of legality in the texts, are significant to tenant participation in Bonnyrigg. While no legal, contractual or other formal arrangement was ever proposed to involve public housing tenants in the BLCP – indeed, the conditions of possibility within neoliberal urban governance would most likely exclude such a process – tenants were often referred to as ‘partners’ alongside other ‘partners’ who had formal or legal arrangements in place. This had important implications for how tenants attached meaning to the terms such as ‘partnership’, ‘consultation’ and ‘participation’, as demonstrated below.

However, these were perhaps more pronounced in Phase 2 of the BLCP, as the requirements of the market and the governance tool chosen by Housing NSW eventually guided who was invited into different BLCP invited spaces in this phase of the project. It is worth noting, at this point, that the ambiguity surrounding legal and informal partnership, messages to public housing tenants relating to the purpose of the public–private partnership and various contractual obligations requiring the private-sector contractors to ‘communicate and consult’ with public housing tenants resulted in many tenants feeling that they were ‘equal’ partners in the BLCP in Phase 2 – an illusion soon distilled by project practicalities in Phase 2 and explored further in Chapter 6.

At BLCP announcement, ‘consultation with the community’ was presented as follows in the BLCP texts:

*Consultation with the community.* The Estate community will be consulted and invited to be involved at each stage of the planning and implementation of the Project. The consultation framework is intended to reflect the cultural diversity of the Bonnyrigg community. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.9; emphasis in original)
The EOI provided guidelines for “community consultation and communication” by the private sector. In particular, section 3.6.4 Consultation and Communication Outcomes, and the evaluation criteria 6.3 Criteria 3 – Working with the community and tenants of the EOI text provide instructions to the private sector and these are attached as Appendices 8 and 9. A summarised sample of the EOI (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c) guidelines and evaluation criteria is provided below (also see Appendix 9):

- ‘Community engagement’ was viewed as critical to the success of the BLCP (2004c, p.9). The EOI Selection Criteria would evaluate private sector proponents on their experience, capability and capacity to:
  - Deliver consultation and communication programs for projects with potentially significant social impact (2004c, p.27)
  - Identifying and engaging with the community and relevant stakeholders including peak housing groups, community groups, local advocates and government with respect to significant housing renewal projects (2004c, p.27)
  - Develop ‘community support’ for the BLCP (2004c, p.27)

- Housing NSW would continue ‘consultation and communication’ with tenants while selecting the private partner (2004c, p.9) and would:
  - Explain Housing NSW’s ‘community renewal’ objectives to the community (2004c, p.9)
  - Incorporate ‘community issues’ into the private partner selection process (2004c, p.9)
  - Communicate ‘community issues’ to short-listed private proponents (2004c, p.9)

The EOI also noted several items on which Housing NSW would consult tenants in Phase 2. These included the proposed management of public housing tenancies by a not-for-profit housing manager and the final concentration of ‘private housing’, as outlined below:

The Department is not committed to implementation of a Community Housing approach (or similar) at this stage, but may seek Proposals incorporating such an approach subject to the outcome of consultation with tenants and the community. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.13)
The final concentration of private housing will be determined after consultation with the Bonnyrigg community having regard to the benefits of increasing the proportion of private housing and any negative impacts on the community or on individual residents and tenants. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.18)

The deployment of terms such as ‘consultation’, ‘participation’, ‘partnership’ and ‘communication’ has its discursive roots in other redevelopment projects – neo-liberal urban governance tools and texts – and these terms were often conflated in the EOI and the BLCP Fact Sheet. However, the recent public housing estate redevelopment experience of Housing NSW, most notably in Minto (Stubbs, 2005; Stubbs et al., 2005a), was clearly driving parts of the ‘community consultation’ agenda in Bonnyrigg. It appears that Housing NSW did not want a repeat of the Minto redevelopment project announcement, where public housing tenants collectively organised and mounted considerable resistance to the project, using the media, research and political strategies.

This is especially evident in Housing NSW’s objective of: “Encouragement for and achievement of broad community support for the proposed improvements” (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.18) and further exemplified by the following statements:

Proponents will need to demonstrate that they have the skills and experience and other capabilities necessary to achieve positive community support. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.14)

[The] Department [Housing NSW] requires that the potentially adverse social impacts of the physical renewal be actively minimised, mitigated and managed by the Private Partner … Obtaining the support of relevant local government authorities, the existing tenant community and local non-tenant stakeholders. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.12)

This was discursively constructed as ‘involvement’ by Housing NSW, in which all the relevant stakeholders would ‘work together’ to ‘rebuild the community’. This neo-communitarian approach masked the inherent interests of each party, blurred the political sides and worked towards Housing NSW’s objective of
‘seeking community support’ at the time of announcement. Therefore, public housing tenants were provided with the following statement (commitment) in the BLCP Fact Sheet at BLCP announcement:

Over the next five to ten years, the Department will work with the Bonnyrigg community, Fairfield City Council, a private sector partner, other government departments and community organisations to renew the public housing estate and help create a stronger community in Bonnyrigg. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004d, p.1)
Social event: Sydney’s hellhole to be bulldozed

In this section, the analysis turns to how the texts outlined above shaped the social events and social actors around BLCP announcement in late 2005. A diagrammatic representation of the micro-level invited spaces with social subjects for Phase 1 is provided in Figure 17 overleaf. At this level of the analytical process, the focus is on *styles or ways of being* (see Table 3 on page 120). Therefore, there is a focus on the more subjective aspects of the discursive strategies deployed by the various social actors.

The analysis looks at how identity and subjectivity shaped how social subjects may have identified with or rejected various discursive features of the texts by making judgements about and drawing conclusions from the BLCP texts. The analysis is particularly interested in ‘identity’, or how public housing tenants, other local residents, BLCP staff and the media responded to the BLCP texts, either by producing new texts, copying BLCP texts or even through non-action or protest.
Figure 17 - BLCP Phase 1: Micro-level timeline with social subjects and invited spaces
Implementation and reception of the discursive strategy

In every metropolis of the First World ... concentrations of public housing are publicly known and recognised as those urban hellholes in which violence, vice, and dereliction are the order of things ... discourses of vilification proliferate and agglomerate about them ... ‘from above’, in the journalistic, political and bureaucratic (and even scientific) fields. (Wacquant, 2007, p.67)

Following the announcement of the BLCP in December 2004, there was a bout of activity from politicians, journalists, Housing NSW staff and public housing tenants. The BLCP texts were pivotal to the formation of objects and concepts (Foucault, 1969) in the period that followed. However, this activity was mostly related to the presentation and definition of the ‘problem’ and the provision of a ‘practical’ solution through the BLCP texts (Jacobs et al., 2003, p.434). The first letter that public housing tenants received regarding the BLCP arrived on the evening prior to the announcement of the BLCP. In this text, Housing NSW presuppose the ‘problem’ through the presentation of the ‘solution’ by stating that (see Appendix 7 for a copy of the letter):

This renewal project will involve the Department working with other agencies to improve community services such as health, education, employment and training. It will also involve changes in the layout of the streets, improved open space, the replacement or upgrading of Department of Housing homes and the building of new houses and flats ... As one of the first steps the Department will be working with Bonnyrigg residents, community groups, Fairfield City Council and the private sector to put together a detailed community renewal plan for Bonnyrigg. This plan will outline the work that is to be carried out on residents’ homes and on public spaces ... The Department wants residents to be fully involved and to have a say in the project. Soon we will be holding meetings and talking to residents and community groups about what they want for Bonnyrigg. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004e)

This text provided no rationale to public housing tenants about the need for this type of redevelopment project or the exact nature of the involvement of the private sector, except for suggesting that Housing NSW would improve a range of
community services and the built form by working with the private sector and public housing tenants.

Soon after, a range of new texts, including media texts and statements by politicians, defined more clearly the objects of the intervention and problem-solution. Certainly the media has a long history of demonizing public housing tenants and public housing estates, both in general and also in association with public housing estate redevelopment projects (Arthurson, 2004a). Darcy (2010a, p.14) argues that government and media texts have been responsible for constructing “public housing estates as ‘unnatural’ places” in the process of justifying a range of redevelopment programs in Australia.

More broadly, the Howard government’s welfare reforms were also creating space for welfare recipients and public housing tenants to be constructed as ‘undeserving’ and ‘dependent’ in the Australian media (The Age, 2005). By the time the BLCP was announced, a range of BLCP texts authored by different social subjects in various locations had already begun to stigmatise public housing tenants and the Bonnyrigg public housing estate by way of demarcating the site and calling for ‘community renewal’ by way of the market. Housing NSW state that

... much of the Public Housing stock is either at the end of its economic life or requires significant refurbishment to bring it to an acceptable standard ... The Estate has [an] ... unemployment rate, for all age groups, higher than the average for the local government area ... Crime levels on the estate are high, exacerbated by the Radburn style housing layout and urban design. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.8)

These representations were quickly inculcated into ways of classifying and identifying the housing stock, the physical site and public housing tenants more generally. Fairclough (2003, p.30) uses the term ‘mediation’ to show how textual information is mediated between texts by various “copying technologies to disseminate communication”. This was clearly the case in Bonnyrigg, and perhaps Silverstone’s (1999) concept of mediation, the ‘movement of meaning’
“from one social practice to another, from one event to another, from one text to another” (Fairclough, 2003, p.30) is a productive way to conceptualise this discursive process.

In the case of the Radburn design feature, the discursive work associating this design feature with ‘failure’ of public housing estates was well developed by 2004. The subjectivity associated with being an urban planner or architect creates certain ways of viewing the world, bound by the idea that design features can lead to social outcomes, either positive or negative (Birch, 1980). However, taken in isolation, these seemed to ignore other key features of the debate, including important public policy and financial considerations. In 1998, Philip Cox, a former advocate of Radburn and the architect responsible for introducing Radburn to public housing estates in Western Sydney, was quoted as follows in a Sydney-based newspaper:

Everything that could go wrong in a society went wrong ... [Public housing estates] became the centre of drugs, it became the centre of violence and, eventually, the police refused to go into it. It was hell. (Welch, 2009, p.1)

Politicians and the mass media mediated, selectively copied and disseminated the information in the BLCP texts and broader sources. The information relating to the suggested condition of the housing stock, employment rates, crime levels and Radburn design features turned up in a range of media texts soon after BLCP announcement. In the following news article, a sort of neo-communitarian agitprop70 (Baylis, 1985; Bodek, 1997) that accompanied the announcement of the BLCP, the journalist writes:

---

70 Agitprop is an abbreviated term taken from the Russian отдел агитации и пропаганды (отдел агитации и пропаганды). I have used the term to refer to a political strategy, articulated in the above case through the media, in which the techniques of agitation and propaganda are combined to mobilise political ideology and influence public opinion. The term is more commonly used to refer to the promotion, through literature, drama, music and art, of a form of Marxism practiced by the Communist Party in the former Soviet Union throughout the 20th century (Baylis, 1985; Bodek, 1997).
Sydney's hellhole estate to be bulldozed

Sydney's failed public housing experiments of the 1970s are set to be bulldozed in a NSW government plan to breathe new life into troubled suburbs ... The Living Communities plan will start with the 81 ha Bonnyrigg estate near Liverpool. The unemployment rate in the estate is more than 29 per cent and crime rates are higher than the state average. Two-thirds of families speak a language other than English at home. Under the plan, the estate will be transformed, with the private sector invited to bulldoze large sections and replace them with public and private housing. Mr Scully [Minister for Housing] said it would show the way forward for bulldozing most of the large-scale public housing estates in western and south-western Sydney ... "Unsurprisingly, the social experiment of the '70s has failed," he said. "It's called the Radburn experiment; front yards face the back, back yards face the street. (Sydney Morning Herald, 2004)

Wacquant (2007, p.67; also see Sampson, 2009) argues that media and political representations can further construct a stigmatised space as a blemish on the urban landscape:

Whether or not these areas are in fact dilapidated and dangerous ..., matters little in the end: the prejudicial belief that they are suffices to set off socially noxious consequences ... (Wacquant, 2007, p.68). Once a place is publicly labeled ... outside the common norm, it is easy for the authorities to justify special measures. (Wacquant, 2007, p.69)

There is little doubt that media representations such as the one cited above are constructed around the problem-solution presented by housing authorities, and in this case Housing NSW. This piece presents the Bonnyrigg public housing estate as ‘troubled’ and ‘failed’, and directs the readers towards the social integrationist agenda implicit in the BLCP texts by highlighting the unemployment and crime rates across the estate.

This type of media representation, and the listing of statistics as a signifier of ‘failure’, is consistent with the discursive framing of many welfare recipients in Australia in late 2005 (The Age, 2005). As shown below, in Australia at the time of BLCP announcement, journalists were accustomed to presenting demographic (statistical) data as part of the descriptive device used to outline government policy. For example, a journalist at The Age newspaper stated in 2005:
According to Treasurer Peter Costello, those who have the capacity to work should be encouraged to do so. Work will provide single-parent families with a path to a better life and a move away from poverty and isolation ... The changes ... are part of a broader strategy to move disability pensioners, mature-aged unemployed and sole parents into jobs. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, there are 799,800 single-parent families in Australia, of whom 416,100 are unemployed. *(The Age, 2005)*

Clearly, broader political discourses of welfare reform, including the Welfare to Work and Reshaping Public Housing, were also shaping the moral claims that journalists and politicians were making about the Bonnyrigg public housing estate and tenants. In Bonnyrigg, these assumptions were based on the information provided to them, in part, by other policy, media and BLCP texts. However, there are also many discursive features clearly absent from these media representations, one of the most significant being the policy prescription of Housing NSW to house ‘only the most disadvantaged’ within society in public housing.

It would be incongruous to suggest that there might be anything other than a statistically high concentration of ‘disadvantage’, if housing authorities only house citizens that they assess to be ‘disadvantaged’. Indeed, the discursive work implicit in citing these statistics, intentional or otherwise, leads the reader towards an assessment of public housing estates and public housing tenants that is devoid of structural and policy considerations.

Instead, politicians – including the new Minister for Housing, Joe Tripodi71 – reanimated the BLCP problem/solution narrative through the media without reference to the fundamental contradictions implicit in such narratives and policy responses. In the example below, journalist Gerard Noonan writes in the *Sydney...*

---

71 Joe Tripodi replaced Karl Scully as the Minister for Housing in February 2005. However, Joe Tripodi was embroiled in the Orange Grove affair – a political scandal investigated by the Independent Commission Against Corruption related to urban planning and zoning decisions that challenged the legitimacy of the Orange Grove Shopping Centre – and he only served as the Minister for Housing until August 2005.
Morning Herald in February 2005, under the headline “Tripodi starts with $500m project”:

Private property developers and financiers will bid for a $500 million project to knock down and rebuild the rundown Bonnyrigg Estate ... It will be the first of six projects aimed at refurbishing decrepit housing estates around Sydney while maintaining the community atmosphere. “It is time to start thinking outside the square,” Mr Tripodi told an audience of financiers and developers in Sydney yesterday ... “The project is not just about the redevelopment of housing and public space – it includes a strong focus on community renewal to improve the lives of the residents of the Bonnyrigg Estate, which is one of the most disadvantaged public housing estates in NSW,” Mr Tripodi said. (Noonan, 2005)

In keeping with the principles of good storytelling, these narratives have been crafted using the duality of a hero and villain. In the news items above, the public housing estate, and to a lesser extent public housing tenants, are constructed in the media narratives as the villains. The hero in this case is not only the housing ministers, but also private-sector developers who will breathe new life into this decrepit public housing estate by bulldozing large sections of the estate and replacing the public housing with private housing.

Further, the private housing is discursively constructed through these texts as an integral part of the solution. Implicit in the ‘Sydney’s Hellhole’ article is an assumption that good things will happen to troubled public housing tenants if privately owned housing is introduced – a discursive feature reminiscent of, if not clearly informed by, the neighbourhood effects thesis. However, this discursive feature also flags the tension between property rights and citizenship that became more apparent as the BLCP progressed. Noonan continues – quoting Paul Gilbertson, who was then the executive director of Housing NSW’s Strategic Projects and responsible for the BLCP within Housing NSW:

After selling the private properties, the developer would be required to maintain the public housing stock in good order for the next 30 years and possibly manage rental arrangements. “Our social objective [is] to make this a reasonable place to live for the people of Bonnyrigg, and the challenge is to find affordable ways of achieving this,” Mr Gilbertson said ...
acknowledged that dealing with private owners on the estate as well as a proper timetable for tenants to move out of their rented homes as rebuilding took place would require sensitive negotiation. (Noonan, 2005)

It is clear not all social subjects agreed with the problem-solution narrative outlined by Housing NSW staff, politicians and the media. A study commissioned by Housing NSW and completed by the University of New South Wales early in 2005 challenges almost all the problem-solution narratives provided above. The study found that public housing tenants were ‘positive’ about life in Bonnyrigg before the announcement of the BLCP:

The study finds that residents are generally very positive about life in Bonnyrigg, have a strong attachment to their community ... Almost 80% of residents had intended to remain resident of Bonnyrigg in the long-term prior to the announcement of the redevelopment. However, they are less certain since the redevelopment has been announced ...

The study also found that the “community rated their neighbourhood as having a higher level of ‘social cohesion’” than other parts of Greater Western Sydney and that these findings were related to the strong sense of attachment that many cultural groups have with the Bonnyrigg area. In fact, there appears to be considerable benefit from the clustering of different cultural groups within the estate. People from the same cultural or language group provide mutual support, whilst friendships with English speaking neighbours were also reported as having positive impacts ...

Additionally, public housing tenants valued Bonnyrigg’s location close to services, shops, religious and cultural institutions and networks, and other attributes of the neighbourhood. They also value the sense of community and friendships that Bonnyrigg offers ... The degree of social mix afforded by the area’s cultural diversity and the level of positive interaction between residents found in the study indicates that in many ways Bonnyrigg is a unique estate. (Stubbs et al., 2005b, pp.11–13)
The Baseline Study calls into question many of the moral claims and assumptions implicit in the problem-solution narrative offered by Housing NSW staff, politicians and the media. Most notably, it casts serious doubt on the credibility of the claims constructed within neo-communitarian conceptions of public housing estates and the suggested low levels of ‘social cohesion’ often assumed of these spatial locations (Arthurson and Jacobs, 2003; deFilippis, 2007; deFilippis et al., 2006; Wacquant, 2007).

The Baseline study refers to the existing Bonnyrigg public housing estate as a socially mixed site, and outlines many benefits resulting from the existing cultural diversity and ‘mutually supporting’ cultural and social networks evident on the estate. This assessment is further supported by other studies, including a 4-year study conducted between 2002 and 2005 that demonstrated considerable benefits for maintaining the demographic profile of Bonnyrigg at the time of BLCP announcement. In this study, the research team engaged with the social capital construct to challenge other representations of the Bonnyrigg public housing estate and tenants. Mona Shrestha, Steve Wilson and Michael Singh argue:

Despite adverse indicators with respect to unemployment and crime, this geographic community exhibits a considerable social capital through its array of past employment experiences, cultural organisations and pro-social practices. (Shrestha et al., 2008, p.151)

However, these were not only theoretical constructs used to describe the spatial location and social relationships; they represented tangible experiences and realities for public housing tenants in Bonnyrigg at the time of BLCP announcement. Wilson and Bain (2001), in a 2001 study, found high levels of motivation towards learning and employment in Bonnyrigg, but suggested that public housing tenants experienced difficulties in securing employment due to low levels of English-language proficiency. Further, public housing tenants challenged the various negative constructions of their estate by providing their own narratives, such as the one below:
“For those of you who don’t know Bonnyrigg I am not one of a kind, many of us have live on the estate for a great number of years. Some of the residents of Bonnyrigg have even been there since the first conception of Bonnyrigg and helped build Bonnyrigg to what it is today. We have the local convenience of a great shopping centre, churches, temples and a school on nearly every perimeter. We have our choice of clubs and a good public transport system. Other than these fantastic amenities we have built life long friendships. As a community we have gone to school and work, played, lived, loved and lost together”. (Arnfield, 2008, p.1)

Alarmingly for public housing tenants, the proposed BLCP introduced the possibility that the ‘positive networks’ and other demographic features, on which the Baseline and other studies reported, could be diluted through the introduction of privately owned housing stock. The paradoxical logic of this argument has been noted in the USA (deFilippis, 2007) and at other sites where the dilution or erasure of the existing social, cultural and other mutually supporting networks is put forward as a method for building ‘social capital’ or ‘social cohesion’ in these spatial locations.

In short, housing authorities assume that benefits will arise from manufactured social networks between citizens without physical capital (public housing tenure) and citizens who have physical capital (capital in the form of private property), and dilute the existing social networks on public housing estates in an attempt to build these new social networks. This is certainly a discursive feature of neo-liberal approaches to urban governance, as described by Lupton and Tunstall:

Mixing for regeneration originates in a neo-liberal analysis of the problems of low-income neighbourhoods, in which structural problems are individualized and spatialized, and disadvantaged neighbourhoods, particularly those with majority social housing tenure, are discursively repositioned as irredeemably problematic. (Lupton and Tunstall, 2008, p.114)

Perhaps more importantly, it is clearly a discursive construction of public housing tenants as a moral underclass. It assumes that public housing tenants would benefit from broader propinquity to a moral citizenry deemed superior by housing authorities based on their capacity to accumulate capital and to maintain assists (i.e. gain employment and acquire private property); that is, moral citizens
who have a job, a mortgage, a house and will work to maintain these assets. Even the term ‘Living Communities’ served to construct the existing ‘community’ as something other than ‘living’. This discursive feature reinforced and further inculcated the notion of a ‘failed’ community into a range of social subjects working in Bonnyrigg in late 2005, as shown by Darcy:

In research conducted by this author, the term Living Communities and the language associated with it in Department of Housing literature is interpreted quite differently depending upon the positioning of the respondent ... [one local service provider suggested] It’s all about living, it’s all about communities, what we have now is a dead thing we just did not know it, and it wasn’t a community. (Darcy, 2010a, p.15)

However, not only did public housing tenants challenge the problem-solution narrative offered by Housing NSW staff, local service providers, politicians and the media soon after BLCP announcement, but they also challenged the moral claims constructed about public housing tenants and their financial commitments to their homes, as described by a community leader and public housing tenant in Bonnyrigg:

"On 20th December 2004, life as we knew it changed with the announcement of the Bonnyrigg redevelopment. Our lives have been like a roller coaster since then, but instead of climbing that first hill like a normal coaster and getting a great view, we felt we went straight into a descent, with no clear vision of a better ride to come. The vision we had was of loss - loss of our homes, our community and our security. The reason for this is that when people moved here we were told to treat our home like we owned it, so we put down roots and made improvements with our hard earned money. Some of us even brought our home from the Department of Housing and that gave us a sense of achievement and empowerment over our own lives. So when the [BLCP] announcement was made our sense of power was taken with it". (Arnfield, 2008, p.1)

Darcy (2010, pp.15–16) shows, using quotes from public housing tenants and non-government service providers in Bonnyrigg, taken here from interviews completed soon after BLCP announcement, that the construction of the Estate as ‘troubled’ and the community as ‘failed’ was felt deeply by public housing tenants.
in Bonnyrigg. One public housing tenant interviewed soon after BLCP announcement stated:

“...It’s because we are Department of Housing people and they think we are scum”. (Quote from public housing tenant, cited in Darcy, 2010, p.17)

The issue for public housing tenants, when they attempted to address the misrepresentations of their suburb, their housing and the social and cultural networks, resided in the conflation of the problem and solution within BLCP and media texts. It was now difficult for tenants to call for the physical repair of the infrastructure, increased policing efforts to address crime or other services to address their concerns, without thereby calling for the complete redevelopment of their estate by public–private partnership and the introduction of privately owned housing.

Both the physical and social sites, as a consolidated whole, were deemed ‘obsolete’ (Weber, 2002) by the construction of the problem-solution. In terms of functional obsolescence – “changes in modern building practices and the manner in which buildings are utilised” (Weber, 2002, p.522) – Housing NSW had deemed and was promoting a narrative that suggested that the “buildings were at the end of their economic life” (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.8) and therefore justified redevelopment. While in terms of economic obsolescence – the factors outside of the property that reduce demand and negate its value (Weber, 2002, p.522) – by extending Weber’s concept of economic obsolescence this analysis demonstrates that under this neo-liberal approach to urban ‘renewal’, not only was the built environment appraised and devalued to justify and facilitate this redevelopment project by the private sector, but so too the social environment (public housing tenants and their social and cultural networks) was appraised and devalued to justify the intervention.

In Bonnyrigg, the texts that accompanied BLCP announcement stigmatised properties targeted for demolition and redevelopment, but also local residents. In
summary, the value of the land remained *in situ*, but was temporarily devalued by functional and economic obsolescence related to the construction of the problem-solution and the stigmatisation of properties and residents. However, while this value (capital) would be realised at a later date by the private-sector contractors, to justify ‘community renewal’ in 2004: the public housing estate needed to be ‘failed’; the public housing stock needed to be ‘at the end of its economic life’ to make the venture financially viable; and public housing tenants needed to be ‘troubled’ and in need of ‘community building’.

As outlined above, at the time of BLCP announcement, public housing tenants expressed concerns about the redevelopment and Housing NSW quickly convened a series of public information sessions and events to discuss the BLCP with public housing tenants, local businesses and other residents. Many public housing tenants challenged the representations of public housing tenants, the public housing estate and the appraisal of the housing stock represented in the BLCP and media texts. In the excerpt below, taken from an interview conducted soon after BLCP announcement, a public housing tenant states:

“We have spent lifetimes building up beautiful homes that we are proud of and we don’t look on them as department houses we look on them as our homes”. (Quote from public housing tenant, cited in Darcy, 2010a, p.16)

Housing NSW addressed these and other concerns by quickly creating and circulating a new text, the Tenant Questions Answered Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project text (NSW Department of Housing, 2004g; see Figure 18 overleaf). In response to public housing tenants concerns, Housing NSW rehearsed the problem-solution narrative to tenants in the *Tenant Questions Answered – Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project* text:

Bonnyrigg is a ‘Radburn’ Estate ... some old and worn out houses will go ... we need to replace and upgrade poor-quality public housing ... we will find ways to upgrade public safety ... create opportunities for local people to improve education and skills and find jobs ... like many public housing estates, it is a community with strengths but also some social problems ... the
first thing we will do is consult with local residents. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004g)

Figure 18 – Letter to public housing tenants: Tenant Questions Answered

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2004g)
Despite a high level of public housing tenants’ concern at BLCP announcement, the process was managed to rule out activism and other forms of tenant organisation and participation that had historically accompanied public housing estate redevelopments (Atkinson and Cope, 1997; Cooke and Kothari, 2001; Cowan, 1998; Hickey and Mohan, 2004; Mathers et al., 2008; Stubbs, 2005; Stubbs et al., 2005a; Taylor, 1995; Wood, 2003). Certainly these other forms of tenant organisation would have called into question the constructions and representations of the estate and the need to ‘build community’ by way of the market and the private sector. Central to this militating strategy deployed by Housing NSW was their commitment to consult local residents and involve them in the redevelopment project. In Chapter 6, the analysis further articulates the expectation that public housing tenants would be involved: indeed, they were discursively constructed as partners in the BLCP from the project announcement in December 2005.
CHAPTER 6 – Phase 2: Community engagement and private partner selection

At the macro level, the spatio-temporal analysis shows that there were two invited spaces in Phase 2 of the BLCP. These invited spaces will be defined as Selection of the Private Partner and Community Engagement in this study. A diagrammatic representation of the macro-level invited spaces with social subjects is provided for Phase 2 in Figure 19 overleaf. This representation builds on Figure 16 provided in Chapter 5 that outlined the invited spaces in Phase 1 of the BLCP. This chapter focuses specifically on Invited Space 3 to show how tenant involvement was discursively constructed in the BLCP and the types of programs that resulted from this understanding of ‘community engagement’ in this space. There is very little publicly available material on Invited Space 2, as the selection of the private-sector contractors was conducted in a confidential space from which public housing tenants and the public were excluded.

Invited Space 2: Selection of the Private Partner
Temporal location: December 2004 – December 2006
Description: ‘Selection of the Private Partner’ focused on the expression of interest, detailed proposals and selection of the preferred proponent for the BLCP public–private partnership. In this space, Housing NSW invited the private-sector proponents in to bid for the public–private partnership.

Invited Space 3: Community Engagement
Temporal location: December 2004 – December 2006
Description: ‘Community Engagement’ focused on the capacity building and consultation spaces that Housing NSW created and invited public housing tenants into Phase 2 of the BLCP.
Figure 19 - BLCP Phase 2: Macro-level timeline with social subjects and invited spaces
Social and institutional structures: Locating Phase 2 invited spaces

Defining the social and institutional site in Phase 2 of the BLCP is largely a descriptive process provided to broadly locate the spatially variegated institutional spaces created to select the private-sector contractors and to involve public housing tenants.

Following BLCP announcement and the initial information session held in December 2004, there was limited activity by Housing NSW in Bonnyrigg over the Christmas and New Year period. Then, on 28 January 2005, Housing NSW publically released the EOI. This text included notification of a briefing session, to be held on 3 February 2005 by Housing NSW in Sydney’s central business district, for registered private-sector proponents.\(^{72}\) The briefing session provided general information about the BLCP and specific information about the EOI response process (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.23). The EOI required private-sector proponents to provide a response to the expression of interest by 30 March 2005 (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.2). The EOI also provided guidance for private-sector proponents who wished to visit the Bonnyrigg public housing estate during the EOI process, as outlined below:

### 5.4 ESTATE ACCESS

The Department does not intend to facilitate access to Departmental properties by Proponents as part of this EOI process. Proponents who choose to visit the Estate area should be very mindful of the right to privacy of the Department’s tenants and other residents and should conduct themselves sensitively ... The conduct of Proponents in visiting the Estate area will bear on the Department’s evaluation of Responses. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.24)

Therefore, the invited space created to select the ‘private partner’ by Housing NSW was both geographically and procedurally removed from the public housing tenants in Bonnyrigg. The initial briefing session was located off the estate for

---

\(^{72}\) Proponents is a term commonly used in business discourse and used here by Housing NSW to describe private-sector companies with an expressed interest in bidding for the BLCP contract.
registered participants; while the assessment of the EOI responses was conducted by the EOI Assessment Committee, which included members from Housing NSW, the NSW Treasury and Fairfield City Council, as well as a range of commercial, financial, legal and planning consultants. This review process was overseen by the Review Committee, with members from Housing NSW, the NSW Treasury, the NSW Department of Infrastructure Planning and Natural Resources, the NSW Cabinet Office and independent probity auditors (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.2). Therefore, the assessment of the EOI did not include tenants or their representatives. This initial geographical, social and procedural space, termed the EOI process, is located in this study within Invited Space 2: Selection of the Private Partner (see Figure 19 on page 180).

In terms of temporal factors, the ‘procurement schedule’ – the time Housing NSW estimated in the EOI it would take to select a private-sector consortium, execute the project deed and achieve financial close – was subject to delays from as early as March 2005, as outlined in Table 6 below:

Table 6 – Invited Space 2: BLCP proposed procurement schedule with corresponding dates of achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLCP procurement milestone</th>
<th>EOI indicative date</th>
<th>Date achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request for expression of interest</td>
<td>28 January 2005</td>
<td>28 January 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing date for receipt of responses</td>
<td>30 March 2005</td>
<td>30 March 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of short-listed proponents</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>12 August 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of RDP</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>19 September 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing date for receipt of proposals</td>
<td>September 2005</td>
<td>15 March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of preferred proponent(s)</td>
<td>December 2005</td>
<td>18 October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project deed executed</td>
<td>March 2006</td>
<td>23 December 2006 – 20 April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial close</td>
<td>June 2006</td>
<td>20 April 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (collated from NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.23; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, pp.1–3).
Five private-sector consortium companies responded to the EOI by submitting expressions of interest to Housing NSW to undertake the project. The EOI Review Committee evaluated the five responses using eight weighted selection criteria (see Appendices 8 and 9). However, the EOI review processes took longer than expected and the three short-listed ‘respondents’ were not announced by Housing NSW until 12 August 2005, approximately 3 months later than the anticipated May 2005 timeframe outlined in the EOI text. Subsequently, Housing NSW did not issue the Request for Detailed Proposals (RDP) to the three short-listed private-sector proponents until 19 September 2005 (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.3).

In December 2005, one of the short-listed private-sector consortium companies withdrew from the selection process. The two remaining short-listed private-sector proponents submitted Detailed Proposals on 15 March 2006. An Evaluation Panel, with members from Housing NSW, the NSW Treasury, the NSW Department of Planning, Fairfield City Council and a range of external consultants, assessed the Detailed Proposals against seven selection criteria. Again, this review process was overseen by the Review Committee (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.3). Only five of the seven selection criteria were weighted in the RDP evaluation:

1. Communication and consultation (10%)
2. Facilities management services (10%)
3. Tenant-related services (26.7%)
4. Development planning (26.7%)
5. Commercial and financial (26.7%)

(NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.3)

73 The three short-listed private-sector proponents were “Bonnyrigg Partnerships” consortium (Westpac, Becton, Spotless and St George Community Housing Co-operative), a “Sydney West Housing Partnerships” consortium (Macquarie Bank, Urban Pacific, Transfield Services and Hume Community Housing Association), and a “Lend Lease and Commonwealth Bank” consortium (Commonwealth Bank, Lend Lease, United and Cumberland Community Housing Association)” (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.3).

74 The ‘Lend Lease and Commonwealth Bank’ consortium (Commonwealth Bank, Lend Lease, United and Cumberland Community Housing Association) (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.3).
CHAPTER 6

The assessment of the Detailed Proposals was focused on three core functions, representing 80% of the evaluation criteria: Tenant-Related Activities; Development Planning; and Commercial and Financial. The assessment of the Detailed Proposals was presented to public housing tenants as shown in the excerpt below in Figure 20, taken from the February 2006 BLCP Newsletter text.

Figure 20 – BLCP Newsletter, February 2006

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2006a, p.3).

As shown in the EOI (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c) and the BLCP Summary of Contracts (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007), these three core evaluation criteria were broadly focused on private-sector contractors’ abilities in the following areas:

(a) The capacity to redevelop large-scale but poorly maintained public housing in order to reposition the stock within the housing market to increase property values.

(b) The capacity to manage social/public housing tenancies.

(c) An understanding of public-private partnerships and past performance in entering into similar long-term commercial arrangements with government entities.

(d) Demonstrating performance in assuming, managing and mitigating risk associated with long-term commercial arrangements with government entities.
(c) Demonstrating performance in arranging finance to cover capital and operating costs.

(f) Demonstrating the ability to commit equity and mitigate risk within the requirements of finance providers.

Source: Author (paraphased from NSW Department of Housing, 2004c; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007).

Between 11 July and 31 August 2006, the NSW Land and Housing Corporation (2007) held confidential negotiations with the two private-sector contractor consortia regarding their *Detailed Proposals* and both consortia submitted *Revised Detailed Proposals* on 11 September 2006. On 18 October 2006, the NSW Premier announced that one private-sector contractor consortium had been named as the ‘preferred proponent’ and would be entering final negotiations with the NSW Land and Housing Corporation (2007). Between 23 December 2006 and 20 April 2007, the private-sector ‘proponent’ – the Bonnyrigg Partnerships consortium – and the Land and Housing Corporation executed the BLCP Deeds and achieved *financial close*\(^{75}\) (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.3).

This marks the end of Phase 2 of the BLCP and the beginning of *mobilisation* from public-sector management to private-sector management (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.35). It also demonstrates that public housing tenants were not invited into the space that Housing NSW created to select the private-sector contractors in any significant way – although some members of the Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group (CRG) reported that Housing NSW presented some aspects of the *Detailed Proposals* to the Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group in a CRG ‘closed session’. However, Housing NSW did not formally record this process and there is no evidence of the contribution of residents in BLCP texts. Members of the Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group could not confirm, even anecdotally, that their contributions had been

\(^{75}\) “Housing’s Project Director certified on 20 April 2007 – the project’s date of ‘financial close’ – that all of these additional conditions precedent had either been satisfied or waived” (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, 14).
incorporated into BLCP planning or private-sector contractor selection (Rogers, 2011).

Further, it shows that the invited space created to select the private-sector contractors was also geographically distant from the public housing tenants in Bonnyrigg and this was important to how public housing tenants conceptualised and imagined the ‘private partner’ in Phase 2 (see Discursive practice: Community engagement and an invisible private partner on page 199). The private-sector contractors only had one very controlled interaction with residents in Bonnyrigg, at the TalkAbout community consultation event, explored further in the ‘community engagement’ invited space below.

**Locating Invited Space 3 – ‘Community engagement’ in Phase 2**

Following the general information session conducted in December 2004, Housing NSW quickly developed more targeted ‘community engagement’ programs in early 2005. While Housing NSW, Fairfield City Council and the Living Communities Consultative Committee (Coates et al., 2008) presented these programs as a coherent ‘community engagement strategy’ in a text produced retrospectively in 2008 on ‘community engagement’, the planning, development and implementation of these programs was more reactionary at the time. Broadly, however, there were two general focal points for ‘community engagement’ within Invited Space 3 as defined in Housing NSW texts: (1) from December 2004 to July 2005, focused on *information and consultation*; and (2) from August 2005 to December 2006, focused on *capacity building and consultation* (Coates et al., 2008; Gilbertson and Shepard, 2008; NSW Department of Housing, 2005b, 2006a; Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005c).

While a detailed list of these programs is provided in Appendices 8, 9 and 10, a briefer discussion of these programs is provided in this section to locate them temporally and within the local institutional site that Housing NSW and Fairfield
City Council created in Bonnyrigg. The following sections will show how these ‘community engagement’ programs were discursively constructed from a range of other texts and social events.

Prior to BLCP announcement, Housing NSW appointed a local Department Client Service Officer to act as a local representative of the BLCP and to manage initial public housing tenant, resident and local business communication following announcement. The Client Service Officer fielded tenant concerns and organised a range of small general public and language-specific ‘information sessions’ throughout the information and consultation period from December 2004 to July 2005. These information sessions, in addition to Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council’s participation in other community events, allowed Housing NSW to address tenant concerns while providing tenants with information about the BLCP, as outlined below:

A number of smaller workshops, precinct barbecues and information stalls ... provided a ‘street-level’ presence allowing residents to raise issues and ask questions, and enable the project team to dispel the inevitable rumours. (Coates et al., 2008, p.12; emphasis in original)

Addressing ‘rumours’ became a common discursive feature of meetings and printed texts from Housing NSW in Phase 2 of the BLCP. The excerpt below, taken from a BLCP Newsletter produced by Housing NSW in February 2006, is an example of this discursive activity. This text cites a ‘rumour’ involving the property surveyors commissioned by Housing NSW, and suggests that they may have indicated to public housing tenants that some housing stock was in good condition and did not need to be demolished (see Figure 21 overleaf).

In a more targeted response, Housing NSW, Fairfield City Council and the Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) planned the following ‘community consultation’ events from early 2005: the Stakeholder Workshop, A week with a camera, SpeakOut and Our Bonnyrigg Dream. The invitation-only Stakeholder Workshop (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005d) was a small event
for local government, non-government organisations, and community and religious groups (Coates et al., 2008, p.11), conducted in February and attended by around 40 people.

Figure 21 – BLCP Newsletter, February 2006: Rumours column

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rumours column</th>
<th>Bonnyrigg Residents Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A property assessment survey of all Department of Housing homes was carried out late in 2005. Apparently some tenants were told by the surveyors that they lived in good homes that would not be demolished. So there is now a rumour that lots of homes will be kept. The surveyors do not know which homes will be kept and which homes will be demolished. This will depend on the concept plan.</td>
<td>Community Common Room, 59-61 Tarrington Parade and 7.30pm: every 2nd Tuesday of the month at Bonnyrigg Public School Hall (from March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come along to:</td>
<td>Contact: Liz Coupe on 9610 2053 or End Blair on 9610 1409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Talk about issues that affect you</td>
<td>Or just come along to a meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discuss Bonnyrigg renewal plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Share views with other residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have your say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Group meets: 10am – 12 noon: 1st and 3rd Wednesday of every month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2006b, p.4).

* * *

*A week with a camera* was held in March 2005 at two local schools with grade 5 and 6 students, many of whom lived on the Bonnyrigg public housing estate. Students were given cameras for a week and asked to photograph “Their favorite areas of Bonnyrigg” and “Areas that they are concerned about or don’t like in Bonnyrigg” (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005b, p.6). The larger April 2005 *SpeakOut* (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005c) was an open-invitation event that attracted around 80 participants in a tightly controlled ‘consultation’ process where tenants were directed to ‘express concerns’ in relation to a set of predetermined ‘topic areas’, as described by Housing NSW and mediated by the BLCP project texts:

The ‘SpeakOut’ at which resident participants were invited to express their views, concerns and ideas in relation to a list of topic areas, including safety, issues for children and youth and design for parks and public spaces. (Coates et al., 2008, p.11)

The last in the series was *Our Bonnyrigg Dream: Telling the planners what really matters* (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005a), held in May 2005:
Our Bonnyrigg Dream – a series of two workshops at which participants developed a set of principles for the development of Bonnyrigg which was documented as the Community’s masterplanning principles. (Coates et al., 2008, p.12, emphasis in the original)

Therefore, within the information and consultation period from December 2004 to July 2005, Housing NSW identified two core ‘community engagement’ activities: ‘Information sessions and small-scale consultation activities’ (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005c); and the two large community consultation events SpeakOut and Our Bonnyrigg Dream (Coates et al., 2008, pp.11–12). Additionally in this period, Housing NSW established the Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group and the Living Communities Consultative Committee, and commissioned the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Baseline Study. The Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group clearly has its roots in the Minto public housing estate redevelopment project. In 2004, and in a striking resemblance to the Bonnyrigg texts, Housing NSW stated the following:

Minto is a community with many strengths, but it has been let down by the poor quality of the physical environment ... A Community Reference Group was established for the project as a conduit for community views about the design of the project and to inform critical processes ... Residents and local organisations are represented ... (NSW Department of Housing, 2004a)

Similarly in Bonnyrigg, a Community Reference Group was established to ‘involve’ public housing tenants and non-government organisations in the BLCP. The Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group’s twice monthly meetings aimed to provide a “multi-directional flow of information”, so that the “Living Communities Program could demonstrate that community feedback is acknowledged on a decision making level” (Coates et al., 2008, p.42). Initially, the Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group was ‘open’ to any Bonnyrigg public housing tenant.

However, the group was later ‘closed’, resulting in new members needing to apply and subsequently clear an approval process (Coates et al., 2008, p.12). Little
rationale was given for ‘closing’ the membership of this group, except for excerpts such as the following: “Over time the membership of the group evolved and was ‘closed’” (Coates et al., 2008, p.12). Other anecdotal evidence from members of the Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group indicates that the group was seen to be “working well together” with Housing NSW, and that new members could disrupt this dynamic (Rogers, 2011).

Throughout 2006, Housing NSW also established the Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group and the Private Homes Owners Group. Although anecdotally, these groups seemed to be auxiliary and hierarchically submissive to the Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group, as they often forwarded communications to Housing NSW through this Group (Rogers, 2011). Housing NSW also funded a local non-government service provider to establish a tenant advocacy service in June 2006 (as shown in Figure 22 below, in an excerpt taken from a BLCP Newsletter).

Initially, the tenant advocacy service was established to:

provide an independent service to support and advocate for public tenants who are being rehoused as part of the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project. (Cultural Perspectives, 2007, p.2)

Figure 22 – BLCP Tenant Advocate Service: Promotional material from BLCP Newsletter, July 2006

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2006c, p.2).
Housing NSW also established The Living Communities Consultative Committee, with the brief to “hold the project accountable for community commitments” (Coates et al., 2008, p.14). This was also a ‘closed’ committee, which held monthly meetings and had representatives of local community organisations, government departments, academics and other advisors. Additionally, Housing NSW commissioned the City Futures Research Centre at the University of New South Wales and Judith Stubbs and Associates to conduct the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Baseline Study, with stated aims to:

1. Identify resident behaviour, perceptions and attitudes towards Bonnyrigg and their dwellings;
2. Establish baseline data on social cohesion in the community;
3. Identify the numbers of public housing tenants who would prefer to stay in the area or move to another location and, if they would prefer to move, their preferred place of residence;
4. Broadly identify resident perceptions and attitudes towards being tenants of the Department relative to becoming tenants of a community housing provider, and tenant willingness to make such a transition.

(Stubbs et al., 2005c, p.20)

The Bonnyrigg Living Communities Baseline Study was released in July 2005 at a key point in Phase 2 of the BLCP. According to the procurement timeline outlined to public housing tenants at BLCP announcement (see Table 6 on page 182), three private-sector proponents should have been short-listed in May 2005 and been issued with Request for Detailed Proposals in June 2005. However, neither of these procurement milestones had occurred by July 2005.

Further, Housing NSW, Fairfield City Council and Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) had completed the information and consultation processes designed for the Request for Detailed Proposals period. These factors combined and resulted in several interesting and unplanned developments in the BLCP by mid-2005. First, public housing tenants BLCP had begun to question the timing of the BLCP, and specifically the timing of the redevelopment by public–private partnership: this is explored further below.
Second, Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) would no longer be designing and conducting ‘community engagement’ processes in Bonnyrigg. Whether this was the result of a concluding contract aligned with the Request for Detailed Proposals period, the end of a predetermined consultation process or for another reason is unknown.76 Importantly, Housing NSW brought the responsibility for the design and implementation of ‘community engagement’ processes ‘in-house’ around the middle of 2005. This in turn led to a third development, in which Housing NSW set up a ‘Community Building Team’ comprised of Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council staff, and external contractors. In July 2005, this included the following staff (Coates et al., 2008):

- Director of Community Building within Housing NSW Strategic Projects, with overall responsibility for the community outcomes of the BLCP. This included strategic vision, leadership and direction of the engagement program.

- Project Manager for Community Renewal within Housing NSW Strategic Projects, with responsibility for developing links between agencies to identify service improvements and client needs.

- The locally based BLCP Client Service Officer noted above, with responsibility for coordinating communication between residents, Housing NSW Strategic Projects and the local Client Service Team of Housing NSW.

- The Fairfield City Council New Residential Neighbourhoods Place Manager with responsibility for the suburb of Bonnyrigg.

Source: Author (quoted and paraphased from Coates et al., 2008, p.19).

However, in July 2005 the BLCP Client Service Officer was the only member of the Community Building Team permanently located in Bonnyrigg. In

76 In 2008, Housing NSW (Coates et al., 2008, p.19) stated “Sarkissian and Associates to undertake the initial consultation for input to the RDP during 2005. Thereafter, consultation activities were managed and staffed within the Project team.”
preparation for the next stage of the BLCP ‘community engagement’ process, Fairfield City Council commissioned the University of Western Sydney to complete a short review of the consultation texts produced until July 2005, to inform the Community Renewal Plan.\footnote{In 2005, the BLCP was being conceptualised as a combination of two integrated ‘plans: The Community Renewal Plan’, which guided the ‘renewal of the community’; and the ‘Concept Development Plan’, which guided the infrastructural and facilities management.}

The Community Renewal Plan was a confidential text produced by Housing NSW aimed at enlisting local service providers and government departments to help Housing NSW achieve their ‘community renewal’ aims and objectives in the BLCP. In July 2005, I moved into an office space in Bonnyrigg with the BLCP Client Service Officer to complete the short \textit{Community Renewal Plan Preliminary Report}. The report involved document analysis and interviews with BLCP staff and local non-government organisations. This project was part of a move by Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council to develop a locally based Community Building Team from August 2005.

In a more structured shift in local governance, Housing NSW also funded Fairfield City Council to employ a Community Project Officer to work specifically on the BLCP. Housing NSW defined this position as follows:

\begin{quote}
Within [Fairfield City Council’s] City Service’s Community Life Team a \textit{Community Project Officer} position was created, funded by Housing NSW, to undertake community development and community engagement work and provide liaison across [Fairfield City] Council’s community development team. The officer sat in the Bonnyrigg project office and operated as an integral member of the local [BLCP Community Building] project team. (Coates et al., 2008, p.20)
\end{quote}

The Fairfield City Council position was filled in August 2005, and the Community Project Officer was co-located in an office space with the BLCP Client Service Officer and myself. From August 2005 to December 2006, the locally based Community Building Team was directed by Strategic Projects to refocus the ‘community engagement’ approach towards \textit{capacity building and...}
consultation. The first ‘community engagement’ event organised by the Community Building Team was the what you’ve told us so far (NSW Department of Housing, 2005b) information session, which attracted around 65 participants.

The Community Building Team suggest that the “outcomes from the consultation were assessed and summarised in a glossy ‘What you’re told us so far” (Coates et al., 2008, p.27) text, distributed to public housing tenants and other residents. Then, in November 2005, Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council conducted the TalkAbout ‘community renewal consultation’ event. Fairfield City Council described the event as follows:

The Bonnyrigg Talk-About will give residents the chance to ... provide their ideas about community services in Bonnyrigg and talk to the Bonnyrigg Residents Group. The Department of Housing will be introducing the three short listed proponents for the Bonnyrigg renewal project – Bonnyrigg Partnerships, Lend Lease and Commonwealth Bank and Sydney West Housing Partnerships. (Fairfield City Council, 2005b, p.1)

This was the only time public housing tenants engaged with the short-listed private-sector contractors in a tightly controlled process soon after the contractors had been asked to prepare Detailed Proposals as part of the bidding process. The TalkAbout event represented the last ‘consultation’ event before the Community Building Team moved into the Building the Dream ‘capacity building’ project. The Community Building Team suggested that Building the Dream was a

workshop series to educate the community in housing and design concepts, including how to read a plan, masterplanning, open space, streetscapes and home design. (Coates et al., 2008, p.13)

To implement the Building the Dream project, the Community Building Team used human resources from a range of institutions, including Fairfield City Council’s Community Life Team and Housing NSW local and head offices, and I was brought in to assist with the project and to facilitate the English-language ‘capacity building’ workshops.
My involvement was negotiated through the extension of the cooperative research program\textsuperscript{78} between Fairfield City Council and the University of Western Sydney on the Community Renewal Plan. The cooperative program was funded by Fairfield City Council and was extended until December 2005. The Community Building Team also recruited an adult educator (located off-site) to produce the \textit{Building the Dream} workshop material under the direction of the team over the coming months.

While this material was being developed, The University of New South Wales conducted three urban design workshops with around 20 residents of Bonnyrigg. The workshops were conducted by students completing architecture/planning degrees at the University of New South Wales and involved mock consultations with residents, the development of master plans reflecting resident input, and presenting the master plans to residents in a simulated ‘community consultation’ and master-planning process.

Meanwhile, in Invited Space 2, the BLCP procurement process was experiencing significant delays. On 19 September 2005, Housing NSW issued the \textit{Request for Detailed Proposals} to the short-listed private-sector contractors. This was significantly later than the June 2005 milestone set in the BLCP procurement timetable outlined in the EOI, which listed September 2005 as the expected date of receipt for the \textit{Detailed Proposals}.

In November 2005, and returning to Invited Space 3, the \textit{Building the Dream} project was about to commence and my involvement in the BLCP was renegotiated. From December 2005, I was employed by Fairfield City Council as a Community Project Officer in a position created within the City Service’s Community Life Team, but funded by Housing NSW to undertake community development and community engagement work.

\textsuperscript{78} This cooperative program was a formal research partnership between Fairfield City Council and the University of Western Sydney, whereby the industry partner scoped the study and funded the research.
In this role, I reported to the Community Building Team, which included reporting to both Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council senior staff members. I was employed to work on ‘capacity building’ within the Community Building Team and I assumed responsibility for developing a ‘site visit’ program to accompany the Building the Dream project. The ‘site visits’ or field trips included taking up to 100 Bonnyrigg residents to a range of urban locations – master-planned estates, open spaces and other residential areas – to provide them with an opportunity to use the skills that they would attain in the ‘capacity building’ workshops.

As noted above, in early 2006 Housing NSW also issued an expression of interest to organisations for the management of a “Tenant Support and Advocacy Service for the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project” (NSW Department of Housing, 2006h). From mid-2006, Housing NSW funded the Fairfield Migrant Resource Centre to manage a tenant support and advocacy service in Bonnyrigg.

Finally, in early 2006 I also developed an action research collaboration between the University of Western Sydney and Fairfield City Council, focused on the ‘community engagement’ processes being implemented by the Community Building Team. Throughout 2006, I conducted the research project as an insider (Coghlan and Holian, 2007) while working on ‘community engagement’ processes as part of an Honours degree. The research was completed in October 2006 and a final report was provided to Fairfield City Council in November 2006.

**Mediation between invited spaces in Phase 2: Housing NSW as a mediator**

As will become clearer throughout this chapter, Housing NSW mediated (Silverstone, 1999) the movement, dissemination and regulation of ‘information’ between different social entities and between Invited Spaces 2 and 3 in Phase 2 of the BLCP. Housing NSW only allowed public housing tenants and the short-
listed private-sector contractors to engage directly in one tightly controlled invited space, where Housing NSW ‘introduced’ the two parties to each other at a public event.

It should be noted that Housing NSW also invited Bonnyrigg Management (The Manager) to the Community Reference Group in December 2007; however, this was a closed session for Community Reference Group members only. The meeting was also bound by the rules of this meeting space (see Figure 23 overleaf, taken from a BLCP Newsletter).

Between project announcement in December 2004 and ‘financial close’ in April 2007, Housing NSW created: ‘community’ narratives, by fragmenting and commodifying ‘consultation outcomes’ and presenting them to the private-sector contractors; and ‘private partner selection’ narratives, by fragmenting and commodifying information from the BLCP procurement process – although there was limited mediation of information about the procurement process to public housing tenants due to a real or perceived requirement for distance between public housing tenants and the short-listed private-sector contractors.

Figure 23 – Community Reference Group meet Bonnyrigg Partnerships

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2006b, p.3).

These requirements were ‘real’ in the sense that the conditions of possibility construct public–private partnerships in this way, requiring distance between various social entities and justifying these processes through the construction of commercial arrangements, public–private partnership probity requirements and
selection processes. The requirement for distance was ‘perceived’ in the sense that there are other possible redevelopment configurations and relationships to the market. Therefore, Housing NSW controlled the presentation of ‘information’ to social subjects in Invited Spaces 2 and 3. However, Housing NSW also presented this ‘information’ on behalf of different social subjects, in this case on behalf of public housing tenants, residents and short-listed private-sector contractors. These Phase 2 micro-level invited spaces, and the mediation of ‘information’ by Housing NSW, are presented diagrammatically in the Social Event section of this chapter.
Discursive practice: Community engagement and an invisible private partner

This section uses Fairclough’s *discursive practice* (1992, p.78) and his more recent theorisation *social practice* (2003, p.21) to show how the institutional sites outlined above further mediated the selection of certain master discourses throughout Phase 2 of the BLCP. The analysis is focused on describing the way in which Housing NSW framed ‘community engagement’ in Phase 2 of the BLCP. The analysis only provides a limited description of the texts that framed the private-sector contractor selection processes, as these were constructed as confidential invited spaces.

The analysis therefore considers the embedding of various master discourses, including social capital, moral underclass and social integrationist discourses into community building and community engagement strategies developed by Housing NSW in Phase 2 of the BLCP. The texts are presented within specific genres – ways in which Housing NSW acted – to show the author of the texts, who the texts were distributed to, how social subjects and other social entities were represented in these texts, and the type of engagement process being advocated by the authors.

Genres: Texts that framed ‘community engagement’

From December 2004 to July 2005, within the *information and consultation* period, Housing NSW managed a range of ‘information sessions’ and Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant), under the direction of Housing NSW, developed a range of community consultation events. These larger consultation events were two-way mediated processes, largely informed by social and urban planning models of community consultation. In outlining their approach to community engagement, Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) uses the theoretical construct of a *Wheel of Participation,*
developed by community engagement practitioner Scott Davidson (1998) in the UK in the late 1990s and a significant realignment of Arnstein’s (1969) *Ladder of Participation* from the late 1960s. The *Ladder of Participation* is provided below in Figure 24 and the *Wheel of Participation* is provided in Figure 25 overleaf.

Figure 24 – Arnstein’s Ladder of Participation

![Figure 24 – Arnstein’s Ladder of Participation](image)


Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) suggested that

We prefer the Wheel [of participation] ... because it does not suggest (as ladders, continua and spectra might) that moving up or along the ladder is necessarily the preferred approach. A feature of this model is that each quadrant identifies appropriate responses and approaches. (Sarkissian et al., 2009b, pp.51–52)
However, reconfiguring the metaphor from a ladder to a wheel has important theoretical implications relating to power. Arnstein (1969, p.216) provides a framework that theorises citizen participation as a “categorical term for citizen power”. The Ladder of Participation draws attention to the distribution of power between social subjects in the context of the political and economic structures of local governance. According to Arnstein, if (poor) citizens make a metaphorical move up the Ladder of Participation, then these citizens would have:

join[ed] in determining how information is shared, goals and policies are set, tax resources are allocated, programs are operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parcelled out. In short, it is the means by which they can induce significant social reform which enables them to share in the benefits of the affluent society. (Arnstein, 1969, p.216, emphasis in original)
The *Wheel of Participation*, theorised as independent but interconnected quadrants, removes the metaphor of linear movement from a politically powerless citizenry (non-participation in local urban governance) towards a politically powerful citizenry (a degree of citizen power in local urban governance). By contrast, each quadrant of the *Wheel of Participation* is tasked with independent aims and objectives. It is assumed that by *informing, empowering, consulting* and *partnering* with poor citizens, ‘community engagement’, described as “enabl[ing] local people to make a meaningful contribution to the project” by Housing NSW (Coates et al., 2008, p.11) in Bonnyrigg, will be achieved.

This re-theorising of the *Ladder of Participation* replaces Arnstein’s metaphor of a linear movement of power between social subjects, with a focus on ‘identifying appropriate responses and approaches’ to *inform, empower, consult* and *partner* with poor citizens (Sarkissian et al., 2009b, pp.51–52). This approach ignores many of Arnstein’s (1969, p.216) original questions, including (adapted here by the author):

- Who is allocating resources?
- Who controls how information is shared?
- Who is developing the (urban redevelopment) policies?
- Who controls how (urban redevelopment) projects are managed?
- Who do these contract (market mechanisms) benefit?
- Are participation efforts enabling the benefits of social reform to benefit poor citizens?

These conceptual differences become especially important in the BLCP. To show how various social subjects conceived of public housing tenant participation, these conceptions will be further explored below by dividing up the Phase 2 community engagement processes temporally using the categories listed above: *Information and consultation* and *Capacity building and consultation.*
Information and consultation – December 2004 to July 2005

From the time of BLCP announcement, the ‘information sessions’ did not focus on informing public housing tenants about different processes for resource allocation, a diversity of urban redevelopment policies or approaches, or the costs and benefits of deploying market-centric policy to redevelop public housing estates. Instead, these ‘information sessions’ were designed to inform public housing tenants about the redevelopment project and to “involve them, where possible” (Coates et al., 2008, p.3; emphasis in original) in a set of ‘community engagement’ activities and processes determined by Housing NSW and shaped by the BLCP approach to redevelopment.

The initial ‘information sessions’ that Housing NSW deployed in Bonnyrigg were not heavily reliant on written material. Instead, they involved a range of oral, short fact sheet and diagrammatic presentations, combined with face-to-face interactions designed to provide public housing tenants and residents with information about the BLCP soon after BLCP announcement. The texts – printed material and other documents, recorded information or visual images (Fairclough, 2003, p.3) – included the BLCP Fact Sheet, the Public–Private Partnership Fact Sheet, maps and plans of the existing Bonnyrigg Public Housing Estate, and other general information.

From December 2004 to July 2005, within the information and consultation period outlined above, information about the BLCP was orally presented to public housing tenants at two-way mediated general public meetings hosted by Housing NSW, language-specific small group meetings facilitated by a staff member of Housing NSW, and neighbourhood-level meetings and barbecues hosted by Housing NSW staff. Information from the BLCP Fact Sheets and other BLCP project texts structured these two-way mediated communication events.

However, these information spaces were also constructed by Housing NSW to facilitate two types of information transfer. First, the spaces allowed Housing
NSW to outline the type of intervention proposed, the market mechanism being deployed and a selection of the changes being implemented through the project. Second, they allowed Housing NSW to address public housing tenant and resident concerns and questions in a controlled environment, in real time and face to face with public housing tenants and residents.

The information spaces were not solely constructed to provide public housing tenants and residents with information about the BLCP. These spaces were also used to alleviate concerns about the redevelopment project and to promote the intervention and use of the market as outlined below by Housing NSW:

Project Announcement (Dec 2004)

The public announcement of the project in December 2004 took many Bonnyrigg residents by surprise, and created significant anxiety about what would happen and when. The first task for Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council therefore was to provide the community with information, and address community concern about the impact of the project, while building trust and credibility. (Coates et al., 2008, p.11; emphasis in original)

Housing NSW chose, amongst many possible ways of carrying out the BLCP announcement and communication process, to design the ‘information sessions’ by drawing on several different ways of presenting information, and of fielding questions and concerns. The focus was on reducing ‘anxiety and concern’ through the provision of information about the ‘impact’ of the BLCP. Housing NSW provided this information by first producing a range of one-way mediated texts, including BLCP Newsletters produced every 2 months and delivered to every house within the BLCP project area, a question-and-answer text and the BLCP Fact Sheets. Housing NSW also conducted two-way mediated ‘community information sessions’ “targeting the affected community, agency stakeholders and broader advocate groups” (Coates et al., 2008, p.11) where these BLCP texts were circulated. During the ‘information sessions’, the focus was on:

providing basic information about the project, answering resident’s many questions and addressing their fears about the impact of the project on them. Further community information sessions were held, until the local team was
satisfied that most people had the information they needed and the project could move on to the initial consultation phase. (Coates et al., 2008, p.11)

There is limited information available about how the public housing tenants experienced and attached meaning to these information sessions. The only texts that reflected public housing tenants’ experience in these information sessions are the transcriptions from my 2006 focus groups, citations from interviews conducted in other studies, several short texts prepared by individual public housing tenants and notes from my research diary (Rogers, 2011). However, all these sources provide anecdotal and retrospective observations made by public housing tenants on these initial information sessions and were recorded by third parties. In the case of my research diary, I took verbatim notes of public housing tenant comments in public meetings and events; while the texts authored by public housing tenants were prepared with assistance, in most cases, by Housing NSW staff.

In any case, the initial ‘information sessions’ can be viewed as “promotional genres, genres which have the purpose of ‘selling’ commodities, brands, organisations, or individuals” (Fairclough, 2003, p.33). The ‘information sessions’ were about ‘promoting’ or ‘selling’ the following predetermined and interlocking elements of the BLCP to public housing tenants, local residents and businesses:

Global/National

- Decisions about resource allocations for public housing in NSW
- Decisions about how information about the BLCP would be collated, presented and shared (i.e. how public housing tenants would be ‘informed and consulted’ about the BLCP)
- Decisions about urban governance policies in NSW
- Decisions about the management of the BLCP by the private-sector contractor

---

79 In the 2006 study, I conducted four focus groups. The focus groups were conducted in four different languages, with participants representing over six different cultural groups living on the Bonnyrigg Public Housing Estate (Rogers, 2006a).
Local/Particular

- Assumptions about the need for ‘community building’
- Suggestions that the BLCP contract and use of the market was to the benefit the ‘local community’
- Suggestions that the ‘community’ would be a ‘partner’ in the BLCP

These ‘information sessions’ were the first way of acting for Housing NSW within Phase 2 of the BLCP. The sessions fit broadly within a promotional genre, mediated by interpersonal relationships and facilitated by charismatic community based employees of the state (Tucker, 1968; Weber, 1919). These discussions occurred between Housing NSW staff and public housing tenants, local residents and businesses in controlled two-way mediated public meetings.

Additionally, between December 2004 and July 2005, within the information and consultation period, Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) developed a range of ‘community consultation’ events. These events fit within another genre of local urban governance that could be broadly located within urban planning and the approaches to ‘community consultation’ advocated by urban planners. In Bonnyrigg in early 2005, this conceptualisation of ‘consultation’, as a way of ‘involving public housing tenants in the decision making’ (Coates et al., 2008, p.3), is particularly important to the way in which meaning was attached to ‘community engagement’ by members of Housing NSW and the Community Building Team, including myself, later in 2005.

---

80 Max Weber (1919) suggested that power is exercised when the subjugated subject accepts the authority of another. Weber used charismatic authority to discuss familial and religious authority, in contrast to say, legal-rational authority, which is more typical of the modern state and large bureaucracies. Reference to Weber’s charismatic authority is useful here, while not necessarily theoretically coherent, to draw attention to the familial aspects of public housing estates. On-the-ground employees of Housing NSW working closely with public housing tenants in their spaces – homes and open spaces – develop different relationships to those engaging with public housing tenants in Housing NSW spaces – departmental offices. These face-to-face relationships, mediated around discussions of significant person concern for public housing tenants – questions of home, family and security – may be better understood by charismatic conceptions of authority such as those put forward by Weber.
By conceptualising ‘community consultation’ as a set of independent processes, as in the *Wheel of Participation*, instead of a process by which citizens can be present at different points on a linear progression from a politically powerless citizenry to a politically powerful citizenry, as in the *Ladder of Participation*, the notion of citizen power advocated by Arnstein over three decades earlier was not rendered invisible, but sidelined. Citizen power is acknowledged in the *Wheel of Participation* and similar approaches, but has been compartmentalised within the functions or activities advocated by these models. *Informing, empowering, consulting* and *partnering* with public housing tenants in Bonnyrigg became the aim of the ‘community consultation’ events and a measure of success. This was in contrast to facilitating a process, for instance, whereby public housing tenants would have an ability to set resources or accept or reject a private partner contractor.

This is not to say that Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant), or members of Housing NSW and the Community Building Team were not aware that limitations to the ‘community consultation’ program existed. The main issue relates to the exact nature of these limitations, as the BLCP contract was still being developed and private-sector contractors were still preparing bids; therefore the exact structure of the commercial arrangement was still being formalised. Further, conceptualising ‘community consultation’ as a fragmented set of activities or functions allowed the focus to be redirected away from citizen power.

Instead, providing public housing tenants with ‘high quality information’, consulting public housing tenants on predetermined and limited components of the BLCP or ‘building community capacity’, was prioritised over other functions. Meanwhile, using this compartmentalised construction of ‘community engagement’ provided space for rationalising their failure to involve public housing tenants in the decisions that guided the social reforms and BLCP in Phase 1.
Members of Housing NSW, the Community Building Team, Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) and later I could justify a 'community engagement' approach that did not address these broader issues of citizenship, because achieving ‘community engagement’ was no longer about citizen power. It was about designing and implementing a set of ‘community engagement’ functions and activities.

However, these prioritised functions tended to be either achievable (i.e. providing information) or vague and immeasurable (i.e. building community capacity). In short, the conditions of possibility that shaped the BLCP also shaped the ‘community consultation’ agenda in Bonnyrigg. Therefore, the broad issues of local urban governance within the BLCP had already been decided and were off the agenda, while other elements such as ‘community building’ were prioritised. Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) were certainly aware of the contention between the democratic involvement of public housing tenants as citizens and the pragmatism required in the BLCP regarding the involvement of tenants. Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) list two key rationales for community engagement in their approach to ‘community engagement’:

1. It is ethical: In a democratic society, those whose livelihoods, environments and lives are at stake should be consulted and involved in the decisions that affect them directly.

2. It is pragmatic: Support for programmes and policies often depends on people’s willingness to assist the process. It is also often necessary because ‘if planners will not involve the citizens, citizens will involve themselves’. (Sarkissian et al., 2009b, p.49)

In Bonnyrigg, the ethics of community engagement was curtailed by the pragmatism required by the governance structure. Housing NSW and therefore Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) had to be pragmatic and implement a ‘community engagement’ process within the confines, however ill defined at this stage, of the BLCP. As outlined above, if Housing NSW had not ‘involved’ public housing tenants, they would have potentially involved themselves and created market and management risks.
Under the direction of Housing NSW, Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) developed two public ‘community consultation’ events, *SpeakOut* and *Our Bonnyrigg Dream: Telling the planners what really matters*, based on an amalgamation of urban planning consultation models used by the consultant at the time. *SpeakOut* was a two-way mediated event held at the Bonnyrigg Youth Center located on the public housing estate in April 2005, conducted just three days after Housing NSW received EOI responses from private-sector contractors. The one-day event was design to allow public housing tenants, other residents and business owners to “drop-in” and “speak out” (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005c). In terms of genre, Sarkissian Associates Planners suggested:

The name itself, *SpeakOut*, suggests a process whereby public housing tenants would come to raise questions and concerns about the BLCP. You could even argue that it is encouraging participants to speak out against any issue of local concern, including the BLCP. Indeed, this may have been Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) intention when they suggested that *SpeakOut* was developed by “people with a keen commitment to an engaged citizenry”, to provide “ordinary people [with] opportunities to contribute to decisions that can make a difference” (Sarkissian et al., 2009a, p.7). Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) suggested that:

Unlike a typical ‘open house’, a *SpeakOut* is a carefully facilitated event. A trained Listener pays close attention to what people are saying and asks pertinent questions, while all their comments are clearly recorded ... A range of interpretive material is used to encourage people to comment on issues of local concern. This is really a ‘listening session’ focusing on the community’s
views. As the *SpeakOut* progresses, the walls of the venue become covered with community views. (Sarkissian and Cook, 2005, p.7)

Nonetheless, Housing NSW tightly controlled the *SpeakOut* event in Bonnyrigg by setting the issues that were open for comment by public housing tenants. Certainly, public housing tenants were ‘allowed’ to speak out about any issue. However, the *SpeakOut* consultation process was structured around nine ‘Issues Stalls’ and “participants were able to visit each stall and make comments specifically about those issues” (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005e). Additionally, Housing NSW and Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) controlled the analysis and presentation of the consultation data by determining the data analysis method and reporting categories within the *SpeakOut* Consultation Report (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005e).

Equally, *Our Bonnyrigg Dream: Telling the planners what really matters* was a two-way mediated event, held over two days. One session was held at a local school and the other event was held a few days later at the local youth centre, in May 2005. Like the *SpeakOut* event, *Our Bonnyrigg Dream* was also informed by urban planning approaches to community consultation. The consultation event asked public housing tenants to ‘tell the planners what really matters’ around specific topic areas relating to a master plan for Bonnyrigg. However, the consultation event also had strong ‘capacity building’ themes, as outlined below by Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant):

The *Our Bonnyrigg Dream* workshops had four main aims: to expand awareness of ‘whole-community’ issues; to build community capacity; to build social capital; and to gather specific information about masterplanning criteria for the RDP. (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005a, p.7)

---

81 The nine stalls were: (1) What’s important to children in Bonnyrigg? (2) The Living Communities project for Bonnyrigg; (3) How to become involved; (4) Fairfield City Council planning; (5) What residents want for Bonnyrigg; (6) Community safety; (7) Parks, recreation, public open space; (8) Youth issues; (9) Rebuilding Bonnyrigg: Houses, roads and services (Sarkissian, 2009e, p.40).
Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) suggested that the Our Bonnyrigg Dream consultation event provided public housing tenants and other residents with input into the RDP and master-planning processes. This involvement, it was supposed, was facilitated by way of public housing tenants developing ‘whole-of-community’ master-planning concepts to guide BLCP governance processes relating to the RDP request in August 2005. Specifically, Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) suggested that:

The workshop program was designed to gather specific information for the future Bonnyrigg master plan. In particular, the workshops aimed to:

- Create guiding principles that reflected the community’s aspirations for the Master plan and can be incorporated into the RDP; and
- Develop guiding principles that can also serve as criteria and could be used to inform later assessment of draft Master Plans by the community and others. (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005a, p.9)

However, not only had many of the master-planning concepts been determined prior to BLCP announcement, but Housing NSW and Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) structured the Our Bonnyrigg Dream events with set topic areas relating to the BLCP. These included informing public housing tenants and others about the BLCP, conducting ‘visioning’ exercises to encourage public housing tenants and others to imagine a new Bonnyrigg, and ‘mapping’ exercises to record ‘social networks’ and community service needs to facilitate community building.

Additionally, Housing NSW and Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) controlled the analysis and presentation of the consultation data by determining the data analysis method and reporting categories within the Our Bonnyrigg Dream Consultation Report (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005a). Therefore, public housing tenants and other residents’ contributions were fragmented, commodified and represented to the private-sector contractors by Housing NSW on behalf of tenants, as ‘whole-of-
community’ master-planning concepts, within the private partner selection invited space.

As outlined above, following the Our Bonnyrigg Dream event, Housing NSW changed their approach to tenant involvement in Bonnyrigg. By July 2005, Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant) had ceased providing ‘community consultation’ services to Housing NSW and the private-sector contractors had not been short-listed. Therefore, the Request for Detailed Proposals had not been released to short-listed private-sector contractors as outlined in the EOI timetable, and Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council were establishing the Community Building Team in Bonnyrigg.

As part of this new approach, I began working on the Community Renewal Plan Preliminary Report (Rogers, 2005a) and was located in Bonnyrigg full-time, while the Community Building Team assumed responsibility for the design and implementation of ‘community engagement’ processes. The Community Renewal Plan Preliminary Report is a good example of how ‘community concerns’ and questions were fragmented, commodified and reimagined within the structures of the BLCP.

In this particular example, taken from mid-2005, I played a central role in the discursive process of fragmenting, commodifying and reimagining ‘community concerns’ by suggesting that:

This is a background report for the Bonnyrigg Community Renewal Plan. The report consolidates existing community consultation reports and demographic data with additional information collected through interviews with key stakeholders and service providers ... This report will assist the Community Building Team to identify issues and determine initiatives for development under the Bonnyrigg Community Renewal Plan. (Rogers, 2005a, p.4)

However, the report further realigned the ‘community consultation’ information with the aims of the BLCP and, specifically, the ‘community building’ aims
outlined in the Community Renewal Plan – so much so, that the four broad Community Renewal Plan areas in July 2005 structured the report’s scope:

- Community safety
- Health and wellbeing
- Education, training, employment, and economic development
- Recreation and neighbourhood life

(Rogers, 2005a, p.4)

Fairclough (2003, p.34) argues that

Part of the ‘filtering’ effect as we move along genre chains is on discourses: discourses which are drawn upon in one genre (e.g. meeting) may be ‘filtered out’ in the movement to another (e.g. report), so that the genre chain works as a regulatory device for selecting and privileging some discourses and excluding others.

The genres chain in the information and consultation stage, between December 2004 and July 2005, moved from promoting the BLCP to public housing tenants in information sessions, through tightly controlled consultation events, to a ‘filtering’ and ‘reporting’ process in mid-2005. Within this process of fragmenting, commodifying and reimagining the information and consultation session ‘data’, the information was reconfigured, amended and aligned with the broader aims of the BLCP.

This is perhaps best demonstrated by the What you’ve told us so far ‘community feedback’ event, held in August 2005. Like the Community Renewal Plan Preliminary Report, Housing NSW reconfigured the ‘community consultation’ information and presented it back to public housing tenants in the What you’ve told us so far text (see Figure 26-29 overleaf) by presenting the information as public housing tenants’ concerns and issues. This text also realigned the ‘community consultation’ information with the aims of the BLCP.
Figure 26 – The What you’re told us so far text, page 1

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2005b, p.1).
The Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project is about making the Bonnyrigg public housing estate a great place to live.

The project aims to make Bonnyrigg safer and more appealing, with better housing, public areas and services.

The Department of Housing and Fairfield City Council have conducted over 40 public sessions and activities to find out what the local community thinks about the project. The wide-ranging consultation program has included:

- the Bonnyrigg SpeakOut in April
- the two part "Our Bonnyrigg Dream" workshop in May
- a workshop for community stakeholders in February
- weekly BBQs in different parts of the estate, and
- a variety of meetings held in the main community languages

Over 1,500 people have shared their ideas about the renewal of Bonnyrigg since December 2004. The process has also included a residents’ survey, which more than 660 families completed. Bonnyrigg’s Community Reference Group and the Residents’ Group have also contributed valued advice.

Through these forums, a number of important messages from the local community have been gathered and are helping to shape the project. They provide valuable information to help guide the Department’s actions as it takes the next step of choosing a private partner for the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project.

Key Messages

Many people saw the project as a positive step for Bonnyrigg, as long as it:

- builds on the strengths of community life in Bonnyrigg;
- provides a range of housing options to meet the current and changing needs of Bonnyrigg residents;
- improves the feeling of safety in Bonnyrigg.

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2005b, p.2).
Maintaining community ties

- Maintaining the strong community connections in the area;
- Building housing so that as much as possible everyone who wants to stay in Bonnyrigg can do so;
- Providing community facilities to meet local needs.

Improving public spaces

- Creating parks and open spaces in Bonnyrigg that are safe, well equipped and usable for Bonnyrigg people;
- Redesigning streets to improve vehicle and pedestrian traffic flows.

Improving the design of housing

- Improving safety through good design that allows people to see the street and parks from their houses;
- Getting rid of the back-to-front “Radburn” design;
- Ensuring there are no obvious differences between public and private housing designs – and that the two are integrated throughout the estate;
- If apartments are to be built, they need to be well-designed, spacious and have good quality fittings.

Improving services and building a stronger community

- Addressing crime and safety problems;
- Providing better health services, child care, youth services and recreation;
- Providing education and training services, to help residents into the workforce.

Managing Change

- Planning rehousing to keep the disruption to families to a minimum;
- Providing support to residents who are anxious about moving;
- Talking to the community about issues like house design and masterplans.

Ongoing Commitment

The Department of Housing remains committed to the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project and is working in partnership at many levels to achieve the best outcome for the people of Bonnyrigg.

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2005b, p.3).
Figure 29 – The What you’re told us so far text, page 4

The next step

With the Community

Community Renewal Plan

A Bonnyrigg Community Renewal plan is being put together. It will look at how:

- Government agencies can improve their services for residents;
- residents can be supported to learn new skills;
- agencies and residents can build a strong community in Bonnyrigg.

Government agencies, community services, businesses and residents will work together to put the plan into action.

With the Private Sector

The Request for Detailed Proposals

The Government will issue a Request for Detailed Proposals outlining what it wants from the project, the services to be provided and the standards to be met.

For More Information

More information about the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project is available from:

- Department’s Bonnyrigg office on 9822 3999
- Department’s 24 hour Contact Centre on 1800 629 212

Interpreter Services

If you have difficulty understanding English, contact the Translating and Interpreting Service (TIS) on 131 450.

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2005b, p.4).
From August 2005, and without Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant), the Community Building Team moved to emphasise ‘community capacity building’ within the tenant involvement strategy. Housing NSW stated in August 2005, in a fact sheet issued to public housing tenants:

The consultation program now moves into a new phase through to the end of 2005, with fewer of the large-scale events and more emphasis on capacity building with residents who are already engaged. (NSW Department of Housing, 2005a, p.2)

This changed the way in which tenant involvement processes were designed and implemented. From August 2005, the tenant involvement processes were developed by mixing genres or creating genre hybrids (Fairclough, 2003, p.34). Additionally, a range of texts were now being brought together to develop and construct the ‘capacity building’ projects, what Fairclough (2003, p.34) describes as a process of interdiscursivity.

Instead of the solely promotional genre, as in the information sessions of early 2005, the ‘capacity building’ sessions also included a workshop environment with ‘community educators’ and ‘workshop participants’, typical of an educational setting. These were combined with a concluding social event, a ‘community feast’, typical of a business networking lunch. Housing NSW called this the Building the Dream workshop series (see Figure 30, the Building the Dream promotional material taken from a BLCP Newsletter, overleaf).

The Building the Dream workshop series departed from the urban planning model of ‘community consultation’ implemented earlier by Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant). By contrast, Housing NSW employed an adult educator, within the Community Building Team but located off-site, to develop “the workshop curriculum with inputs from experts in each topic area” (Coates et al., 2008, p.13).
master-planning process for the BLCP and was structured around the following master-planning principles: basic design and planning concepts; master-planning principles; open space, streetscape and built-form configurations; crime prevention design; and house design.

Figure 30 – Building the Dream promotional material: Workshops

Register now for upcoming workshops

Following the success of the first two Building the Dream workshops, the Department of Housing and Fairfield City Council are running new workshops in February, March and April. The new workshops will cover housing density, house and precinct design, planning parks and spaces for children and designing to prevent crime (see timetable on next page).

“We are expecting these new workshops to be very popular with Bonnyrigg residents as many who attended the first two Building the Dream workshops said that they would be coming along in 2006,” said Bernie Coates, Community Building Manager, NSW Department of Housing.

“The workshops are very relaxed - residents can try out their new skills, learn from each other and develop fresh ideas.”

The day time workshops will be held in the main community languages – English, Vietnamese, Lao, Spanish, Arabic and Khmer. The evening sessions will be in Vietnamese and English only.

Everyone who comes to the workshops will be presented with a ‘certificate of attendance’ on the day.

“Like all events that the Department and Council has held, these workshops are free and lunch or refreshments will be provided.”

Child care is available at the workshops – please let us know when you register.

Mr Chris Smith, Principal, Bonnyrigg Public School presented certificates to those who attended the workshop on 7 February. Over 200 residents attended the November workshops.

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2006b, p.2).

The adult educator worked with ‘experts’ – academics, architects and planners – to develop training packages for each workshop. Then the adult educator trained
Community Educators to deliver the workshops in different language groups, as outlined below:

Instead of using translators, a Bilingual Community Education (BCE) model was used. The BCE’s delivered the workshop series, having had training from an adult educator. The workshops were held in each of the main language groups and then all groups mixed over a light lunch, thereby adding to community capacity. The workshops were designed to suit prevocational learners and were highly participatory and informal and proved an effective tool for engagement in the 6 main language groups, in addition to English. (Coates et al., 2008, p.13)

I was the English-language ‘community educator’ for the Building the Dream workshops throughout 2005 and into 2006. Additionally, I developed the field trip program for the Building the Dream program. The field trips were designed to allow public housing tenants and other residents to “identify urban design concepts” (Coates et al., 2008, p.13) from the workshops in the built environment. Each field trip corresponded to a workshop topic and was conducted, where possible, soon after the workshop session. Therefore, the Building the Dream ‘capacity building’ project included the following events, as shown in the Table 7 below.

Table 7 – Building the Dream Capacity Building Project Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Site visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2005</td>
<td>How to read a plan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2005</td>
<td>Master-planning</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2006</td>
<td>Better parks and places for children</td>
<td>Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2006</td>
<td>Precinct design</td>
<td>House design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design to prevent crime (CPTED)</td>
<td>Precinct design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design to prevent crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2006</td>
<td>Housing density</td>
<td>Housing density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master-planned estate design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (from Coates et al., 2008; NSW Department of Housing, 2006a, 2007b).
The *Building the Dream* field trips also fitted within an educational format, with Community Educators leading workshop participants in language groups. However, public housing tenants and residents were also asked to comment on “what they liked and did not like” (Coates et al., 2008, p.13). The focus of the field trips was guided by the workshop content, and each language group recorded their ‘likes’ and ‘dislikes’ by taking photographs of elements of the built form. These photographs were collated for each language group and revisited in the next workshop session. Each field trip was concluded with a lunch at a local recreational club. Again, these field trips blended genres including promotional, educational and recreational formats and, although it was not altogether clear to me at the time, I was central to the discursive move to position these events within the confines of the BLCP, the market and the workings of capital (see the *Building the Dream* promotional material for the field trips, taken from a BLCP Newsletter, in Figure 31 below).

Figure 31 – Building the Dream promotional material: Field trips

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2006b, p.2).

Finally, the Community Building Team also conducted a series of strictly capacity building events in the second half of Phase 2 of the BLCP. These included, in November 2006, the Transcultural Mental Health (BCE) workshop (nine sessions, conducted in community languages), the Community Voice Counts (BCE)
workshop (nine sessions, conducted in community languages) and the Bonnyrigg is Growing Stronger (BCE) workshop (nine sessions, conducted in community languages). Then, in December 2006, the team conducted the Working Across Cultures (BCE) workshop (nine sessions, conducted in community languages).

**Representations: How Housing NSW defined community engagement**

In this section, the analysis shows how certain discourses, ways of representing, were enacted in the genres and genre chains outlined above (Fairclough, 2003), to demonstrate how the master discourses associated with urban renewal and social reform were incorporated into the BLCP texts that shaped ‘community engagement’. In the next section, the analysis shows how these texts were used to guide a range of social events, including consultation and information events. The Social Event section that follows highlights how these texts were received and responded to by public housing tenants and other social subjects.

*Privatisation and Partnership: Selling the Bonnyrigg Dream*

Throughout Phase 2 of the BLCP, the information and consultation events had the expressed aim of promoting the redevelopment project and addressing public housing tenants’ and other residents’ concerns. While the focus on providing information was more concentrated in the first 12 months, it continued throughout Phase 2 as a component of every ‘community engagement’ activity. This aim is encapsulated in a BLCP report, completed by Sarkissian Associates Planners (Community Consultation Consultant), covering the ‘information sessions and small-scale consultation activities’, concluding in July 2005 as outlined below (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005c):

The draft consultation plan ... outlined the types of consultation used to engage the broad community in understanding the Bonnyrigg Project (2005c, p.5).
The purpose of the consultation activities was extended to provide support to tenants as they came to realize the extent of the challenges posed by the renewal program (2005c, p.6). The small-group consultation activities succeeded in informing residents about the Living Communities Project by presenting information at all activities and addressing the questions and concerns raised by tenants and homeowners. (2005c, p.10)

Therefore, an important objective of the initial information sessions was to “build enthusiasm for the ... proposed renewal of Bonnyrigg” (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005d, p.4). To build this enthusiasm, Housing NSW provided public housing tenants and other residents with a rationale for the use of a private-sector contractor and the need to ‘reduce the concentration of public housing’ that was structured around the three ‘community renewal’ main objectives in the EOI: providing better services and creating new opportunities; building a stronger community; and renewal of houses and public areas (for the annotated list of the three main ‘community renewal’ objectives in the EOI, see Appendix 13).

Housing NSW stated, in one EOI objective, that providing better services and creating new opportunities would be achieved in the BLCP through “partnership with other agencies and community leaders” and by improving public housing tenants’ “education and skills” (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.9). In another ‘community renewal’ objective, the renewal of houses and public areas, Housing NSW suggested that ‘renewal’ would occur through “partnership with a Private Partner, Fairfield City Council and the community” (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.9).

However, while the EOI process was occasionally referred to in information sessions, the EOI text was not actively promoted or circulated to public housing tenants. Instead, a range of fact sheets, audiovisual presentations and other texts were presented to public housing tenants and other residents at these events. These three main ‘community renewal’ objectives continued to be reproduced in texts produced, distributed to public housing tenants and recounted in public events and meetings throughout Phase 2 (Rogers, 2011). At times, only the three headings were provided, while at other times, and in some texts, the annotated
‘community renewal’ objectives were quoted in full. An example including full annotation is the BLCP Fact Sheet (NSW Department of Housing, 2004d).

Importantly, the three ‘community renewal’ objectives became ‘key messages’ for BLCP staff working with public housing tenants and other residents. Staff briefing sessions for Housing NSW, Fairfield City Council staff and external consultants referred to these objectives and they were given BLCP texts to review before commencing projects. As a result, the ‘community renewal’ objectives were copied into many other texts and social sites. Housing NSW staff and Community Educators presented the ‘community renewal’ objectives in workshops and on-site visits. Housing NSW staff presented the objectives at housing conferences (Coates, 2007, 2008; Gilbertson and Shepard, 2008; Kavanagh, 2010) and they appeared as BLCP overviews in consultant and research reports (Rogers, 2005a, b, 2006; Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005a–c; Stubbs et al., 2005c).

These three key objectives became the narrative of the social problem and its solution, a plausible story about the problem-solution that was told and retold by a range of actors, both within and outside of Housing NSW. In the processes, Housing NSW developed a coalition of support for the BLCP and the narrative began to shape the programs that Housing NSW developed to address their articulated social problem (Jacobs et al., 2003, p.430).

The ‘key messages’ in Phase 2, taken from the master narrative of ‘community renewal’ being promoted by Housing NSW staff, the Community Building Team and external consultants, correlate closely to the three objectives. For BLCP staff, providing better services and creating new opportunities had come to mean ‘partnering’ with local services and the ‘community’ to help tenants into volunteer roles or employment. Building a stronger community had come to mean that the ‘community’ had high levels of disadvantage and needed renewing by promoting a reduction in the public housing tenure ratio, and building ‘social capital’ and ‘community

[82] ‘Key messages’ was a discursive term used within the Community Building Team to attempt to keep BLCP messages from staff consistent. The term also appeared on the What you’ve told us so far text provided above.
Finally, renewal of houses and public areas was associated with ‘partnering’ with the private sector to harness their expertise and experience (Rogers, 2011).

In Chapter 5, the analysis showed how the discourse of partnership was prevalent in the EOI and BLCP Fact Sheet texts prior to BLCP announcement. Throughout 2005, members of the Community Building Team were referring to public housing tenants as ‘partners’ in meetings and public events (Rogers, 2011). By August 2005, Housing NSW had begun referring to public housing tenants as ‘partners’ in texts. The following is taken from the BLCP Frequently Asked Questions text:

New community groups have also been established – the Community Reference Group – the Bonnyrigg Residents Group who are now active partners in the project. (NSW Department of Housing, 2005a)

These types of statements by Housing NSW bolstered the expectation, on the ground, that public housing tenants would become, or may already have been, partners in the BLCP. Subsequently, Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council staff, as well as external consultants, promoted these messages to public housing tenants in the information sessions and workshops. Each workshop began with a question and answer session to ‘address community concerns’, as outlined in the BLCP Newsletter citation provided below, circulated to residents in July 2006. Housing NSW stated, quoting a Bilingual Community Educator (BCE) and Fairfield City Council employee, that

“As residents become more involved in the project, they are becoming more confident about speaking up about their concerns. They also understand that the Department is listening to them,” said Hanh [BCE]. “The BCE’s have to do a lot of work before each workshop including a three hour training session and most do extra homework to make 100% sure they can answer all the questions raised by residents,” said Lesley Unsworth, Place Manager with Fairfield City Council. (NSW Department of Housing, 2006c, p.1)

When asked questions about the ‘private partner’ in workshops, Community Educators incorporated the messages about partnership and a private-sector
contractor who would be required to ‘listen to community views’ into the **question and answer** sessions. I certainly responded to questions about the private-sector contractor by informing tenants that the successful ‘private partner’ would be required, by contract, to ‘take the community’s views onboard’ (Rogers, 2011). Managing the **question and answer** sessions in the workshops, by referring to the BLCP Frequently Asked Questions text and BLCP Fact Sheet, was part of the training I received for the role. This training and learning process is also evident in the quote above, outlined in this example by another Bilingual Community Educator.

In the picture overleaf (see Figure 32 overleaf), taken from the July 2006 BLCP Newsletter, I am explaining the BLCP timeline to residents following growing concerns amongst residents that the BLCP was taking too long. In the same text, Housing NSW suggested, “the Department answered many questions asked by tenants” in the *Building the Dream* workshops (NSW Department of Housing, 2006d, p.2). However, in this text Housing NSW only listed the questions and answers relating to the workshop topic, not broader and more challenging questions to which I turn in the following section. These include BLCP timeframes and urban redevelopment by private-sector contractors. Housing NSW’s list of questions, in this case relating to public housing tenant relocations resulting from the BLCP, are clearly about reducing public housing tenant concerns and facilitating the rehousing process. These questions were not about involving public housing tenants in the BLCP in terms of citizen power.

Implicitly or not, these events were about building public housing tenants’ capacity to be rehoused and their understandings about the complexity of implementing redevelopment projects involving a private-sector contractor. In these workshops, and despite the intentions of Community Educators and other staff, and however well conceived or otherwise, the master discourses of partnership, privatisation and a moral underclass of public housing tenants were shaping how social subjects developed programs and engaged with public housing tenants.
This is the power of neo-liberal spaces; in these spaces, power is most effective when it is hidden from view. Social subjects work on themselves, and self-regulate their own actions towards ends that they may not even conceive and with which they may not agree (Foucault, 1969, 2001; Lemke, 2001). The next section highlights these discursive processes, this time turning to the neo-communitarian and social integrationist discourses incorporated into community building in the BLCP.
In 2008, Housing NSW had taken the information sessions, the capacity building programs, the consultation events and the discourse of partnership and presented them as a coherent ‘community engagement’ strategy. Like the *Wheel of Participation*, this ‘community engagement’ approach was no longer about citizen power, resource allocations and citizenship; instead, it was about completing a set of functions or activities within four broad areas, similar to the four quadrants of the *Wheel of Participation*.83

Although the ‘community engagement’ schema, shown below, does have a linear progression, the schema’s orientation to citizen power was compartmentalised and fragmented and the progression seemed to follow Housing NSW’s implementation timeline for the programs as much as any other factor. In 2008, the Community Building Team (Coates et al., 2008, p.3) described ‘community engagement’ as follows (see Appendices 13 and 14):

The Living Communities approach signifies an integrated response to the social and physical environments in estates. The approach has three simple core objectives:

1. Providing better services and opportunities for residents
2. Building a stronger community
3. Renewing the houses and public areas

... in Bonnyrigg [community engagement] denoted a more complex set of functions and activities. The project adopted the following working definition for community engagement:

activities and processes that seek to inform affected people about the project, include them in project decision making structures, consult them about their views, involve them, where possible, in decision making, provide opportunities and support for residents to participate in community projects, committees and events and partner with them on specific aspects of the project. This has entailed significant capacity building to provide them with

---

83 The *Wheel of Participation*’s four quadrants are as follows: Information; Consultation; Participation; Empowerment (Davidson, 1998).
the skills and confidence to enable local people to make a meaningful contribution to the project.
(Coates et al., 2008, p.3; emphasis in original)

Housing NSW represented this approach to ‘community engagement’ diagrammatically as shown in Figure 33 below:

Figure 33 – Housing NSW Schema for ‘community engagement’ in the BLCP

Source: Coates et al. (2008, p.3).

In short, by providing public housing tenants with information about the project and building community capacity, it was assumed that public housing tenants would gain “the skills and confidence ... to make a meaningful contribution to the project” (Coates et al., 2008, p.3). A degree of citizen power would be realised, assuming that was the aim of these processes, by providing information, consultation events and capacity building programs. Therefore, these functions and activities became ends in themselves.

This approach to ‘community building’ was clearly informed by the prevailing commitment to social capital theory, largely influenced by structural functionalism, that was prevalent in urban policy guiding urban redevelopment projects in the early to middle 2000s, but lingered on through the decade. Developing social capital and social cohesion, as posited by Putman (1993, 1995, 1996) and others, was commonly cited as a BLCP aim in texts from Phases 1 and 2. In Phase 1, there are the following examples from the EOI:

The tenant and community outcomes that the Department is seeking to achieve are as follows: ... Actively promote social cohesion, the development of social networks and social interaction in the Estate. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c, p.11)
In the Baseline Study commissioned and scoped by Housing NSW, one of the four main study objectives was to “establish baseline data on social cohesion in the community” (Stubbs et al., 2005c). Despite the difficulties of defining ‘social cohesion’, let alone measuring the construct, some theoretical attention was given to the problem in the study:

In terms of temporal comparisons, the survey provides an opportunity to undertake a longitudinal study of the effects of estate renewal on Bonnyrigg; for example, on any changes in the perceptions and life experiences of residents as their community changes, or they are relocated to other areas (changes in what may be termed ‘social cohesion’). (Stubbs et al., 2005c, p.20)

However, due to the scope of the study and a commitment to the social capital thesis by Housing NSW, the study did report on social capital and social cohesion indicators as outlined below:

Again, this provides a sound foundation for the types of co-operative work that will be required during the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg, and described by Putnam (1995) who talks of ‘social capital’ as ‘working cooperatively for the benefit of all’, or the ‘dedication of individual time and resources’ a common goal. (Stubbs et al., 2005b, p.149)

Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council also commissioned other ‘studies’ focused on linking the social capital thesis to their capacity building programs throughout Phase 2 of the BLCP. These included the following short research projects conducted in 2006 by the University of Western Sydney:


Also see: *The ‘Mens Shed’ Initiative and Bonnyrigg* (Rogers, 2005b); and *Economic Development Strategy: Bonnyrigg* (Rogers, 2006).
As the report names suggest, these research projects were scoped within the community building and social capital debates implicit in the discursive politics of public housing redevelopment projects both locally and internationally. This commitment to the prevailing urban ‘renewal’ rhetoric is as equally relevant to neo-communitarian and social integrationist discourses, which were also deeply embedded in the BLCP texts from Phase 2. However, it should be noted that the discursive framing of these two reports and others was inherited as much from wider policy debates within Australia, especially those relating to welfare provision and the use of the market for the provision of social services, as from international policy prescriptions relating to urban renewal *per se*.

These broader neo-communitarian and social integrationist inspired debates provided the schema for the discursive framing of the Bonnyrigg public housing estate, public housing tenants and welfare provision in the BLCP texts, including the EOI and Summary of Contracts texts. The following analysis focuses specifically on these two texts, as they provided the guidance and instruction for the tangible aspects of the BLCP bidding process, including the scope to which the private-sector contractors were responding in their bid.
Social event: The creation of parallel invited spaces

As a result of the fundamental differences between the public and private sectors ... parties never approach the PPP contract table with open minds nor with a sense that they are starting discussions on equal terms. Opposing negotiations teams enter the ‘position idealising’ stage with an idealistic view of what they hope to achieve in the final contract for the benefit of their own organisation. (Noble, 2006, p.227)

In this section, the analysis turns to how the texts outlined above shaped the social events and social actors throughout Phase 2 of the BLCP. At this level of the analytical process, the focus is on styles or ways of being (see Table 3 on page 120). Therefore, there is a focus on the subjective aspects of the discursive strategies deployed by the various social actors.

The analysis looks at how the identity and subjectivity of the social subjects shaped how narratives were created about particular aspects of the BLCP, especially when these representations and narratives were in conflict with other discursive constructions and representations of the same process. In these cases, the identity of the social subjects and their subjectivity played an important role in how they identified with, rejected, amended or borrowed various discursive features of the texts. In these cases, the social subjects were making subjective and interest-laden judgements about BLCP texts.

The analysis is particularly interested in how the identity of public housing tenants, private-sector staff, local residents, journalists and other social actors shaped their responses, either by producing new texts in external spaces or copying BLCP texts, or even through non-action or protest. Furthermore, in Phase 2 of the BLCP, the coordination of time and space became important factors within the redevelopment project, following the development of more complex relationships between the various invited spaces.
Harvey (1996, 1990) and Fairclough (2003, p.151) argue that time and space are social constructs and therefore “are differently constructed in different societies, change in their construction is part of social change, and constructions of space and time are contested”. Therefore our experiences of time and space, relative to place, are important areas for analysis. In Bonnyrigg, Housing NSW defined the subjects and objects of the intervention. Housing NSW invited one demarcation of social subjects into a particular invited space, while demarcating others and excluding them, or inviting them into different spaces.

Consequently, social subjects involved in Phase 2 of the BLCP experienced this broad temporal location through the spaces into which they were invited, and with different spatio-temporalities. Each social subject’s experience of time, it seems, was constructed by more than the passing of minutes, days, weeks and years. A key constituent of their experience of time was bound by the spaces into which they were invited, but also by their biography and subjectivity. Helen Jarvis (2011, p.3) argues that our lived experience, recollections and personal narratives of the temporal dimension of our own biography are important, for these “bear witness to intimate details and experiences of social and demographic change”.

Jarvis (2011, p.3) outlines four constructions of time relating to biographical research that are useful for this analysis:

The temporal dynamic may simply represent history (change over time), chronological sequence (events and transitions), historical vintage (the legacy of living with a particular type of house and construction), or a more complex cultural understanding of rhythm and pace beyond the calendar and clock ... it may focus on the sequence of events and characteristics of a particular transition ... tracing all the points of coordination (in time and space) that join up the elements of home, work, and personal life.

To better understand how various social subjects experienced space (including invited spaces) and time in Phase 2 of the BLCP, the analysis will utilise the four temporal distinctions outlined above. This section therefore seeks to prepare the
socio-political landscape to allow the analytical focus to move to the pivot point, the construct on which power and decision-making was balanced in the BLCP, in subsequent chapters.

In the context of contestation between the right of public housing tenants, as citizens, to be involved in the political decisions that affect their lives, and the inherent logic of market-centric conceptions of urban governance that aim to ‘let the market decide’, the history (Jarvis, 2011, p.3) of the Bonnyrigg public housing estate and public housing policy more generally in Australia are certainly important (see Chapter 3). However, the chronological sequence (Jarvis, 2011, p.3) of events and transitions in the BLCP case is also a significant consideration and is outlined diagrammatically in Figure 34 overleaf.

This micro-level spatio-temporal representation of Phase 2 of the BLCP will be used to show how the historical vintage (Jarvis, 2011, p.3) – the legacy of living in, or managing, public housing – shaped social subjects’ biography and subjectivities and therefore their spatio-temporal experiences in the BLCP. But perhaps the most important time–space consideration in Phase 2 was the cultural understanding, “the rhythm and pace beyond the calendar and clock” (Jarvis, 2011, p.3), through which social subjects constructed and/or participated in the various invited spaces in the BLCP. This is the core focus of the following section, a focus on the rhythm and pace of the everyday lives of the various social subjects, whether they were employees of the state completing a work role or tenants of the state living out their daily lives while being drawn into new social sites and experiences.
Figure 34 - BLCP Phase 2: Micro-level timeline with social subjects and invited spaces
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Implementation and reception of the discursive strategy: ‘Community engagement’ and the invisible ‘private partner’

There was a clear disconnect between how public housing tenants experienced the passing of time in Phase 2 of the BLCP when compared to the experiences of Housing NSW staff and private-sector contractors. The chronological sequence (Jarvis, 2011) of the ‘community engagement’ strategy, compared to the processes running in a parallel invited space to select the ‘private partner’, were incongruous. Soon after BLCP project announcement, public housing tenants became anxious about the lack of information being provided about the timeframe for the BLCP, the selection of the ‘private partner’ and the impacts on their families. Sarkissian and Associates (Community Consultation Consultants) reported from the mid-2005 Our Bonnyrigg Dream event that:

Tenants were more demanding in this set of sessions. The shock of the initial announcement had passed, the holidays were over ... people wanted direct answers to direct questions. The emphasis was still on individual people with individual concerns, however. Few people were able to consider issues relating to the wider Bonnyrigg community. Their focus, understandably, was on their own household or family. (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005a, p.13)

Meanwhile, the Housing NSW team charged with selecting the private-sector contractor were time poor, busy issuing the Request for Expressions of Interest, short-listing private-sector contractors and soliciting their Detailed Proposals. Throughout Phase 2, public housing tenants and other residents were asking questions in their invited space about the private-sector contractor selection process. Public housing tenants were given very little information about this process, leaving one public housing tenant to propose, in a 2006 focus group:

“They said they will choose a company. They’ve got two companies and they’ll choose one. Let them choose and finish with it!” (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.62)
While another public housing tenant suggested:

“People are worrying, and you made a comment yourself Mary:85 ‘Oh, will we go, will I get a house, will I be able to accommodate myself, what if something happens to my husband? When it all first started off, we thought these were immediate things to be concerned about. Obviously as it's going on, from my point of view, it's [priority is] still way down there somewhere”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.62)

Certainly, Housing NSW and their community consultation consultants provided public housing tenants and other residents with a broad selection of information about the BLCP in Phase 2. Indeed, the information available would appear to have exceeded that provided to other public housing tenants involved in other neighbourhood redevelopments projects around that time in NSW (Stubbs et al., 2005a). However, there was specific information that could not be communicated to local residents accurately due to either commercial-in-confidence stipulations or simply because Housing NSW did not know, or could not predict with any certainty, the answers to some questions.

Further, as Housing NSW was designing and co-locating both the macro-level invited spaces operating in parallel in Phase 2, Housing NSW staff was privy to both: the complex issues and selection processes operating in the ‘private partner’ selection space; and the rising concerns and requests from public housing tenants and other residents in the ‘community engagement’ space.

Importantly, these two invited spaces had different space–time\textsuperscript{86} dimensions – different ways in which constructions of space and constructions of time were brought together (Fairclough, 2003). Fairclough (2003, p.151) argues that in any “social order, there will be different co-existing space–times” and these can be

\textsuperscript{85}Not the participant’s real name.

\textsuperscript{86}Stephen Hawking (1998) popularized the term ‘space-time’ in the late 1980s in \textit{A brief history of time}. While Hawking was discussing the science of the universe in this book, he also developed the idea of socially constructed time; he stated: “This might suggest that the so-called imaginary time is really the real time, and that what we call real time is just a figment of our imaginations ... So maybe what we call imaginary time is really more basic, and what we call real time is just an idea that we invent to help us describe what we think the universe is like ... So it is meaningless to ask: which is real, ‘real’ or ‘imaginary’ time?” (pp.147-8)
brought or chained together and built into social practices – although in the BLCPP case, the two invited spaces coexisted in parallel for a period of time. Therefore, spatio-temporalities are interlinked with particular social relations and social identities (Fairclough, 2003). In Invited Space 2 – Selection of the private partner, the social relations and the social identities of the social subjects were constructed around the BLCPP financial and contracting functions. While in Invited Space 3 – Community Engagement, the social relations and the social identities were constructed around a physical site and the lived experience of social subjects, no doubt defined by housing tenure type, but connected more importantly to the physical space by memories of the past, questions about the present and concerns about the future.

Harvey (1996, p.242) uses the term ‘space–time compression’ in an almost metaphysical sense by drawing on the philosophical work of Leibniz (1695)\(^7\) and Heidegger (1927), but also the more applied\(^8\) work of Lefebvre (1991), to which Harvey is perhaps more closely related. Harvey attempts to capture the ‘collapse’ of social space and time; and the more applied aspects of Harvey’s (1996, p.242) ‘space–time compression’ are useful here, for they bring into focus the “objective qualities of social space and time” and their connection to the local and global. In Invited Space 2 – Selection of the private partner, the space was chained together to other space–times and built into globalised social practices of private contracting and financing with long procurement timelines.

By contrast, in Invited Space 3 – Community Engagement, the space was chained together to other space–times, but built into the localised social practices of public housing estate management, where public housing tenants wanted immediate answers to questions that would have a significant effect on their lives. Housing NSW was forced to mediate between these local/global, short-term/long-term and financial/interpersonal social practices when they chained together these two

---

\(^7\) Leibniz argued against the suggestion that time and space were absolute by suggesting that they were relative. See, for instance Leibniz (1695).

\(^8\) Certainly, the term applied is used here by way of comparison to Leibniz and Heidegger, with Lefebvre bringing conceptions of philosophical and real space together in the ‘real world’.
invited spaces (space–times), since different social subjects were invited into each space and the time compression was not always spatially comparable across these sites.

In short, Housing NSW was time poor in the globalised space–time of private contracting and financing (Invited Space 2) and was busy attempting to secure a private-sector contractor as BLCP procurement milestones failed to be realised. Meanwhile, in the localised community engagement spaces (Invited Space 3) they appeared time rich, running additional capacity building projects in attempts to ‘keep the community engaged’ and to ameliorate the frustration and uncertainty articulated by public housing tenants, as in the following statement:

“It’s frustrating! Two years now and we don’t even know who is going to do it [the redevelopment], or who [private partner] is going to run it.” (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.58)

One of the clearest examples of Housing NSW’s attempt to mediate between these two conflicting spatio-temporalities was demonstrated by their timeless timeline (see Figure 35 on page 241). Throughout Phase 2 public housing tenants and other residents became increasingly concerned when BLCP milestones were not realised (see Table 6 on page 182). Typical comments included:

“To reduce stress, the project has to speed up the process, and the community should be kept informed all the time”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.58)

“A lot of them [community engagement activities] are positive and some parts are negative, because they keep changing their minds. They keep changing the answers when we ask the same question”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.58)

The Community Building Team identified this as a ‘key community concern’ and as Phase 2 progressed, public housing tenants became increasingly frustrated by the changing messages and timeframes being offered by Housing NSW staff in the ‘community engagement’ events (Rogers, 2006a, 2011). By 2006, public housing
tenants were sceptical of the timelines and messages being provided by Housing NSW staff in ‘community engagement’ processes, as exemplified below by one public housing tenant:

"[We want] something more positive. Not ‘we might do this in January, or we may do this, or now we’ve changed our mind, it will be a further six years down the track’. Half of them [community members] won’t participate for that very reason. It’s always being delayed. They [community members] want to know, the majority of people in this particular housing suburb want to know what’s going to happen to them tomorrow, not two years from now". (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.57)

or this comment from another public housing tenant:

“We went to the [capacity building] workshop before, and talked a lot to the social worker [Bilingual Community Educator], and we can’t get the answer yet. We told her we’re very worried. We asked when are we going to move and when are we going to come back? She said “no worry, just relax, up to 1 year, or more than 1 year”. That’s why, when they say next week we are having a meeting or a workshop, we just worry what’s going on, or what is happening”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, pp.62-63)
Figure 35 – BLCP timeless timeline

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2006e)
In response to these concerns, in 2006 Housing NSW created the Bonnyrigg Living Communities timeline that, due to the unpredictability of the private-sector contractor selection processes (Invited Space 2) and the increased frustration of the public housing tenants (Invited Space 3), did not contain any dates or time references (see Figure 35 on page 241). However, the timeless timeline became a discursive tool in the mitigation strategy that was deployed in June 2006 through the community capacity building workshops, as shown in the Newsletter on page 227 (see Figure 32 on page 227). In this newsletter, I am pictured attempting to appease a group of public housing tenants who have concerns about the protracted timing of the BLCP.

Their concerns and questions related to the rhythm and pace of the spaces into which they had been invited: as time had passed and the focus had moved from ‘information sessions’ to ‘capacity building’, they had not been privy to the private partner selection process and were becoming cynical of the public–private partnership model. The community consultation consultant articulated this as follows:

Residents wanted to know what would happen to them: Would there be compensation for the improvements they had made to their house? Where would they be located? They challenged the notion that DoH did not already have a plan. They questioned the role of the Private Partner and found it difficult to understand how DoH would allow the Private Partner to prepare the future plan for Bonnyrigg. (Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005a, p.13)

This passing of time, the progression of the BLCP, was experienced by public housing tenants and other residents in Phase 2 as a long process of meetings, events and information sessions in which they were constantly seeking to clarify information and understand the redevelopment process that would be guided by the public–private partnership, as shown below:

*All of us are saying, everybody is saying, that we don’t want to live in stress any more. We are very tired and we need to know what is going to happen. Don’t show us pictures of things and tell us we’re not going to do it. Don’t show us plans and say
we're not going to do it. Just tell us what you are going to do”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.61)

“Too many workshops we went to, [I'm] quite tired, but we can't get answers yet”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.57)

“A lot of questions that are answered to our satisfaction, not just me, others [agree] as well, are changed down the track”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.57)

The above quotes from public housing tenants highlight the tension between the financial and interpersonal social practices made manifest in these diverse invited spaces: the conflict between the lived experiences of public housing tenants being drawn into the redevelopment of their public housing estate by public–private partnership, and the mechanics of procuring a private-sector contractor and finance. This sentiment is perhaps more clearly articulated below by two comments from long-term residents of the public housing estate:

“My children will come and say they want to bring something home, and they say, "mum, when we are going to move, didn't they tell you!" [I say] Don't ask me this question anymore”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.57)

“Your life is really in their hands”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.53)

The tensions between the financial and interpersonal social practices were further strained in late 2006 when a private-sector company contracted to undertake another public–private partnership in Sydney, the Cross City Tunnel, went into receivership. The failure of this project sparked a Parliamentary Inquiry and attracted broad media attention throughout Australia, focused on the outstanding debt and the role of government in both the collapse of the company and possible bailouts. The Australian national broadcaster (ABC, 2006, p.1) reported that the public–private partnerships had accrued $560 million worth of debts, while the Sydney Morning Herald reported the “Government's decision to reopen 13 roads without the company’s consent – triggering legal action – ... The whole thing has
been a disaster” (Baker et al., 2006, p.1). This further exacerbated the concerns that public housing tenants held regarding the private-sector contractor and the redevelopment of their Estate by public–private partnership, as shown below:

“I’m afraid of [one of the private-sector companies] taking over the thing, because, as we’ve see on the news, they’ve got out of things they really should have done, and they’ve changed things to have their own way, and that’s my fear, that they’ll change it to their very own way, what they want. And they’ve got the money to pay the fines and whatever”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.68)

“These private partners or whatever they’re called, have got millions upon millions of dollars, and they can tie this development up for the next 20 years, and they can argue with the department and keep taking them to court, and they can really screw it. What about the Cross City Tunnel, the Lane Cove Tunnel, the M5, everything they’ve been involved in with a private partner has been screwed”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, pp.67–68)

Clearly, public housing tenants had concerns about the BLCP and the urban governance model throughout Phase 2:

“There are too many differences between the private company and the Government [Housing NSW]. The Government [Housing NSW] has a close connection to the people. The people can live in the same house, everything is the same. We will be more separate from the private company’s ideas and opinions”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.67)

An interesting question must therefore be posed: Why didn’t Housing NSW staff working on the ground also have serious concerns about the BLCP? The answer to this question has two dialectally connected parts. First, a Foucauldian might suppose that we were subjugated and self-regulating citizens, a technology of power deployed by the state to manage a population (Foucault, 1975). That is, we had been so taken by the discursive construction of the problem-solution we were espousing through our community engagement work that we had in turn come to believe the problem-solution narrative ourselves. There may, as it turns out, be some legitimacy to this argument, but certainly not a complete answer.

89 The Cross City Tunnel, Lane Cove Tunnel and the M5 are transit public-private partnership projects.
90 It is possible that a Foucauldian might make this claim; it is perhaps less likely that Foucault would.
Here resides the second and more complex component of this ethical dilemma for on-the-ground staff. The construction of the problem-solution, not controlled by any single social subject or entity, or not restricted to a single definition, and certainly not complete in the sense that it had reached discursive closure, was experienced as part fact, part fiction, altogether part urban myth and part social reality on the ground. I, for one, took some aspects at face value to be legitimate, and rejected others outright as discursively constructed for political purposes and altogether false, or at least implausible. But accepting and rejecting individual discursive features of the BLCP was no simple task, as the public housing tenants had found out. Even when they talked frankly at a SpeakOut event, it seems that their voice was regulated by the discursive space that now surrounded the BLCP.

Accepting or rejecting one part of the problem-solution pulled other aspects into question. Challenging or resisting independent aspects of the problem or solution, providing different perspectives, contrasting conventional (controversial) wisdom or seeking diverse conclusions only served to shock the discursive machine into action. By this, I mean that new social subjects or social entities stepped in, sometimes from close by and at other times from afar, to shore up the discursive strategy. Certainly the chaining together of the two invited spaces (space–times) played a central role, with the discursive strategy now intersecting with the local and global, short-term and long-term, and financial and interpersonal social practices outlined above.

We have already seen above that public housing tenants challenged the problem-solution narrative on issues including: timeframes; using the private sector and market-centric urban policy to redevelop their Estate; the success of the community engagement strategy; and a host of concerns relating to unanswered questions. The analysis now moves to include more social subjects in an attempt to bring to the surface a more nuanced, but certainly not complete, picture of the subtle ways in which neo-liberalised spaces control and constrain social subjects.
The raison d’être, if you like, for exposing the numerous and diverse techniques for activating the subjugations of bodies and the control of populations is (Knights and Vurdubakis, 1994), on my reading of Foucault (1975), to facilitate resistance against these same techniques. Foucault contends:

That power relations do indeed ‘serve’, but not at all because they are ‘in service of’ an economic interest ... there are no relations of power without resistances; the latter are all the more real and effective because they are formed right at the point where relations of power are exercised ... It exists all the more by being at the same place as power; hence, like power, resistances are multiple ... (Foucault, 1980, p.142)

I would like to take this concept of multiple resistances coexisting with, but not in binary opposition to, power to discuss different manifestations of social subject resistance in Phase 2. One account from the BLCP that disrupted the subjugated techniques outlined above and redirected my attention to resistance is the process through which I came to research public housing tenant participation with tenants in Bonnyrigg. However, I do not refer here to my own resistance per se, but more to the resistance of public housing tenants and other BLCP staff to the BLCP – to which, due to my unique role within the BLCP, I was privy.

No amount of discursive manoeuvring could have challenged the raw but powerful questioning that public housing tenants directed towards me in the community engagement spaces. When I facilitated capacity building sessions, armed with a BLCP Fact Sheet and a timeless timeline ready for delivery, public housing tenants had their own agenda and questioned me and other staff directly and with authority. The quote below is typical of this type of challenge:

“I am bitterly resentful that this guy could just dream up this idea, let’s deprive Bonnyrigg residents of their homes”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Darcy, 2010, p.16)
Other common questions included:

Will the private company talk and listen to the community?
   Why can't I talk to the private company?
   When will I see the Master Plan?
   When will I have to move?
   What guarantee do we have that the private company will listen to the community’s views?

(Rogers, 2006a, p.40)

Public housing tenants ignored the problem-solution narrative or challenged it outright, and in most cases their questions could not be answered directly. Instead, more generic, and in many cases premeditated, answers were given, such as the standard reply to questions about public housing tenant involvement in the BLCP: “The private company will be accountable under contractual terms to ‘engage’ the community” (Rogers, 2006a, p.40). These types of interactions and questions from public housing tenants prompted my 2006 Honours research study.

However, what the 2006 study found – and contrary to my expectations following the experiences outlined above – was that public housing tenants, for the most part, had indeed resigned themselves to the private-sector contractor by late 2006 (Rogers, 2006a, p.40). One public housing tenant stated:

“From the information we’ve been told, we have been told that they [private partner] have to work with us and this is in part of the thing [contract] that’s been set up. That they have to, and if it means they have to go back to the drawing board, but they have to work with us. So if that’s true, that’s good”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.56)

Resistance and power, it seemed, were collocating in the BLCP and no single work of resistance – a stream of questions in a community workshop by public housing tenants – could dislodge the discursive power of the BLCP. Instead, it
would take a coalition of resistance to challenge the power structures of the BLCP and the social subjects and social entities that it now represented: a concerted and organised program of resistance by public housing tenants, as opposed to a collection of resistant comments and questions disconnected from a program consolidating these acts (deFilippis, 2001; deFilippis et al., 2006; Foucault, 1975; Shragge, 2003). As this public housing tenant remarked:

“With knowledge you have power and I think that’s what it comes down to, we need more knowledge of what’s going on. Then we have more control over what you can do. You all work together as a group and you can change things”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.56)

Here, the work of social subject employees of the state, subtle work that was possibly invisible to the social subjects themselves, including myself, of fragmenting, commodifying and reimagining public housing tenants resistances – community views – in terms of the discursive strategy of the BLCP – consultation reports – can be viewed most clearly as a technology of power. The subtle nature of these discursive strategies is hard to capture empirically and is perhaps better demonstrated in the BLCP by staff members’ resistance to this technology of power.

In mid-2006, the Community Building Team commissioned two short collaborative research projects: The Building of Social Capital through Bilingual Community Education: A Case Study of the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project Capacity Building Sessions (Kamminga, 2006) and the Bonnyrigg Building Communities – Review of Processes (Stevens, 2006a). In both cases, the University of Western Sydney researcher was based within the team, and in the case of the second report, the author also began working for the Community Building Team, running community events and workshops. Further, the author of the second report would go on to hold a senior position with the private-sector contractor on the ground in Phase 3 of the BLCP.
The reports themselves are of good quality and within the scope of the report brief provided by the Community Building Team. However, it was the report brief and the disciplining affects on social subjects of the BLCP space against which the author of the second report mounted resistance. The author writes in a *Researcher’s Reflections* paper on the short research project:

As an exercise in self-reflection ... I believe that the purpose of my research project did not lend itself to critical analysis. A requirement to produce $3 \times 2–3$ page documents for use as promotional material generates a pressure to bias the findings toward positive outcomes and to minimalise any issues. (Stevens, 2006b, p.1)

Further, the author goes on to discuss the disciplining effects on social subjects within the BLCP space:

I found myself conflicted about how to present issues ... I perceived that other team members were also affected by this pressure. Many comments have been made outside of the bounds of the interviews that suggest that some team members do not feel that criticality is welcomed ... I make this observation with a concern that mine might seem to be the only voice of dissent and that my findings will be seen as ungrounded. (Stevens, 2006b, p.1)

Then the author describes the technology of power with some precision:

There were suggestions that, for the sake of continuity, my report should conform to what had been written in other reports ... The fact that the report tells the story from the team’s perspective limits its validity as a tool for critical analysis ... I have seen several instances of this inward focused review methodology within the broader scope of project evaluations. Success is often measured by recording the views of internal stakeholders without a pre-determined set of measures on which to make evaluations, adequate recording or external input ... As an outsider, this information is vital to a full understanding of the milieu in which the team was operating ... (Stevens, 2006b, pp.1–2)

The result, argues the author of this report, was a synthesising and distilling of information in line with the discursive strategy of the BLCP:
It was impossible to distil the opinions of team members into a coherent document without disregarding people’s opinions. This issue has also been raised for the BLCP generally. (Stevens, 2006b, p.1)

Finally, the author concludes by calling into question the discursive strategy, developed and deployed by a whole host of social subjects, in the BLCP:

Although the interview process allowed individual team members to debrief, there was no process ... to review the findings and discuss any disparities such as the fundamental issue of the definition of building community engagement ... The fact that the definition, aims, objectives and measures for evaluation of community engagement are not clearly stated in any documentation makes critical analysis a challenge ... The fact that after two years of operation, there are still no agreed upon measures of success is a real concern to any researcher trying to evaluate this project. How can we talk about what we’ve learnt if we don’t know what we are setting out to achieve? (Stevens, 2006b, pp.1–2)

Certainly, the experience of managing my 2006 Honours research project, which coincidentally ran in parallel to the research project noted above, mirrors this authors’ account. Neither report (Rogers, 2006b; Stevens, 2006a), both of which offered in part a critical reflection of our own practice, served its author well within the Community Building Team. Both reports called into question aspects of the broader BLCP problem-solution narrative, and my research in particular was driven by questions that developed in the field through my interactions with public housing tenants.

In this space, the contribution of Foucault’s (1994) theorising of bio-power is insightful. Foucault shows that power and resistance are not to be viewed as binary constructs that are inversely proportional to each other, but instead how they co-locate in the same space in subtle ways. In this way, public housing tenants can be both subject to the discursive power of the BLCP and mounting resistance against it, in subtle ways, at the same time. The questions I received in the community workshops are examples of this subtle resistance, a small but
important challenge to the discursive power of the BLCP – an alternative narrative, a submission to power and at the same time a resistance against it, such as the following comment by a public housing tenant about the community workshops:

“Most of us have done the workshops and so you have some idea of what should happen. They [private partner] think they're just handling just ordinary people that are at home, they don’t think we've done the workshops. By doing the workshops, a lot of us have a much better idea about how things will happen. So if we’re not given the opportunity [to participate] then the workshops have been just useless. If we’re not given that opportunity to do that then, then all the meetings and all the workshops have been a waste of money”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.56)

This understanding of power/resistance is possibly a productive way to conceptualise both the resignation to the private sector on behalf of public housing tenants combined with their expectation to be involved in the BLCP once the private-sector contractor has taken control. This sentiment is articulated more clearly in the following two quotes:

“We want to meet them [private partner] regularly. I don’t want a 'once every blue-moon' and they stand there and show us what they want to do! We want to work with them. I don’t want to feel that I'm just a token person”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.56)

“We want them to talk to us. We want them to get involved with us. We want to get involved with them. This is the whole thing, we want the commitment”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.56)

There is a clear expectation, if not a hope, by the public housing tenants that the private-sector contractor will involve them in decision-making in the BLCP. Further, public housing tenants were also fully aware of what this involvement would involve:
“The only way you’re going to know if it [public housing tenants] changed the project, is when you see the initial outlay on the initial plan [master plan]. We spit the dummy, go ‘woo-har whatever’, and they come back with a revised set of plans. That’s the only way you’re going to know that”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.56)

However, while there may have been an expectation on behalf of public housing tenants to be involved in decision-making in 2006, there was also resistance to the discursive power of the BLCP, and specifically the narrative of public housing tenant involvement:

“I honestly think, no matter what we want, or how we’d like it, whatever they’re going to do, they’re going to do, and that’s going to be that. They’re going to do exactly what they want”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.57)

“They might say ‘we already have the maps and we’re not going to change them’”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.58)

In October 2006, when Bonnyrigg Partnerships was announced as Housing NSW’s ‘preferred proponent’ in the BLCP, public housing tenants were ready to move to the next stage of the BLCP as ‘partners’ with the private-sector contractor. The public housing tenants had become increasingly concerned about the timing of the BLCP and the lack of information:

“It just seems to be going on, and on, and on. What we knew then is exactly what we know now”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.58)

Further, Bonnyrigg Partnerships had given them a guarantee of ‘partnership’ in the BLCP at the one Housing NSW event both Bonnyrigg Partnerships and public housing tenants were allowed to attend together. Bonnyrigg Partnerships provided public housing tenants with the Working with you pamphlet and also provided the following message verbally:
The Bonnyrigg community will become the fifth member of our team. The 5 partners will work together on every aspect of the renewal, from Masterplan and staging plan, to open space and service improvements, and rehousing and tenancy management. (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2005, p.1)

In Chapter 7, the analysis further articulates the expectation that public housing tenants would be involved; indeed, they were discursively constructed as partners in the BLCP from the projects announcement in December 2005. The analysis turns in this chapter to Phase 3 and the management of the BLCP by the private-sector contractor. However, in terms of viewing public housing tenant participation within the construct of citizenship, it is perhaps this final comment from a public housing tenant bests captures the subjectivity of public housing tenants in late 2006:

“You ask people [BLCP staff] about certain things and they say ‘well, it could be up to the land developer, it could be up to the Council’. They can't give you an answer on it. The bottom line is, we’re supposed to be the ones that are supposed to be deciding these things and when it comes to the crunch; we've got no say whatsoever”. (quote from public housing tenant cited in Rogers, 2006a, p.58)
CHAPTER 7 – Phase 3: Private partner management

At the macro level, the spatio-temporal analysis shows that there were two invited spaces in Phase 3 of the BLCP. These invited spaces will be defined as public–private partnership contract management and tenant involvement under private-sector management. A diagrammatic representation of the macro-level invited spaces with social subjects is provided for Phase 3 overleaf, see Figure 36. This representation builds on the figure provided in Chapters 5 and 6 that outlined the invited spaces in Phases 1 and 2 of the BLCP (see Figures 16 and 19). This chapter focuses specifically on Invited Space 5, to show how tenant involvement was discursively constructed and the types of programs that resulted from this understanding of ‘community engagement’ in this space.

Invited Space 4: Public–private partnership contract management
Temporal location: From December 2006
Description: Housing NSW began contractual management and Bonnyrigg Partnerships began the 30-year contract term for the BLCP.

Invited Space 5: Tenant involvement under private-sector management
Temporal location: From December 2006
Description: The ‘private-sector partner’ assumed responsibility for involving public housing tenants and other residents in the BLCP from ‘transition’ (transition from Housing NSW to Bonnyrigg Partnerships for 30 years).
Figure 36 - BLCP Phase 3: Macro-level timeline with social subjects and invited spaces
Social and institutional structures: Transition to the private sector

Describing the social and institutional structures in Phase 3 of the BLCP is largely a descriptive process provided to broadly locate the spatially variegated institutional spaces created by: Housing NSW, to manage the public–private partnership contract and the private partner; and the private sector, to involve public housing tenants in the BLCP. In this study, the contractor and subcontractors will be referred to as outlined in Table 8 below (for a more detailed glossary of terms see Table 9 on page 263).

Table 8 – Contractor and subcontractor affiliations and contract status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation name</th>
<th>Contract status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonnyrigg Partnerships (Nominee) Pty Ltd</td>
<td>The Project Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westpac Banking Corporation Pty Ltd</td>
<td>The Financier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becton Property Group Pty Ltd</td>
<td>The Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd</td>
<td>The Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George Community Housing</td>
<td>Tenancy Services Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotless Pty Ltd</td>
<td>The Facilities Services Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbis</td>
<td>Masterplan Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Stubbs and Associates</td>
<td>Community Consultation Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosway Australia</td>
<td>Communications Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (from Housing NSW, 2008a; NSW Department of Housing, 2004c; NSW Department of Planning, 2006; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007).

Locating Invited Space 4 – Management by the private sector

On 23 December 2006, with the exception of four deeds, Housing NSW executed the public–private partnership deeds with Bonnyrigg Partnerships.91 Between

91 Under the December 2006 Working with Government Guidelines (NSW Government 2001), a formal “public interest evaluation” considered by the government at the time it originally decides whether a project will be privately financed must subsequently be updated at specified stages of the procurement processes, and the final version, prepared immediately before the project’s contracts are finalised and executed, must be summarised in a publicly released summary of the contracts. However, the Bonnyrigg “Living Communities” PPP project was developed and its contracts were
December 2006 and April 2007, Housing NSW and Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) negotiated and finalised the four remaining deeds.\textsuperscript{92} The contract became effective on 20 April 2007, defined as ‘financial close’ by Housing NSW, with the term of the contract ending on 28 February 2037 (NSW Department of Housing, 2007b, p.1). The public-sector ‘parties to the contracts’ are:

- The New South Wales Land and Housing Corporation (ABN 45 754 121 940), a statutory corporation established by section 6 of the Housing Act (NSW) and acting in the name of the NSW Department of Housing, and

- The State of New South Wales, which has guaranteed the Land and Housing Corporation’s performance of its obligations under the project’s contracts (see section 5 of this report). (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.5)

However, in the BLCP summary of contracts (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.5), Housing NSW identifies both the NSW Land and Housing Corporation and the State of New South Wales as ‘Housing’. Therefore, in this study, ‘Housing NSW’ refers to these public-sector ‘parties to the contracts’.\textsuperscript{93} The private-sector ‘party to the contracts’ is Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company), “a special purpose company which was established for this project [BLCP] and which may not conduct any other business” (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.5). Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (defined as “The Project Company” by Housing NSW) is 50% jointly owned by two trusts: WEST BP Trust, owned solely by the Westpac

\textsuperscript{92}The four outstanding deeds were: “a deed of guarantee by the State of NSW under the Public Authorities (Financial Arrangements) Act (NSW), a deed appointing an independent certifier, a tripartite deed with a security trustee appointed by the project’s financiers and a collateral warranty deed with one of the private sector contractors” (NSW Department of Housing 2007b, p.3).

\textsuperscript{93}The basis of Housing NSW’s ‘power to enter the BLCP contract’, as defined by Housing NSW, is attached in Appendix 16.
Banking Corporation; and Becton BP Trust, owned solely by the Becton Property Group (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.5):

The Partners [WEST BP Trust and Becton BP Trust] have entered into an unincorporated joint venture known as “Bonnyrigg Partnerships” ... (“the Project Partnership”), and have appointed the Project Company [Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd] as their nominee and agent to manage and administer this joint venture, under a Bonnyrigg Partnerships Joint Venture Agreement. (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.5; emphasis in the original)

Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company), has been contracted by Housing NSW both “in its own capacity” and “as an agent and nominee of other private sector parties” and not-for-profit organisations (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.5). There is little space here for a detailed analysis of the BLCP contract design and accountability structures. Instead, Figure 38 on page 259 provides a somewhat convoluted Housing NSW flowchart that attempts to broadly chart the contract functions and accountability of the BLCP deeds.

However, several key contractual relationships are important under this public–private partnership contract for this study. Not only is Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) acting in its own capacity, but it is also acting as an ‘agent’ for the other two BLCP ‘partners’: Spotless P&F Pty Ltd (the Facilities Management Contractor) and St George Community Housing Co-operative Ltd (the Tenancy Services Contractor) (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, pp.5 & 8):

In addition to contracting directly with the Partners in the project’s main contract (the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project Deed, referred to in this report as “the Project Deed”), Housing has, both in the Project Deed and in all the other project contracts to which Housing is a party, contracted with the Project Company as the nominee and agent of the Partners. (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.6)
Therefore, the only ‘partnership’ in the BLCP, at the level of the public–private partnership contract, is between Becton Property Group (the property developer) and Westpac Banking Corporation (the financial institution).

Collectively identified as Bonnyrigg Partnerships (see Figure 37 below and Appendix 15), these two private-sector entities are contracted to Housing NSW to provide the complex array of goods and services outlined above; while all other parties are contracted by Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) under various contractual mechanisms, for the provision of a specifically defined component of the overall contract specification. These ‘subcontractors’ are directly, or indirectly, accountable to Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company), which is solely owned by the Becton Property Group and Westpac Banking Corporation.

Figure 37 – Bonnyrigg Partnerships: A collective identity for a hierarchically managed private-sector consortium

Welcome to Bonnyrigg Partnerships

We want Bonnyrigg to be a...

VIBRANT  HEALTHY
SAFE &  FRIENDLY
WHERE EVERYONE HAS OPPORTUNITIES.

Figure 38 - Flowchart summary of contracts

Source: NSW Land and Housing Corporation (2007, p.7)
However, it is worth noting that many of the subcontractors also have ‘side contracts’ directly with Housing NSW, and this makes defining clear accountability structures more complex. In addition to the two visible subcontracted ‘partners’ – the Facilities Services Manager and the Tenancy Services manager – Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) has subcontracted, through Becton Property Group (The Developer), a range of construction contractors to complete the physical works (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.6).

Each of these three subcontractors was contracted using different contractual mechanisms. In some cases ‘side contracts’ grant Housing NSW additional powers, including the authority to ‘step in’. For example, under some ‘side contracts’, Housing NSW could “place a new contractor into the shoes of the Project Company” or “place a new contractor into the shoes of the Project Company under the Facilities Management Contract” (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.11). In other cases, construction contractors were required to:

execute a specified side contract with Housing, principally concerning the quality of its works and Housing’s rights to “step in” should the Development Contractor breach the relevant Construction Contract. (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.6)

Other contractual mechanisms also used additional third-party management companies, such as ‘Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd’, which is 50% owned by Becton Property Group (The Developer) and 50% owned by Spotless Pty Ltd (The Facilities Services Manager). Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) is particularly important to this study, as the company:

• Is the Facilities Management Contractor’s subcontractor for the provision of the project’s community renewal, communication, consultation, management and integration services;
• Is also providing general facilitation, co-ordination, management, communication and “external presentation” services for the Project Company, the Development Contractor, the Facilities Management Contractor and the Tenancy Services Contractor (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.8)
In short, Spotless Pty Ltd (The Facilities Services Manager) has been subcontracted by Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) to provide the following services:

- facilities management,
- tenancy,
- community renewal,
- communication,
- consultation,
- management and integration services to the Project Company

(NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.6)

Spotless Pty Ltd (The Facilities Services Manager), as outlined above, has further subcontracted these services to Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) and has entered a ‘side contract’ with Housing NSW. Spotless Pty Ltd (The Facilities Services Manager) has also subcontracted the non-government organisation St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) as the Tenancy Services Contractor “for the provision of tenancy services to the project’s public housing tenants” (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.8).
Table 9 – Glossary of key BLCP legal entities and contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Project Company</th>
<th>Bonnyrigg Partnerships Nominee Pty Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Project Deed</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project Deed, executed by the NSW Land and Housing Corporation (“Housing”), Bonnyrigg Partnerships Nominee Pty Limited (“The Project Company”) and “the Partners” – WEST BP Pty Limited (“the Westpac BP Trustee”) and Becton Bonnyrigg Equity Pty Limited (“the Becton BP Trustee”) – and dated 12 February 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Partners</td>
<td>The partners in the “Project Partnership” established by the Partnership Agreement: WEST BP Pty Limited (“the Westpac BP Trustee”) and Becton Bonnyrigg Equity Pty Limited (“the Becton BP Trustee”), Bonnyrigg Partnerships Nominee Pty Limited (“the Project Company”), WEST BP Holdco Pty Limited, Westpac Investment Vehicle No. 2 Pty Limited, Becton Bonnyrigg Holdings Pty Limited, Becton Construction Services Pty Limited and Becton Property Group Limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Agreement</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg Partnerships Joint Venture Agreement, executed by “the Partners” (WEST BP Pty Limited (“the Westpac BP Trustee”) and Becton Bonnyrigg Equity Pty Limited (“the Becton BP Trustee”)), Bonnyrigg Partnerships Nominee Pty Limited (“the Project Company”), WEST BP Holdco Pty Limited, Westpac Investment Vehicle No. 2 Pty Limited, Becton Bonnyrigg Holdings Pty Limited, Becton Construction Services Pty Limited and Becton Property Group Limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Manager</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg Management Pty Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Agreement</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg Living Communities Management Services Contract executed by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Limited (“the Manager”) and Spotless P&amp;F Pty Limited (“the Facilities Management Contractor”, also known as “the Services Contractor”), dated 27 February 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management Contractor</td>
<td>Spotless P&amp;F Pty Limited, also known as “the Services Contractor”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management Contract</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg Living Communities Services Contract between Spotless P&amp;F Pty Limited (“the Facilities Management Contractor”, also known as “the Services Contractor”), Bonnyrigg Partnerships Nominee Pty Limited (“the Project Company”) and “the Partners”, WEST BP Pty Limited (“the Westpac BP Trustee”) and Becton Bonnyrigg Equity Pty Limited (“the Becton BP Trustee”). This contract is also described in some contracts as “the Services Contract”. It was originally executed on 12 February 2007, amended and restated on 27 February 2007 and amended again on 20 April 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Development Contractor</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg Development Pty Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Development Contract</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg Living Communities Development Contract executed by Bonnyrigg Development Pty Limited (“the Development Contractor”), Bonnyrigg Partnerships Nominee Pty Limited (“the Project Company”) and “the Partners”—WEST BP Pty Limited (“the Westpac BP Trustee”) and Becton Bonnyrigg Equity Pty Limited (“the Becton BP Trustee”)—and dated 12 February 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenancy Services Contractor</td>
<td>St George Community Housing Co-operative Limited (which also has another role, as “the Ground Lessee”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenancy Services Contract</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project Tenancy Services Contract executed by St George Community Housing Co-operative Limited, in its role as “the Tenancy Services Contractor”, and Spotless P&amp;F Pty Limited (“the Facilities Management Contractor”), dated 12 February 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Contractor</td>
<td>Spotless P&amp;F Pty Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Contract</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg Living Communities Services Contract between Spotless P&amp;F Pty Limited (“the Facilities Management Contractor”, also known as “the Services Contractor”), Bonnyrigg Partnerships Nominee Pty Limited (“the Project Company”) and “the Partners”, WEST BP Pty Limited (“the Westpac BP Trustee”) and Becton Bonnyrigg Equity Pty Limited (“the Becton BP Trustee”). This contract is referred to in this report and some of the contracts as “the Facilities Management Contract”. It was originally executed on 12 February 2007, amended and restated on 27 February 2007 and amended again on 20 April 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community Building Team</td>
<td>Community Building Team was a locally based community engagement team made up of seconded Housing NSW staff, contractors, consultants and staff from other agencies, including Fairfield City Council. The Community Building Team was responsible for the local delivery of the engagement strategy, including communication, consultation, tenant liaison in conjunction with the Housing NSW client service team, capacity building and community development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (collated from Coates et al., 2008, p.23; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, pp.82–84).
Similar to other contractual arrangements, St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) has also entered a ‘side contract’ with Housing NSW and:

As the lessee of the project’s public housing properties, under leases granted to it by Housing, and, in turn, as the landlord of tenancy agreements with the project’s public housing tenants (“the Ground Lessee”). (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.6)

*Mobilisation – April 2007 to October 2007*

Hence, the contractual and accountability arrangements were complex and required considerable inter-company/organisation planning and coordination. This first stage of planning and ‘service integration’ following Financial Close – the signing of the contract deeds – was called Mobilisation by Housing NSW (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.35). *Mobilisation* refers to the period following the signing of the Project Deeds, and was created by Housing NSW to allow Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) to prepare for full service delivery under the BLCP contract.

During this period, from April 2007 until October 2007, Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) was required: to implement a suite of services, outlined in a confidential *Mobilisation* Plan text; in addition to developing internal ‘management and integration’ processes (NSW Department of Housing, 2007, p.35) between Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) and the subcontractors, and in some cases side contracts with Housing NSW. Housing NSW described these two functions, in the context of the BLCP deeds, as follows:

During a “mobilisation phase” prior to this “transition date”, the Project Company must:

- Prepare for the delivery of its services by updating and implementing a Mobilisation Plan which is set out in its Proposals for the project and specified in the Specification, and
- Communicate and consult with tenants, other residents of the Bonnyrigg housing estate, the owners and residents of adjoining properties and recognised community organisations (including tenancy, community, cultural and “special needs” organisations and advocacy groups) and associations representing Bonnyrigg housing estate’s tenants, as required by the Specification, the Project Company’s Proposals for the project, a Communication and Consultation Protocol that is to be developed by the Project. (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.35)

As noted above, providing an analysis of the BLCP contracts or deeds, which are in excess of 1,000 pages, without supporting material is not the intention of this section (Blake Dawson Waldron Lawyers, 2007a–k; NSW Department of Housing, 2007b) (see Appendix 17). Instead, the intention is to show that during Mobilisation the property developer, financier, facilities manager and not-for-profit housing manager were engaged in two distinct functions. The first was establishing internal protocols, communication processes, accountability hierarchies, and service implementation policies and procedures within and between the contractors and subcontractors. Housing NSW defined this process as follows:

These services must include “integration” activities (such as the development of organisational structures, reporting systems, communications controls, coordination procedures, project management arrangements, “change management” practices and procedures for ensuring private housing marketing and sales do not adversely affect tenants), quality assurance, information management, environmental management, fire, emergency and disaster response systems, occupational health and safety systems, risk management systems, employee training, employee conduct management, industrial relations, performance monitoring and “helpdesk” services. (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.35)

The second function involved completing the contract requirements defined under the Mobilisation Plan, including conducting community consultation events. The latter processes were conducted, in some cases, with assistance from Housing NSW, Fairfield City Council and external consultants.
Transition – From October 2007

Following Mobilisation, the BLCP ‘transitioned’ to full private-sector management in October 2007. Following Transition, Housing NSW suggest that under the BLCP Deeds, Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) must provide the following:

- “Management and integration” services,\(^{94}\) embracing the overall management, coordination and integration activities necessary to ensure the Project Company’s services are delivered in an integrated manner across all stages of the project and throughout the duration of the project (p. 35).

- “Communication and consultation” services,\(^{95}\) including the preparation, implementation and updating of a Communication and Consultation Protocol and the maintenance of a local office on or adjacent to the Bonnyrigg housing estate (p. 36).

- “Community renewal” services,\(^{96}\) including the preparation, implementation and updating of a Community Renewal Service Plan, addressing a wide-ranging list of community issues, and project evaluation services (p. 36).

- “Facilities management” services\(^{97}\) ... including routine, cyclical and responsive dwelling and facility maintenance services ... inspection and assessment of vacant dwellings, pest control, responses to vandalism, graffiti and damage caused by tenants, lift maintenance,

\(^{94}\) “The Project Company has subcontracted these ‘management and integration’ services to the Facilities Management Contractor under the Facilities Management Contract, and the Facilities Management Contractor has, in turn, sub-subcontracted the services to the Manager under the Management Agreement” (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.35).

\(^{95}\) “The Project Company has subcontracted these services to the Facilities Management Contractor under the Facilities Management Contract, and the Facilities Management Contractor has, in turn, sub-subcontracted the services to The Manager under the Management Agreement”, and guaranteed this service by a side deed (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.36).

\(^{96}\) “Again, the Project Company has subcontracted these services to the Facilities Management Contractor under the Facilities Management Contract, the Facilities Management Contractor has, in turn, sub-subcontracted the services to the Manager under the Management Agreement”, and guaranteed this service by a side deed (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.36).

\(^{97}\) “The Project Company has subcontracted these services to the Facilities Management Contractor under the Facilities Management Contract, supported by the direct commitments to Housing by the Facilities Management Contractor and the Facilities Management Guarantor in the Facilities Management Side Deed” (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.36).
forensic cleaning and maintenance services, and “handover” services at the end of the project (p. 36).

- “Tenancy” services,\(^98\) including specified “tenancy management” services (such as eligibility assessments, tenant information, participation, complaints and appeals systems, housing allocations,) ... “tenancy support” services ... and, until all the project’s construction works have been completed, tenant rehousing services (p. 36).

Following Transition, a range of inspection, compliance and reporting mechanisms, effective from financial close but largely idle throughout Mobilisation, became important tasks for Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company). The Project Deed Specifications, again too extensive for detailed analysis here (see Appendix 17 for a list of the deeds), organised the management services and tenancy arrangements as “a large number of management plans and protocols ... assembled into an overall Services Manual” (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.44). Table 10 overleaf shows the Services Manual and provides a list of some of the plans.

The Services Manual is an important compliance and reporting mechanism for the BLCP. Each Plan and Sub-plan\(^99\) is under periodic review – review timeframes are specific to each plan – by Housing NSW. Housing NSW state that they may:

at any time, direct the Project Company to further develop, update or amend its Services Manual (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.45)

or

review these drafts [draft plans submitted as part of the BLCP compliance and reporting arrangements] and provide comments and recommendations

---

98 “The Project Company has subcontracted these tenancy services to the Facilities Management Contractor under the Facilities Management Contract, and the Facilities Management Contractor has, in turn, sub-subcontracted the services to the Tenancy Services Contractor under the Tenancy Services Contract” and guaranteed this service by a side deed (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.36).

99 It is not uncommon for each of these Service Plans to have a number of Sub-plans informing and guiding the overall Plan’s objectives (see Appendix 18 – Private Sector Services Manual: Inspection, compliancy and reporting mechanisms).
to the Project Company, limited to matters affecting the compliance of the drafts with the Project Deed. (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.35)

Table 10 – Management plans and protocols in the BLCP Service Manual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry, management and organisational protocols:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A Management and Integration Service Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Occupational Health and Safety Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disaster, Fire and Emergency Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employee Training Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employee Conduct Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Industrial Relations Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performance Monitoring System Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helpdesk procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public housing tenant and resident communication and consultation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A Communication and Consultation Service Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A Community Renewal Service Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities and tenancy management services:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A Facilities Management Service Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A Tenancy Management Service Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A Tenancy Support Service Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Rehousing Service Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An Off-Estate Housing Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (categorised by author from NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.44).

Following these review processes, Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) must make “any necessary amendments to the drafts, and ... resubmit amended drafts of the Services Manual documents to the Project Director [Housing NSW]” (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.45). The review process is then reapplied to the amended drafts until Housing NSW approves the plans.
Throughout these review processes, Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) remains “solely responsible for ensuring its services comply with the requirements of the Project Deed” (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.45). Therefore, the Services Manual and the management plans and protocols contained within the Services Manual document are important texts that guide, define and limit various aspects of the BLCP. Not only do they set out Housing NSW’s requirements of Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) under the BLCP Deeds, but they also set out how Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) will complete these requirements and the review and management processes.

From financial close, Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) worked with Housing NSW to develop the Services Manual in a process of draft plan submission and review. Continual monitoring, redrafting and resubmission of plans and protocols will continue throughout the BLCP, as outlined by Housing NSW below:

The Project Company has expressly acknowledged that the Services Manual will need to be further developed, amended and updated throughout the project, taking account of the status of each stage of the project and each precinct within each stage, any changes in law and Housing’s public housing policies. (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.45)

Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) created a Planning and Compliance Manager position to monitor the service plans and to assist Bonnyrigg Partnerships (The Project Company) to meet its key performance indicators (KPI) as defined in these texts. The Planning and Compliance Manager, located in the project office in Bonnyrigg, is responsible for monitoring the contractor and subcontractor’s performance in respect of the Services Manual and facilitating Services Manual reviews (Newleaf Communities, 2009a, p.8; Private-sector contractor, 2009) and assisting the contractor and subcontractors to provide “Monthly Performance Reports to Housing [NSW], setting out all of its failures to provide its services as specified” (NSW Land and Housing
Corporation, 2007, p.46). Similarly, Housing NSW appointed project staff members, who were located in Housing NSW’s Head Office in Sydney’s central business district, to review these monthly and annual service compliance mechanisms.

The BLCP Deeds also proposed a range of independent monitoring, inspection and compliance mechanisms. Housing NSW reserved the right to “monitor and review the Project Company’s delivery of its works in any other way it thinks fit” (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.30). Several of these ‘independent’ monitoring and review mechanisms specifically relate to public housing tenant involvement in the BLCP. For example, the Bonnyrigg independent tenant advocacy service would be located within the following provisions, outlined here by Housing NSW:

The Project Company must also permit representatives of recognised community organisations (including tenancy, community, cultural and “special needs” organisations and advocacy groups) and associations representing Bonnyrigg housing estate’s tenants to review and comment on these monitoring methods and their findings, provided this is done on a confidential basis. (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, pp.31 & 46)

Housing NSW also required Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) to conduct an annual Customer and Tenant Satisfaction Survey. The BLCP Deeds require the surveys be conducted by “independent, reputable surveyors and using survey methods and questionnaires agreed to by Housing [NSW]” (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.45). Finally, as noted in Chapter 6, the BLCP Deeds also require Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) to conduct a “longitudinal study of the experiences of a representative panel of residents and their attitudes to the project” (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.45). Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) was therefore required to appoint an independent expert, “selected in consultation with Housing [NSW] and engaged on terms satisfactory to Housing [NSW]” (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.45). The
longitudinal study was framed within the context of the 2005 Baseline Study (Stubbs et al., 2005c), with payment deferred to Housing NSW.

Finally, in December 2005, in another space removed from BLCP, the Director General of Housing NSW applied for the ministerial determination regarding the ‘state significance’ of the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (the Act) (Director General NSW Department of Housing, 2005).

Emerging from the Ministerial Taskforces of 2003, which identified major developments and infrastructure projects as key priorities for the state of New South Wales, the announcement of Part 3A of the Act in August 2005 flagged a significant change in the NSW Planning System (Nino, 2008, p.4). As part of the new Part 3A planning reforms, a new State Environment Planning Policy was implemented that allowed the Minister of Planning to determine, based on evaluation criteria, whether a ‘major project’ could be classified as state significant (NSW Department of Planning, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009a-c). “Only the Minister for Planning can list a site as a State significant” (NSW Department of Planning, 2009c, p.1) and under this reform, if a project is deemed “State significant” by the Minister of Planning, their department becomes the planning consent authority for the project. The NSW Department of Planning suggest that rationales for declaring state significant sites under Part 3A are as follows.

State significant sites are typically sites that the Minister for Planning considers may have a wider social, economic or environmental significance for the community, for example ... major residential developments. The site may also have redevelopment significance important to implementing the State’s planning objectives [for example, the Sydney Metropolitan Plan].

When a new site is listed as a State significant site, the Minister establishes the planning regime for that site. This includes, amongst other things, identifying the appropriate zoning and permitted land uses of the site, determining whether any development on the site should be declared to be a Part 3A project and determining the appropriate development controls for the site such as height of buildings, floor space ratio and heritage conservation standards. (NSW Department of Planning, 2009c, p.1)
In terms of local urban governance and community participation, the interesting point to make about the Part 3A planning reforms is the move to preference regional over local interests, as outlined below:

Other benefits of listing a site as a State significant site include:

- facilitates major investment in key economic and employment-generating development across the State
- facilitates the redevelopment of major State government sites
- Ensure that wider than local interests are considered when there are matters of state or regional significance involved.

(NSW Department of Planning, 2009c, p.2; emphasis added by author)

The case for a well thought out regional response to planning is compelling and has attached significant reflection in the context of urban planning (McGuirk and O'Neill, 2002; Gleeson et al., 2004). However, there is also a compelling argument, advocated most actively perhaps by lawyers in the field of environmental law, for a closer assessment of the impacts that Part 3A has had on involving local communities in major projects deemed State significant by the Minister of Planning under Part 3A.\footnote{As this thesis was going to print, Part 3A was abolished in New South Wales, Australia.} Ian Ratcliff, Jessica Wood and Sue Higginson (Ratcliff et al., 2010, p.1) argue that the Act had, on reflection of the introduction of Part 3A, served as a relatively effective mechanism for “recognising that the community can and should have a significant voice in planning decisions”. Ratcliff et al. argue, in legal terms, that the Act had previously encouraged local community involvement in planning decisions through the provision of public participation rights with respect to the original decision-making process, merits appeal rights for objectors in relation to ‘designated development’, opportunities to be heard when a developer appeals against refusal and open standing for any person to seek an order from the specialist Land and Environment Court to remedy or restrain a breach of the Act. (Ratcliff et al., 2010, p.1)
Most importantly, Ratcliff et al. that suggest the introduction of Part 3A of the Act “dramatically reduces the involvement of the community in the original decision-making process” (Ratcliff et al., 2010, p.1) through an increasingly technocratic planning approvals mechanism focused on in-house governmental decision-making power residing with the minister. Further, they suggest, this sidelining of local community input negatively influences local community members’ ability to raise both individual and communal concerns or to intervene in major developments as concerned community members, as was previously possible under the Act (Ratcliff et al., 2010).

However, in Ratcliff et al.’s discussion, the ‘community’ is assumed to have resources and civic capacity to bring to these decision-making processes. These resources cannot be assumed, although it is also plausible that they are present, in cohorts of residents living on large public housing estates. The skills, knowledge and civic capacity required of individuals or groups to take the NSW Department of Planning or a private developer to the Land and Environment court are considerable. More importantly, one could ask whether public housing tenant capacity building projects would be better directed at these types of knowledge and skills; that is, building civic capacity to these ends. Ratcliff et al. (2010) conclude by arguing that “there has been a move towards a discretionary, technocratic form of decision-making that places little value on local knowledge or concerns”. Under Part 3A of the Act, it seems that the NSW Government has placed a higher value on centralised decision-making and regional (over local) planning priorities.

In the form contained within the Act, this centralised decision-making is to the exclusion, at the local level, of involving citizens in local urban governance. However, the BLCP case is more complex than other Part 3A Major Projects in the context of local urban governance for several reasons. In June 2006 the Minister for Planning deemed that Part 3A of the Act applied to the BLCP; and in April 2007 the Minister for Planning issued an Instrument of Delegation to
Fairfield City Council, delegating “all assessment powers in relation to the BLCP to Fairfield City Council” (Fairfield City Council, 2008).

As outlined above, and in keeping with the Act, the minister retained the consent role for the BLCP. However, the BLCP is not a typical major project under Part 3A of the Act, for Housing NSW had conducted additional ‘community consultations’ at the local level, and the private-sector developer was now required to conduct ‘community consultations’ as part of its ‘community renewal’ strategy. Further, as the delegated assessment authority, Fairfield City Council would be responsible for assessing the BLCP Development Applications, including the Concept Plan and individual Stage Plans for each stage (see Stage Plan in Figure 39 on page 276). Further, in another planning approvals twist for the BLCP, Fairfield City Council, following another local government authority in Western Sydney, had established an Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) in 1999 to review Development Applications to which the BLCP applications would be subjected (Fairfield City Council, 2006a,b, 2007, 2008; Williams, 2005).

At the local level by late 2005, IHAPs were suggested to militate against decision-making bias by elected representatives (in the Fairfield City Council case this would be councillors) by allowing for an independent review of the Development Application by the IHAP before final determination of the application by the Council (elected representatives) (Independent Commission Against Corruption, 2005; Williams, 2005). Fairfield City Council outline the structure and function of the IHAP as follows:

The Panel independently assesses applications that generate unresolved objections ... The Panel provides an opportunity for both applicants and community members to understand each other’s concerns and ideas regarding a Development Application. It increases the transparency of the development and building process and increases access to the development process, while ensuring that these applications are assessed in a manner that

101 A Development Application (DA) is an application submitted by an applicant seeking approval from a local government authority to alter or undertake building work.
is both ethical and independent from Council ... The Panel consists of a solicitor, architect, environmental scientist and community representative ... Three of the members of the Panel are not residents of or employed in the Fairfield area. The fourth member – the community representative – is selected to ensure that there is no conflict of interest. (Fairfield City Council, 2007, p.1)

Also see Appendix 20.

The ‘State significance’ of the BLCP under Part 3A of the Act, the delegation of approval power to Fairfield City Council and the IHAP review process within the local government authority had important implications for the involvement of citizens and other organisations in local urban governance in the BLCP in Phase 3. These are explored further as part of the discussion about discursive practice below.
Staging Update
Revised Staging Plan

• Note: Existing private owners homes have not been identified on this map and no private owners will be asked to move during the redevelopment.

Locating Invited Space 5 – Tenant involvement under private-sector management

Mobilisation – April 2007 to October 2007

This section shows how the ‘community engagement’ programs implemented by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) from April 2006 were discursively constructed from a range of other texts, including the contract deeds and the Services Manual. Following the targeted information sessions held in November and December 2006, there was little activity by the Community Building Team over the Christmas period on the ground. From January 2007, while Housing NSW negotiated the outstanding contract terms with Becton Property Group and Westpac Banking Corporation in Invited Space 4, the Community Building Team maintained the tenant groups, including the Community Reference Group, the Bonnyrigg Public Housing Tenants Group and, to a lesser extent, the Bonnyrigg Private Owners Group.

Meanwhile, the funding agreement between Housing NSW and Fairfield Migrant Resource Centre for the Bonnyrigg Tenant’s Support and Advocacy Service expired in November 2006 (NSW Department of Housing, 2006h). A new funding agreement was negotiated between the parties for the period January 2006 to May 2006, and a further funding agreement was negotiated between the parties to take the service to Transition (Cultural Perspectives, 2007, p.2). Following Transition, Bonnyrigg Partnerships (The Project Company) was required to fund the service and entered a further negotiation process (see “Transition – From October 2007” above).

Therefore, Mobilisation is best characterised by a period of slow withdrawal from an on-the-ground presence by Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council, starting in late 2006. This was combined with a discursive move by the Community Building Team to promote Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project
Company) as a ‘partner ready to take their views on board’, a message promoted by the Community Voice Counts and Bonnyrigg Growing Stronger workshops conducted in late 2006 by the Community Building Team (Coates et al., 2008, p.29). However, towards the end of 2006, senior Fairfield City Council staff involved in the BLCP – who were aware that the NSW Department of Planning was in the process of delegating “all [planning] assessment powers in relation to the project” to Fairfield City Council and was subsequently positioning the institution to be the planning approval authority\footnote{The NSW Department of Planning (2006) wrote to Fairfield City Council and a number of other government departments on 11 April 2006 to inform Fairfield City Council: “As you are aware in 30 June 2006, the Minister for Planning agreed to consider the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project as a Major Project to be assessed under 3A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979. In doing so the Minister agreed that Fairfield City Council may be delegated all assessment powers in relation to the assessment of the project ... the Department’s Director General has now delegated those powers” (p.1).} for Development Applications relating to the physical works – began to distance Fairfield City Council from both Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) and Housing NSW.

This had implications on the ground for the two Community Project Officers funded by Housing NSW but working within the Community Building Team as Fairfield City Council employees, and to the resources that the institution could contribute to future ‘community engagement’ activities. Subsequently, one of the Community Project Officer positions, a permanent position, was geographically removed from the Community Building Team office space in Bonnyrigg and relocated within the Fairfield City Council offices located off-site. While still working with the Community Building Team on specific tasks, this Community Project Officer became more aligned with Fairfield City Council’s core business. Housing NSW brought the other Community Project Officer position, a casual position that I filled, in-house, in October 2006 in an attempt to finalise a range of targeted capacity building projects before Transition. These projects included finalising a Men’s Shed service (see Figure 40 below), conducting youth engagement programs and organising an arts project field trip. Therefore, from October 2006, I worked directly for Housing NSW full-time and on a week-by-
basis, which was anticipated to conclude when the BLCP Deeds were executed.

Figure 40 – BLCP Newsletter describing the Bonnyrigg Men’s Shed

The Men’s Shed team (from left to right) Tom, Jorge, Ganai, Dallas, Hans and Mathew check out the building before opening.

The sounds of hammering, sanding, sawing, chatting and laughter will soon be heard all around Bonnyrigg with the opening of the Men’s Shed.

“Now that we’ve got keys from the Department of Housing, we’ll be working to get the workshop fully equipped in the New Year,” said Matthew Ditton, Community Development Worker, Parks Community Network. Matthew will be working with local men to get the project up and running.

“We are taking a ground up approach with the men planning to repair furniture, toys, craft items or work on their own personal projects.”

Hans, who has been involved since the beginning, said “The Living Communities team has done wonders for the men of Bonnyrigg by getting behind this project which is going to make a real difference.”

Long term resident, Tom, said that he was looking forward to helping the older residents with small tasks like repairing furniture.

A special thanks go to ADT Alarms who have provided the alarm system.

Jorge Henao from NSW Refugee Health Service and Ganai, a local resident, will be working with residents to design and build a water-wise garden in the backyard. They are looking for people to help them with this project.

Bonnyrigg men who are interested in joining the Men’s Shed should contact Mathew on 9600 7400 or Dallas on 9823 7666.

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2006d).

Under a week-by-week contract, either party need only give one week’s notice to end the employment contract.
Around the same time that Housing NSW and Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) were conducting final negotiations in November 2006, I invited Becton Property Group, then acting as a representative of Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company), to become a collaborative research partner in an action research project investigating public housing tenant participation in the BLCP. The Acting Director of Social Justice and Social Change Research Centre at the University of Western Sydney made the formal request. Bonnyrigg Partnerships’ Pty Ltd (The Project Company) community consultation consultant (Judith Stubbs and Associates) informally supported the research project.

The Social Justice and Social Change Research Centre did not request any financial remuneration for the study. In any case, there appeared to be genuine support for the research project and Becton Property Group provided in principle support to the study in December 2006, subject to several conditions:

- Achieving financial close (projected to be mid-December 06);
- A more thorough review of the research methodology;
- An assessment of our capacity to work with Mr Rogers based on an interview with him and discussions with key Bonnyrigg stakeholders with whom he has been working over the last two years
- Ultimate approval by Bonnyrigg Management Board

(Personal communication: see Appendix 19 – Becton Property Group Letter)

However, Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) was required to conduct a range of information and consultation processes in early 2007 and develop an on-the-ground presence. This urgency was partly related to the mounting frustration that public housing tenants were expressing about the BLCP timeline. Public housing tenants and residents had been advised at BLCP project announcement that the BLCP Deeds would be signed by March 2006 and it was now the eve of 2007 (also see Table 6 on page 182). Then, between January 2007 and March 2007, Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) and their community consultation consultant, Judith Stubbs and Associates
(Community Consultation Consultant), were planning the first set of information and consultation sessions.

In March 2007, Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) began establishing “an on-site, one-stop office for Bonnyrigg Partnerships” (Urbis, 2008a, p.13). The BLCP Masterplan, prepared by Urbis (Masterplan Consultant), suggests that

Key factors contributing to the appointment of the Bonnyrigg Partnerships team to this important project include ... The commitment to a holistic place management approach, with housing management, maintenance, and development staff all working together. (Urbis, 2008a, p.12)

However, Housing NSW was still managing the public housing tenancies on the Bonnyrigg Estate and needed to implement an extensive transition process to St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager). This required a systems transfer, a largely information technology function to grant St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) access to Housing NSW’s tenancy management databases and systems. Additionally, it involved training new St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) staff to manage these tenancies. To meet the tenancy management requirements stipulated for Transition – that is, to assume responsibility for tenancy management across the Bonnyrigg Public Housing Estate – St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) and seconded Housing NSW Client Service Officers co-located in the Bonnyrigg Partnerships office near the Bonnyrigg Public Housing Estate. Housing NSW reported:

The Minister for Housing, Matt Brown, welcoming the handover of the estate to Bonnyrigg Partnership and the transfer of the management of community housing as an important milestone and a positive step for the community ... ‘Housing NSW has been working closely with Bonnyrigg Partnerships to ensure a seamless handover and minimal disruption to the lives of residents’, Mr Brown Said. (NSW Department of Housing, 2007a, p.1)
Throughout 2007, St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) staff, which included seconded Housing NSW Client Service Officers with whom public housing tenants had an established relationship, worked together to prepare the information technology and other systems and train their Housing Managers for Transition. From April 2007, St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) staff also began to assume responsibility for the neighbourhood barbecues, street meetings and other ‘community engagement’ functions previously managed by the Community Building Team (see Figure 41 overleaf). Therefore, the transition from the state housing authority to the private sector was not a direct process for public housing tenants and residents on the ground. Instead, it was a gradual process whereby many of the ‘community engagement’ functions continued in a similar form and with similar BLCP staff.

These included developing community newsletters, hosting street meetings, neighbourhood barbecues, and conducting Community Reference Group and Bonnyrigg Public Housing Tenants’ Group meetings. Staff from the Community Building Team and the local Housing NSW Officer, who were familiar to public housing tenants and residents through their participation in these ‘community engagement’ processes over the preceding 2-year period, were still prominent figures in these events, meetings and discursive processes. The change came slowly from the signing of the BLCP Deeds, with Community Building Team members withdrawing from these functions at different times; while others, including seconded Housing NSW staff, changed their stated affiliation from Housing NSW to St George Community Housing. Further still, new St George Community Housing ‘Housing Mangers’ were being incrementally introduced to public housing tenants and residents at these events and meetings by Housing NSW staff familiar to public housing tenants and residents.
Figure 41 – Meet the St George Community Housing team

MEET THE TEAM

Housing Management and Maintenance
Bonnyrigg Partnerships’ Housing Management & Maintenance Team is made up of St George Community Housing and Spotless Services Australia. We will be responsible for housing management and maintenance of Department of Housing homes and some facilities in the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Area from 20th October 2007. Two members of the current Department of Housing Service team will also be working with us to ensure that your needs are fully understood.

Who is St George Community Housing?

- We were established in 1985 as a non-profit & government-funded community housing provider.
- We provide and/or manage affordable and secure housing for individuals and families in the Sydney area.
- We are the largest community housing provider in NSW, managing over 1600 properties.
- We aim to be responsive to community needs and achieve the highest standards of accountability, efficiency and community service that we can.
- We encourage tenant involvement in our organisation.
- We are required to meet National Housing Standards and go through regular accreditation and registration processes. The Department of housing through the Office of community housing assesses this accreditation.
- We achieve the highest rating (Type 1 Grade A) as a registered housing provider under the Department of Housing’s compulsory Performance Based Registration System.
- We have won many awards for excellence in Community Housing.

Source: Bonnyrigg Partnerships (2007h, p.1)
In another space, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) was working with Housing NSW and Judith Stubbs and Associates (Community Consultation Consultant) to plan the first information and consultation events to be held ‘by the private partner’ in April 2007. Again, these events involved members of the Community Building Team and Housing NSW alongside members of Becton Property Group, St George Community Housing and other BLCP subcontractors (Urbis, 2008a, p.13).

Judith Stubbs and Associates (2007b) defined the first set of events as *Phase 1 Bonnyrigg Community Engagement*,\(^{104}\) while the Masterplan (Urbis, 2008a) text used the term *Community Consultation*. What separates the April/May 2007 set of information and consultation events from a second set of events conducted in August 2007 was the involvement of Housing NSW in the first set of events only. Therefore, this study uses the terms from the Masterplan (Urbis, 2008a, p.13) text that better reflect this distinction during *Mobilisation*. These terms are: *Community Consultation (BP\(^{105}\) and DoH\(^{106}\)*, conducted in April/May 2007; and *Community Consultation (BP)*, conducted in August 2007. The events for each of these micro-level invited spaces are outlined in Tables 11 and 12 overleaf. These tables are followed by the text of *Have your say about Bonnyrigg’s future*. This timeline text was created by Bonnyrigg Management (The Manager) to locate the *Community Consultation (BP and DoH)* and *Community Consultation (BP)* events within *Mobilisation* (up to October 2007), and to locate a range of further community consultations on the management plans from *Transition* (from October 2007). This text guided community engagement throughout 2007 and provided a ridged timetable for the private-sector contractors from *Mobilisation* (Figure 42 on page 286).

\(^{104}\) *Phase 1 Bonnyrigg Community Engagement* is not to be confused with the *Phase 1 Framing the redevelopment project* that I have used in the invited space analytical framework of this thesis.

\(^{105}\) Bonnyrigg Partnerships (BP).

\(^{106}\) NSW Department of Housing (DoH).
Table 11 – Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP and DoH) – Information and consultation events conducted by Housing NSW and Bonnyrigg Partnerships in April and May 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 April 2007</td>
<td>Community Information Days</td>
<td>Information Session 1 ‘Meet the private partner’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 April 2007</td>
<td>Community Information Days</td>
<td>Information Session 2 ‘Meet the private partner’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May 2007</td>
<td>How to Have Your Say</td>
<td>Workshop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May 2007</td>
<td>How We Use Our Outdoor Space</td>
<td>Workshop 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 May 2007</td>
<td>How We Use Our Indoor Space</td>
<td>Workshop 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (collated by author from Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b, p.8; Urbis, 2008a, p.13).

Table 12 – Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP) – Information and consultation events conducted by Bonnyrigg Partnerships in August 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 August 2007</td>
<td>Community Information Days</td>
<td>Information Session 1 ‘Revised plans released’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 August 2007</td>
<td>Community Information Days</td>
<td>Information Session 2 ‘Revised plans released’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2007</td>
<td>Household survey of 97 households</td>
<td>30–40 minute interviews with residents in their homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(conducted over four days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2007</td>
<td>Public displays of redevelopment plans (held in the local shopping centre)</td>
<td>Consultation on revised plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(held on selected Thursdays and Saturdays)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (collated by author from Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007c, p.2; Urbis, 2008a, p.13).
Figure 42 - The private-sector community consultation timeline

Have your say about Bonnyrigg’s future

We want to give you as many opportunities as possible to hear about what is proposed and have your say. The timetable for community consultation and the calendar of events for May and June are outlined here.

PHASE 1 - APRIL TO JULY 2007
Bonnyrigg Partnerships’ plans are shown to the community for the first time.
You’ll have lots of opportunities to comment on plans for roads, open spaces, the staging of development and some of the types of homes.

PHASE 2 - JULY TO SEPTEMBER 2007
Revised plans are presented to the community for comment.
What you said during Phase 1 will be taken into account in drawing up the revised plans and you’ll have further opportunities to comment. You can also give your views on plans for community renewal, for example, employment, services and community projects, in this phase.

PHASE 3 - OCTOBER TO DECEMBER 2007
Final plans are lodged for approval.
Final plans will be drawn up, taking into account all the comments received during the previous consultation sessions, and will be lodged with Fairfield City Council. Council will do the assessment of the plans and will invite you to make formal submissions on them.
We will continue to work with you and listen to you for the life of the project.

What opportunities will there be to have a say?
You will have many opportunities throughout 2007 to hear about what is proposed and have your say. The Calendar for May and June is on the back of this sheet, and includes:
- Community Information Days
- A Project Information Centre in the Plaza, which will also have sessions each week in the main community languages
- Workshops in the main community languages
- Special sessions on specific issues for indigenous people, older people, young people, and people with a disability

Please contact us if you need:
- An interpreter in your language
- Childcare to attend a workshop or event
- Transport if you are housebound or would find it difficult to come along to a workshop or event

Want to know more?
- Everyone is welcome to come along to any of the events shown on the Calendar
- Drop in to the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project Information Centre in Bonnyrigg Plaza
- Phone Bonnyrigg Partnerships on 1300 137 265
- Visit us at www.bonnyriggpartnerships.com.au

Additionally, during Mobilisation I attempted to negotiate the formal research agreement with Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager). I met initially with the newly appointed General Manager of Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), who had not been involved in the BLCP previously. Therefore, the General Manager had no prior knowledge of the research proposal, the study or previous work undertaken in Bonnyrigg on public housing tenant participation. Guided by the December 2006 letter from Becton Property Group providing *in principle* support to study, we discussed the research history, aims and methodology. In a series of meetings between March 2007 and July 2007, I provided a range of texts outlining the research questions and the proposed methodology, and attempted to establish a process to gain approval from the Bonnyrigg Management Board.

However, as the General Manager was still acquainting herself with the BLCP project, contract structures, contractors and subcontractors, and preparing for Mobilisation information and consultation processes, she was not able to invest sufficient time to provide detailed feedback to the research proposal. Meanwhile, I continued to attend the public events facilitated by Housing NSW and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) throughout Mobilisation, including the *Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP and DoH)* information and consultation events, neighbourhood barbecues and street meetings. When I attempted to resume discussions regarding the study in mid-2007, I was informed that the General Manager had resigned and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) was in the process of recruiting a new candidate. Around the time of Transition in October 2007, I restarted negotiations with the interim General Manager, a senior member of Becton Property Group, who had little knowledge of the study.

On 10 December 2007, a research agreement was circulated between the proposed collaborative research partners, The University of Western Sydney and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager). This research agreement (University of Western Sydney, 2007) proposed the following:
CHAPTER 7

The research period

The research project is expected to involve a comprehensive data collection phase between January 2008 and March 2009 involving Bonnyrigg Partnerships staff. It is anticipated the candidate will be based in Bonnyrigg two days per week and will have the greatest contact with Bonnyrigg Partnerships staff located in Bonnyrigg throughout this phase of the research. Between March 2009 and March 2010 the candidate will have periodic contact with Bonnyrigg Partnerships staff and may still spend significant time in Bonnyrigg. (University of Western Sydney, 2007, p.1)

The research question

The candidate will be exploring the compatibility of the principle and practices of ‘community participation’ and ‘engagement’ with Public–private Partnerships in community regeneration and urban renewal ... However, the empirical study will consider elements such as: the internal accountability structures and relations within the private partner consortium and between the consortium, the state housing authority and tenants; the complex tender requirements required of the consortium relating to tenant involvement, tenancy management and communication; and the intersection of the various tender requirements and resolution process within the consortium. (University of Western Sydney, 2007, p.1)

The proposed methodology

The research method is expected to utilise a form of Action Research and the specific research question will therefore be decided by the candidate and co-researchers Bonnyrigg Partnerships after an initial period of collaborative reflection on location in Bonnyrigg. (University of Western Sydney, 2007, p.1)

Reporting requirements

The candidate will produce a report of the findings (Bonnyrigg Partnerships Report) and/or other aspects of the study as deemed beneficial by Bonnyrigg Partnerships co-researchers. While the exact study outputs will require further negotiation between the candidate and Bonnyrigg Partnerships, these outputs may include: writing up the results in a format that is most beneficial to Bonnyrigg Partnerships for future projects; co-presenting the results at academic conferences; or the co-publication of findings in industry or academic journals. (University of Western Sydney, 2007, p.2)
In-kind support

Bonnyrigg Partnerships will provide Dallas Rogers access to the BLCP, Bonnyrigg Partnerships staff and tenants. Bonnyrigg Partnerships will also provide Dallas Rogers with access to a workstation in the Bonnyrigg Partnerships office for two days per week from which Dallas Rogers can coordinate the study. (University of Western Sydney, 2007, p.2)

By the end of 2007, I was discussing the research questions with key members of the Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group and Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group and planning for public housing tenant involvement in the study as part of the action research process. Meanwhile, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) had not engaged in detailed discussions about the research questions or methodology, nor signed the research agreement.

Transition – From October 2007

On 20 October 2007, defined as Transition by Housing NSW (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007), many of the contract Deeds became fully effective for the contractors and subcontractors in Bonnyrigg. From this date, Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) became solely responsible for the BLCP, albeit through a range of contracts and side contracts to be delivered by different subcontractors. Of the three broad management services being provided by Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) – Asset Services, Community Services and Tenancy Services – the implementation on the ground was as shown in Table 13 overleaf.
Table 13 – Accountability arrangements on the ground for the services being provided by The Project Company at *Transition* (20 October 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Services</th>
<th>Asset Services</th>
<th>Infrastructure Planning and Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>• No physical works started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Urban design under way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dwelling design under way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Statutory approvals under way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Concept Plan submitted for planning approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Services</td>
<td>Facilities Management Services</td>
<td>Facilities Management Company assumes responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public housing tenants now directed to the Facilities Management Company for repairs and maintenance by Housing NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Services</td>
<td>Rehousing Services</td>
<td>• No public housing tenants rehoused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Housing NSW working with the Tenancy Services Manager to develop the rehousing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Services</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Communication and Consultation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Project Company assumes responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information and consultation events conducted by The Project Manager in August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Services</td>
<td>Community Building Services</td>
<td>• The Project Manager assumes responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Services</td>
<td>Tenancy Services</td>
<td>Tenancy Management Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Tenancy Services Manager assumes responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public housing tenants now directed to the Tenancy Services Manager by Housing NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenancy Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Project Company assumes responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Project Manager now responsible for funding the independent tenant advocate service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (from Coates, 2007; NSW Department of Housing, 2007a; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007).

While The Community Building Team had been withdrawing from the BLCP on the ground since the signing of the BLCP project Deeds in December 2006, from 20 October the remaining staff members would have very little public contact with public housing tenants and residents in Bonnyrigg. However, Housing NSW would continue to act as the contract manager for the BLCP in Invited Space 4. Therefore, from *Transition*, Housing NSW positioned Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) as the first and last point of contact for all housing and BLCP matters for public housing tenants and residents in Bonnyrigg.
The October 2007 Newsletter, the last produced by The Community Building Team, clearly positions ‘Bonnyrigg Partnerships’ as the BLCP operator, and Housing NSW moved to distance themselves from public housing tenants and residents in Bonnyrigg. Under the headline “Bonnyrigg’s future now in the hands of Bonnyrigg Partnerships”, the Community Building Team stated “Future project newsletters will come to you from Bonnyrigg Partnerships” (NSW Department of Housing, 2007a, p.1), before going on to outline a range of service accountability changes. These included the following changes on the Transition date:

Facilities management

Who do I call for maintenance?

From October 20, you should call the Bonnyrigg Partnerships helpdesk on [telephone number withheld] or call in to the Bonnyrigg Partnerships office at the Bonnyrigg Plaza [street address withheld]. (NSW Department of Housing, 2007a, p.2)

Tenancy management

If you pay your rent at the post office using a Department of Housing rent card you should stop using that card from 20th October 2007. From that date you will need to use your Bonnyrigg Partnerships Interim Rent card which was posted out to you recently. (NSW Department of Housing, 2007a, p.4)

On 20 October 2007, the management of all public housing in Bonnyrigg was transferred to Bonnyrigg Partnerships and their specialist housing management team, St George Community Housing. While all aspects of tenancy management will now be handled by St George Community Housing, the existing rights and responsibilities of Bonnyrigg tenants will remain unchanged. (Housing NSW, 2008a, p.1)

From Transition and guided by the Services Manual, ‘community engagement’ was fragmented into ‘communication and consultation services’, ‘community building services’ and ‘tenancy support services’ as specific and independent contract

107 In the newsletter, it is not clear if ‘Bonnyrigg Partnerships’ refers to The Project Company or The Project Manager.
functions to be completed as contract requirements by a range of subcontractors (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007b, 2008c). Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) was now established on-site, with an office located in the local shopping precinct attached to the public housing estate. Co-located in the Bonnyrigg Partnerships office were permanent staff members from Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), Spotless Pty Ltd (The Facilities Services Manager) and St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager).

As part of the Transition process, Housing NSW had largely withdrawn from the Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group, the Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group, Bonnyrigg Private Owners Group and other smaller ‘engagement’ processes. Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), Spotless Pty Ltd (The Facilities Services Manager) and St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) now attended these meetings and groups under the consolidated name of ‘Bonnyrigg Partnerships’.

**Mediation between invited spaces in Phase 3: Housing NSW becomes the invisible ‘partner’**

Housing NSW, the BLCP contractor and subcontractors, and public housing tenants and residents were only in one micro-level invited space together during Phase 3 of the BLCP: Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP and DoH). From that point on, as The Community Building Team slowly reduced its participation on the ground, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) mediated (Silverstone, 1999) the movement, dissemination and regulation of ‘information’ between different social entities and in between Invited Spaces 4 and 5 of the BLCP. Housing NSW directed public housing tenants and residents to Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) when issues arose in information sessions, meetings and other public events, even when these issues related to the BLCP contractor.
From *Transition*, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) created: ‘community housing’ and ‘private owner’ narratives by fragmenting and commodifying ‘consultation outcomes’ and information collected through the Customer Satisfaction Survey. This information was presented to Housing NSW and public housing tenants, and eventually turned into promotional material used to market the estate. Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) also created contract management narratives by fragmenting and commodifying information from the BLCP contract management process. However, there was limited mediation of information about the contract management process provided to public housing tenants in the two tenant groups meetings: Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group and the Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group.

Therefore, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) largely controlled the construction and transition of ‘information’ to social subjects and between Invited Spaces 4 and 5. Additionally, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) presented this ‘information’ on behalf of different social subjects, in this case on behalf of public housing tenants and residents. These Phase 3 micro-level invited spaces, and the mediation of ‘information’ by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), are shown in more detail in the Social Event section of this chapter.
Discursive practice: Community engagement and an invisible housing authority

This section uses Fairclough’s *discursive practice* (1992, p.78) and his more recent theorisation of *social practice* (2003, p.21) to show how the institutional structures outlined above further mediated the selection of certain master discourses throughout Phase 3 of the BLCP. The analysis is focused on describing the way in which the private-sector contractor and subcontractors framed ‘community engagement’ in Phase 3 of the BLCP. The analysis therefore considers the further embedding of various discourses, including neo-communitarian approaches to community building, in the ‘community engagement’ strategy developed by the private-sector contractor and subcontractors in Phase 3.

Further, the analysis shows how these discourses were reimagined by a range of social actors, and given new meaning and project function within the new market-based spaces in Phase 3 of the BLCP. The texts are presented within specific genres, ways in which the private-sector contractors acted, to show the author of the texts, to whom the texts were distributed, how social subjects and other social entities were represented in these texts, and the type of engagement process being advocated by the authors.

To facilitate this analysis, this section only provides a limited description of the texts that framed the BLCP contract management process or the contract management processes, as these process were largely regulated by various commercial confidentiality arrangements and were conducted off-site between Housing NSW and Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company), Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), Spotless Pty Ltd (The Facilities Services Manager) and St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager). In other words, these processes were rendered ‘invisible’ to public housing tenants by the construction of the BLCP as a public–private partnership.
However, while this section is focused on the texts that have shaped ‘community engagement’ in Phase 3 on the ground, the discursive effect of the contract management negotiations and texts, irrespective of the commercial-in-confidence status, can be observed in the actions and programs implemented on the ground by contractor and subcontractor staff. This analysis will make these points explicit.

**Genres: Tests that framed ‘community engagement’**

Within Phase 3 of the BLCP, now guided by the BLCP Deeds, Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) compartmentalised and fragmented the various BLCP contract functions related to ‘community engagement’ further, to facilitate service allocation to the various subcontractors. The various rungs on Arnstein’s *Ladder of Participation* (see Figure 24 on page 200), or quadrants in Davidson’s *Wheel of Participation* (see Figure 25 on page 201), became independent contract tasks to be delivered by the private-sector contractor and subcontractors and measured by KPI (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007b, 2008c; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007).

These ‘community engagement’ functions – information, consultation, participation and capacity building (called empowerment in the *Wheel of Participation*) – were located within various BLCP management services and various ‘actions’ were created to achieve these desired ‘service’ outcomes. Table 14 overleaf compares: the ‘community engagement’ aim from the BLCP community engagement schema; the contract service requirements developed by the private sector; and the subcontractor ‘actions’ related to each service requirement.

As shown in Chapter 6, this type of reconfiguring and compartmentalising of Arnstein’s *Ladder of Participation* has important implications relating to the orientation of ‘community engagement’ towards citizen power. Soon after signing
the BLCP contract Deeds in December 2006, The Community Building Team sought to remove Housing NSW staff from direct contact with public housing tenants and other residents on the ground by positioning the private-sector contractor and subcontractors as the new local contact and BLCP manager.

Table 14 – BLCP contract management services fragmented into the ‘community engagement’ quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrants</th>
<th>Management service</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Information</td>
<td>Communication and consultation services</td>
<td>Provide public housing tenants and other residents with information about the BLCP, and the BLCP contractor and subcontractors</td>
<td>The Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consultation</td>
<td>Communication and consultation services</td>
<td>Consult public housing tenants and other residents about Staging Plans as part of the approvals process</td>
<td>The Manager and The Development Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participation</td>
<td>Communication and consultation services</td>
<td>Provide formal and informal ‘tenant participation’ spaces</td>
<td>The Manager and The Tenancy Services Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Capacity Building</td>
<td>Community building services</td>
<td>Provide capacity building programs for public housing tenants and other residents</td>
<td>The Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (from Arnstein, 1969; Blake Dawson Waldron Lawyers, 2007f; Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007b, 2008c; Davidson, 1998; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007).

Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company), now a large corporate entity responsible for the delivery of range of services via various subcontractors (and contracts), responded as you would expect, by returning to the contract Deeds and subcontractor agreements to began monitoring each subcontractor as they began service delivery. While the key subcontractors were co-located in the Bonnyrigg Partnerships office, they were implementing services under different contractual arrangements (guided by various management plans) and defined by their own BLCP management services contracts. The Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty

---

108 As determined by the researcher from observations and BLCP texts (Rogers, 2011). However, it is possible that the accountability structures contained in confidential texts and the organisational experience for employees of the contractor and subcontractors may differ from this assessment. In any case, this was the observed ‘reality’ from outside the organisation.
Ltd (The Project Company) texts related to ‘community engagement’ included the following:

- Communication and Consultation Plan
- Community Renewal Services Plan
- Management and Integration Plan
- Housing Management Plan
- Concept Plan
- Masterplan

while other plans – related, for example, more generally to the construction of physical infrastructure – included the following:

- Environmental and Construction Management Plan
- Voluntary Planning Agreement
- Traffic Management Plan

The following analysis will show that the result of this fragmented contractual and subcontractor arrangement, by Transition in October 2007, was that the information (communication), capacity building, consultation and tenant participation functions had been reduced to contracted services to be provided by various subcontractors under specific management plans. More importantly, the analysis will show that the contracts were being independently implemented, measured and assessed as components of a broad ‘Community Renewal’ approach (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007b, 2008c; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007), like bricks in a ‘community renewal’ wall, one stacked upon the other. When compared to the metaphor of linear movement from a politically powerless citizenry (non-participation in local urban governance), towards a politically powerful citizenry (a degree of citizen power in local urban governance) – outlined in Chapter 6 – the two approaches appear in sharp contrast.
However, this fragmented approach to service implementation is not in conflict with the management processes and structures of the private sector. In this space, the private-sector contractor and subcontractors required demarcated contractual terms, clear lines of accountability, predetermined resource allocations, integrated policies and procedures across the subcontractors, and rigid market mechanisms through which the BLCP would realise a profit for the contractors and subcontractors. ‘Locking in’ these various contractual, financial, resource and accountability measures meant, from the signing of the BLCP contract Deeds in December 2006, that there was limited opportunity for public housing tenants and others to influence these urban governance features of the BLCP.

_Mobilisation – December 2006 to October 2007_

In 2009, a senior member of the contractor working on the ground remarked:

“I think the first six months was, Mobilisation, so that was about making sure we had all the nuts and bolts, so that we could deliver the onsite services we needed to around housing management facilities maintenance ... then it sort of went into community development and communication, you know, and so there’s been a natural progression I think in terms of what people are concerned about. There was the nuts and bolts side of things and making sure that we had the staff on board, had them trained and ready to deliver”. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

Just prior to the signing of the BLCP contract Deeds, the _Communications and Issues Management Group_ (CIMG) circulated a confidential 20-page ‘question and answer’ (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2006; Rogers, 2011) text to the contractor and subcontractors. This text constructed an official BLCP narrative, outlined the process for information dissemination (the text was structured in a question-and-answer format, to be used on the ground by the BLCP contractor and subcontractors) and the internal and external communication processes for the BLCP until financial close.
CIMG was a committee set up by Housing NSW to develop ‘key messages’ and communications strategies, and to address ‘issues’ if and when they arose. The committee included members of Westpac Banking Corporation Pty Ltd, Becton Property Group Pty Ltd, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager), Spotless Pty Ltd (The Facilities Services Manager), Urbis (Masterplan Consultant), Judith Stubbs and Associates (Community Consultation Consultant) and Cosway Australia (Communications Consultant). CIMG did not produce public texts; instead, the committee produced internal communication guidelines and master BLCP narratives, to be retold by the contractor and subcontractors as part of their management functions.

These texts (narratives) were used by Housing NSW and the contractor and subcontractors to produce texts and to guide face-to-face interactions with public housing tenants at specific communication and consultation events (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2006; Rogers, 2011). All external, media or other communication processes were dealt with by CIMG directly until financial close (Rogers, 2011).

The Bonnyrigg Partnerships Master Q&A (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2006) text provided master narratives for every aspect of the BLCP, written in a ‘plain English’ format for use on the ground; for instance, for use by the Tenancy Services Manager to address questions from public housing tenants, or by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) to address questions from private homeowners. However, these texts also guided the larger information and communication event ‘key messages’ (Rogers, 2011).

From Financial Close in April 2007 to July 2007, Housing NSW and the private-sector contractor and subcontractors conducted a set of information and consultation events collectively titled Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP and DoH). The objectives of this ‘community engagement’ process through Mobilisation were largely shaped by the “expectations of the Department of Housing [Housing NSW] and the approach set out in the Communication and Consultation Plan in the

In addition to The Bonnyrigg Partnerships Master Q&A (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2006) text, the other texts guiding the initial information and consultation events were the Community Renewal Services Plan and the Masterplan (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007d). The first two events in the Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP and DoH) information and consultation process were two-way mediated Community Information Days held on 27 and 28 April 2007. Judith Stubbs and Associates (2007b, p.35) reported 500 people attending over the two days. The Draft Communication and Consultation Strategy, developed by Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) “in consultation” (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b, p.25) with Housing NSW set out:

the specific strategies that [were] implemented during Mobilisation, and a comprehensive calendar of events ... Discussions with the Department [Housing NSW] part way through Phase 1 (April 2007 to October 2007] provided the opportunity to use other ‘support’ activities such as BBQs and other special events as consultation opportunities as well. The Draft [Communication and Consultation] Strategy sets out:

- The messages that will be contained in all written materials to be used in consultation during Community Information Days, Workshops, Shopfront and Plaza displays, BBQs, home visits and all other contact with the community;
- The processes that will be implemented;
- Themes around which information and consultation activities would be organised;
- The requirement to provide feedback to stakeholders.

(Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b, p.25; emphasis added by author)

The ‘messages’ referred to above were the ‘key messages’, or the BLCP master narratives, that were developed and promoted by Housing NSW and the Communications and Issues Management Group through the contractor and subcontractors. However, the Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP and DoH) information and consultation events were more targeted, and each event focused
on a specific ‘theme’ or ‘topic area’ also informed by the expectations of Housing NSW (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b, p.31).

Table 15 – The topic areas for Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP and DoH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Plans released</th>
<th>Event type</th>
<th>Event theme(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonnyrigg Partnerships</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Community Information Day I</td>
<td>27 April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>releases plans to</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Community Information Day II</td>
<td>28 April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public housing tenants and</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Introducing Bonnyrigg Partnerships First Impressions on Bid Basics How to Have Your Say!</td>
<td>8 May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other residents from the</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>How We Use Our Outdoor Space</td>
<td>15 May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bid for:</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>How We Use Our Indoor Space</td>
<td>29 May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Roads</td>
<td>Information/Consultation</td>
<td>Designing a Safe, Environmentally Friendly Community</td>
<td>5 June 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Open space (parks)</td>
<td>Information/Consultation</td>
<td>What is a Social Impact Assessment?</td>
<td>26 June 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) House types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (collated from Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007d; Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b, p.31).

The clear demarcation between information and consultation is apparent from the first events managed by both Housing NSW and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) in Phase 3 (see Table 15 above). Housing NSW, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) and Judith Stubbs and Associates (Community Consultation Consultant) initially created two-way mediated general public ‘information sessions’. While the aim of the two ‘information sessions’ was to ‘introduce’ the contractor and subcontractors to public housing tenants and other residents, the genre (way of acting) was similar to Phase 2 ‘information sessions’. Judith Stubbs and Associates (Community Consultation Consultant) suggest that the Community Information Days and the Community Information Centre,109 located in the local plaza, had an

---

109 "The Bonnyrigg Partnerships Community Information Centre was open for visitors during the week starting 7 May 2007. The public has been encouraged throughout the consultation period to
emphasis on clear written and visual material, translations of key material, as well as on personal contact/verbal presentation were designed to meet particular community needs. (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b, p.8)

Despite the expectation by public housing tenants that they were now ‘partners’ in the BLCP and that the private-sector contractor and subcontractors were ready to ‘take their views’ on board, the ‘information sessions’ did not focus on informing public housing tenants about the processes for resource allocation or how they would like to be included in the project decision-making or the governance structures of Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager). Instead, these ‘information sessions’ were designed to inform public housing tenants and other residents about the private-sector contractor, and to introduce some of the subcontractors and the structures that Housing NSW and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) had set up to “involve them, where possible” (Coates et al., 2008, p.3; emphasis in original) in the BLCP.

The first two ‘information sessions’ involved a range of oral, textual and diagrammatic presentations structured by the ‘key messages’ of the BLCP. These ‘information sessions’ were combined with face-to-face interactions between Housing NSW, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) and Judith Stubbs and Associates (Community Consultation Consultant), and public housing tenants and other residents, as outlined below:

Bonnyrigg Partnerships hosted the initial release of information about the redevelopment plans for Bonnyrigg Estate at the Bonnyrigg Youth Centre on 27 and 28 April 2007. The two-day event provided the opportunity for the public to view initial plans for the redevelopment of Bonnyrigg presented through a series of large storyboards containing maps, photos and text. Bilingual Community Educators (BCEs) contracted by the NSW Department of Housing conducted “guided language tours” of the storyboards in the main community language. (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b)
An analysis of the texts – printed material, recorded information, diagrammatic presentations, plans, maps and visual images (Fairclough, 2003, p.3) – associated with these sessions shows that the events were designed to provide public housing tenants and residents with information about the private-sector contractor, the subcontractors and the BLCP according to a tightly controlled script or ‘storyboard’ (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b–d). Stubbs and Associates provides a list of the five texts that were given to public housing tenants and other residents at the information days:

- We are Bonnyrigg Partnerships
- Bonnyrigg Partnerships’ Bid at a Glance
- Housing Management for Public Tenants
- Bid Plan Maps – Staging Map and “Concept Plan” Map
- How to Have Your Say
- Consultation Calendar of Events for May and June

(Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b, p.35, citing Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007a,c,d,k,m; St George Community Housing, 2007)

Other maps, plans and texts describing the existing or future Bonnyrigg Public housing estate also accompanied the texts outlined above (see Figure 43 and 44 below).
Neighbourhood Mix

The new Bonnyrigg will comprise around 2,330 new homes - 70% private and 30% community housing - all built to the same high quality standards of design and appearance.

- Private and community homes will look the same from the outside.
- New private housing will be sold for a range of prices - including some that will be more affordable than new housing in surrounding suburbs.
- There will be a seniors’ living area near the Plaza with private and community homes.
- Around 20% of homes will be ‘adaptable’ - designed so they can be easily modified as residents get older or are less mobile.
- Home design and layout will meet the needs of the diverse community.

Source: Newleaf Communities (2008b).
Figure 44 – Stage 1 map

More importantly, a range of internal texts outlined the BLCP narrative and controlled the dissemination of information to public housing tenants and others. The ‘information’ from the texts that shaped the BLCP narrative during Mobilisation, while explored in greater detail below, is broadly summarised in Table 16 below.

Table 16 – ‘Key BLCP Messages’ from Bonnyrigg Partnerships texts during Mobilisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key message</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>The suggestion that ‘community’ members would have a degree of decision-making power. However, there were also clear steps by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) to provide a balanced assessment of the capacity for ‘community’ consultation in the BLCP. In any case, there were suggestions that the BLCP was still in a ‘proposal’ phase and that the ‘community would have their say’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community renewal</td>
<td>The suggested need for ‘community renewal’ and to move public housing tenants and other residents into paid employment or volunteer positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privatisation</td>
<td>The suggested benefits of the private sector. This included outlining the contractor and some of the subcontractors: providing justifications for selecting Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Company) over the other consortium; providing justifications for the public–private partnership by suggested a saving to government of $25 million compared to the public-sector comparator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure mix</td>
<td>The suggested benefits of ‘social mix’. This included providing examples of other ‘successful social mix’ estates and outlining the planning and design process that would engineer ‘social mix’ in Bonnyrigg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timelines</td>
<td>Providing BLCP staging and construction times. This included addressing public housing tenants’ and other residents’ concern about the delays with the BLCP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing density</td>
<td>Outlining the housing density increases; including providing justifications for the density increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling sales</td>
<td>Providing information about private housing sales. This included the anticipated prices for private dwelling sales and target markets (owner occupiers or investors).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (collated and summarised from Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2006, 2007a,c,d,k,m; St George Community Housing, 2007).

Between April 2007 and October 2007, the information about the BLCP and the private-sector contractor and subcontractors was also orally presented to public housing tenants at smaller two-way mediated general public meetings, neighbourhood level meetings, street barbecues and language-specific small group
meetings hosted by Housing NSW and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) [Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b,d]. The narratives contained in the texts associated with the initial information sessions in April 2007 were constructed from a range of texts authored by Housing NSW and the Communications and Issues Management Group and other texts dating back to BLCP announcement. These included, for example, ‘key messages’ about public housing tenant involvement that were reconstructed in the Have your say about Bonnyrigg’s future text. In this text, Bonnyrigg Partnerships (2007d, p.1) provided the following suggestion to public housing tenants and other residents during Mobilisation:

You will have many opportunities throughout 2007 to hear about what is proposed and have your say. (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007d, p.1)

However, ‘information’ and ‘consultation’ were clearly demarcated and distinct tasks to be completed by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) under the Communication and Consultation Plan (and contract) from April 2007. In the citation above, the narrative of ‘information provision’ is constructed as ‘hearing what is being proposed’, which in itself suggests that there is a BLCP ‘proposal’ that is open to change. Further, the narrative of ‘consultation’ is constructed as ‘having your say’; in this case, having your say about what is being proposed. However, both the ‘information’ that could be provided to public housing tenants, residents, the media and others, and the components of the BLCP open to ‘consultation’, had already been clearly defined by Housing NSW through a range of discursive processes stretching back over 2 years.

As shown above, Housing NSW and the Communications and Issues Management Group were (re)constructing BLCP narratives, in various internal texts (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2006), that were used as templates and guidelines for the creation of new ‘information’ texts. Housing NSW staff, the contractor and the subcontractors were also using these internal ‘key messages’, or ‘question-and-answer’ texts, to structure their face-to-face interactions with public housing tenants and other residents. Therefore, while there were many opportunities for public housing tenants to ‘hear what was being proposed’, and indeed there were
many opportunities to attend information sessions and meetings, the ‘information’
being presented to public housing tenants had been discursively constructed over
a long period, and now represented a very narrow and tightly scripted narrative
about the BLCP.

These narratives, while largely constructed by Housing NSW, would be presented
as ‘community’ or ‘Bonnyrigg Partnerships’ narratives throughout Phase 3. Similar
to the Phase 2 ‘information sessions’, the spaces created to provide
‘information’ to public housing tenants and others in Phase 3 allowed Housing
NSW, through the private-sector contractor, to further promote the Bonnyrigg
redevelopment and the market mechanism being deployed, in addition to a
selection of the changes being implemented through the redevelopment project
(social mix and housing density increases).

Additionally, these spaces allowed Housing NSW and Bonnyrigg Management
Pty Ltd (The Manager) to address public housing tenants’ and residents’ concerns
and questions in a controlled environment, in real time and face to face with the
public housing tenants and residents. Therefore, the information spaces were not
solely constructed to provide public housing tenants and residents with
information about the BLCP, the private-sector contractor or the subcontractors.
These spaces were also used to alleviate new or continuing concerns about the
redevelopment project, to further validate the intervention and to promote the
use of the market.

In the process, the discursive roots of these BLCP narratives, now deeply
entwined in a range of texts that had been constructed over several years and
authored by a diverse range of social subjects spanning multiple organisations,
were being augmented by a new set of social actors. For example, different social
actors were using various genres – ways of acting – to retell Housing NSW’s
public housing tenant participation story in the BLCP. In a review of ‘community
engagement’, Cultural Perspectives (2008, p.3) suggest that

Bonnyrigg has been identified as the pathfinder project for the Living
Communities Program. It is the first estate redevelopment model committed
to keeping community central to the decision making and planning for estate renewal. The project’s success will provide a benchmark for community renewal and engagement processes in future estate redevelopments and may provide guidance to subsequent community engagement in human service public–private partnerships.

In this citation, from a report based on a document analysis of BLCP texts and interviews with ‘key stakeholder’ of the BLCP, Cultural Perspectives (2008, p.3) retell the BLCP narrative about the ‘community being central to the decision-making’. Meanwhile, in the Masterplan, Urbis (2008a, pp.14 & 16) suggest that

From the announcement of the project in 2004 to the request for detailed proposals in 2006, the NSW Department of Housing held over 100 public sessions (including a series of workshops attended by over 4,000 people) from the time of the announcement of the project ... This consultation informed the specifications contained within the Public Private Partnership, and all consultation reports were forwarded to the consortium during the competitive process. This enabled the Bonnyrigg Partnerships proposal to be developed in accordance with community inputs (although direct consultation with the community was not permitted during the competitive process) ... Community consultation is considered an ongoing process with this project, and community members are expected to play a vital role in the overall design, planning, management, and place-making of the site.

In this citation, not only is the ‘community’ expected to play a vital role in the ‘management’ of the BLCP into the future, but the Phase 2 ‘community engagement’ processes have been discursively reconstructed as important consultation processes in their own right that informed both the public–private partnership ‘specifications’ and the bids prepared by the private sector. While this may be the case, in a very limited sense, these spaces were not designed or constructed at the time as democratic spaces for participation. Instead, the messages provided to public housing tenants during Phase 2 by Housing NSW suggested that the contractor and subcontractors would be required to develop their plans ‘in partnership with the community’ in Phase 3.

The ‘capacity building’ projects of Phase 2 had the stated aim of building public housing tenants’ capacity to engage in decision-making processes with the private sector in Phase 3 spaces (see Privatisation and Partnership: Selling the Bonnyrigg
Dream on page 222). However, by *Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP and DoH)* in May 2006, Bonnyrigg Partnerships was consulting the ‘community’ on a very narrow selection of topics relating to specific design features. These included design consultations relating to the built form and open space, focused on how existing public housing tenants and other residents used indoor and outdoor spaces (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b,d). Therefore ‘community participation’, as a demarcated and contracted task, was now focused on consulting public housing tenants and other residents on a tightly controlled selection of design and planning features related to the built form. At this point, public housing tenant participation was retrospectively (re)constructed for Phase 2 to suggest that public housing tenants were involved in the private partner selection invited space (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007d; Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007a,d).

This provided a rationale in Phase 3 for not involving public housing tenants in BLCP decision-making (i.e. resource allocations and management). The focus of the ‘decision-making’ activity was now firmly centred on the Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group and Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group (see below). Judith Stubbs and Associates (Community Consultation Consultant) outline the consultation process during *Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP and DoH)*, in addition to highlighting that public housing tenants and other residents also commented ‘outside’ the specified topic areas, by stating:

> As noted above, feedback [from residents] was directed to specific topic areas and to themes and questions within these topic areas. However, it was not always possible nor desirable to confine data capture to the specific topic area or questions of interest to Bonnyrigg Partnerships. (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b, p.34)

The specific topics, outlined in Table 15 on page 301 above, were clearly driven by the requirements placed upon the contractor and subcontractors outlined in the BLCP Deeds, and were being shaped by the (limited) scope for amendment of the BLCP plans (i.e. the Masterplan, Concept plan and Staging Plans). By mid-2007, the BLCP plans had been in development since early 2005 and had
undergone significant approvals processes by Housing NSW. Additionally, the
texts had been used by Housing NSW to evaluate the private-sector bids and had
informed the selection of the contractor and subcontractor during the private
partners selection process.

Therefore, from the first information session, Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd
(The Project Company) stated the items on the agenda for consultation with the
Bonnyrigg community by outlining how the contractor and subcontractors would
release the BLCP plans in three phases110 (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007d, p.1).
Therefore, the contractor and subcontractors would consult the community in
2007 on the specific components of the plans through the three phases. The two
phases relating to Mobilisation are outlined below:

PHASE 1 – APRIL TO JULY 2007
Bonnyrigg Partnerships’ plans are shown to the community for the first time.
You’ll have lots of opportunities to comment on plans for roads, open space,
the staging of development and some of the types of homes.

PHASE 2 – JULY TO SEPTEMBER 2007
Revised plans are presented to the community for comment.
What you said during Phase 1 will be taken into account in drawing up the
revised plans and you’ll have further opportunities to comment. You can also
give your views on plans for community renewal, for example, employment,
services and community projects, in this phase.

We will continue to work with you and listen to you for the life of the project.
(Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007d, p.1)
As you would expect from a consultation program managed as a planning
approvals exercise, the consultations would now closely follow the release of the
development plans (see Table 15 on page 301 above). Consultations with public
housing tenants and other residents would, in turn, focus on a tightly scripted
selection of these plans targeted towards areas of the plans that might present
opportunities for amendment. What was becoming clearer to public housing

110 These phases should not to be confused with the three phases of BLCP deployment used in this
study’s methodology.
tenants, and was certainly clear to the contractor and subcontractors, was that the key planning decisions had been made and the plans had already undergone significant approvals processes over the last 2 years (through the Request for Detailed Proposals and bid evaluations processes, see Chapter 5). As a result, significant amendment to these plans was now essentially impossible.

These points are highlighted in the recommendations from the *Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP and DoH)* report, that states – in reference to the next set of information and consultation events – that Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) should

Show clearly ‘How We Responded’ to these community responses in the revised plans, particularly to the more contentious issues or those that pose the greatest potential risk to the project. (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b, p.53; emphasis in original)

Focus intensive consultation on aspects of the Concept Plan and dwelling design to which the community can have any final input early in Phase 2 [*Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP)*], including:

- Hold 2 Community Information Days on 3 and 4 August, which provide excellent information on the revised plans, and particularly those aspects where the community has had some influence over the outcomes.

(Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007b, p.52)

Clearly, the information and consultations processes, like those conducted by Housing NSW earlier, had become part of the risk mitigation strategy, as illustrated by the ‘How We Responded’ quote above. The difference now was that the private-sector contractor and subcontractors could not defer responsibility for involving public housing tenants and other residents in the BLCP to a third party. In Phase 2, Housing NSW deferred responsibility for involving public housing tenants and other residents in the BLCP to the private sector, to be undertaken in Phase 3. Housing NSW claimed that they were ‘building the communities capacity’ to be involved in decision-making processes with the private sector in Phase 3. Therefore, the contractor and subcontractors
identified early during Mobilisation the need to outline the limitations to the consultation process and to highlight where public housing tenants’ and other residents’ views, however minor, were incorporated into the plans following ‘consultations’.

The ‘How we responded’ metaphor was a prominent narrative in the second program of information and consultation events managed solely by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), but monitored by Housing NSW. These events, known as Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP), were conducted throughout August 2007 and coincided with the release of the Concept Plan, the Home Design Plan, the Housing Management Plan, the Draft Community Renewal Plan and the Draft Social Impact Assessment. During August 2007, the information about the BLCP and the private-sector contractor and subcontractors’ plans was provided to the public housing tenants in two forms at the two-way mediated general public community information days.

The first included a range of fact sheet texts, containing narratives from the Development Applications being prepared for submission to Fairfield City Council. These included the Bonnyrigg Partnerships texts: What we heard you say (2007o); Living in the new Bonnyrigg (2007g) (see Figure 45 overleaf); Stage 1: What do you think? (2007j); Staging Update – revised Staging Plan (2007l); Concept Plan map (2007c); Home Types for New Bonnyrigg (2007e); Stage 1 Homes (2007p) (see Figure 48); and Rehousing for public tenants (2007i). Second, these and other BLCP texts were orally presented to the public housing tenants and other residents through a range of two-way mediated processes including the information sessions, with public housing tenants in their own homes, at the Community Information Centre and in Community Consultation workshops (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007c, p.2).
Figure 45 – Living in the new Bonnyrigg: Private-sector promotional material

Living in the New Bonnyrigg

Bonnyrigg Partnerships would like to thank everyone who has shared their views about the plans with us so far. Our team has worked hard to revise the plans to respond to many things we’ve heard. We want to know what the community thinks about these revised plans, as we still have work to do on the plans before we submit them in October to the NSW Department of Planning and Fairfield City Council for assessment.

Source: Bonnyrigg Partnerships (2007g, p.1)
The Development Plans, information and consultation events and themes for Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP) are provided in Table 17 below.

Table 17 – The topic areas for Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Plans released</th>
<th>Event type</th>
<th>Event theme(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonnyrigg Partnerships releases Revised Plans to public housing tenants and other residents for:</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Community Information Day I</td>
<td>3 August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Concept Plan</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Community Information Day II</td>
<td>4 August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Home Design Plan</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Door-knock Survey on all the Plans; 20–40 minute surveys with residents in their homes (97 completed)</td>
<td>Throughout August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Housing Management Plan</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>All the plans were on display at the Bonnyrigg Partnerships Community Information Centre</td>
<td>Thursdays and Saturdays throughout August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Draft Community Renewal Plan</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Community Consultation Workshop on all Plans</td>
<td>August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Draft Social Impact Assessment</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (from Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007a–p).

Like the Housing NSW What you’ve told us so far text (NSW Department of Housing, 2005b) provided to public housing tenants and other residents in Phase 2 of the BLCP, the Bonnyrigg Partnerships What we heard you say (2007o) and Bonnyrigg Partnerships Bid ... at a glance: We heard you say ... how we responded (2007a) texts signal the continued fragmentation and commodification of ‘community’ narratives by the contractor and subcontractor. The genres chain during Mobilisation moved from promoting the contractor and subcontractors to public housing tenants in information sessions, through tightly controlled information events, to a ‘filtering’ and ‘reporting’ process starting in early 2007.

Within this process of fragmenting, commodifying and reimagining the information and consultation ‘data’ from previous and current events, the information was reconfigured, amended and aligned with the management plans of the contractor.
and subcontractors or directed towards the areas with some scope for change in Development Applications. This is perhaps best demonstrated by the reoccurring Bonnyrigg Partnerships’ narrative of ‘we heard you say ... how we’ve responded ... what do you think?’ However, ‘what’ Bonnyrigg Partnerships often ‘heard’ was usually related to the BLCP project aims or Bonnyrigg Partnerships’ management plans, as demonstrated below.

In the Bonnyrigg Partnerships Bid ... at a glance: We heard you say ... how we responded text produced in early 2007, Bonnyrigg Partnerships (2007a) states that they have ‘heard’ public housing tenants and other residents, under the heading:

We heard you say ...

We want to feel safe in a high quality residential environment
We want to build on existing strengths of Bonnyrigg ...
We want a range of housing options to meet the current and changing needs of local residents

(Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007a, pp.1 & 2)

Certainly one would expect many public housing tenants and other residents to ‘want to feel safe’, have access to a ‘high quality residential environment’ and to ‘build on the strengths of Bonnyrigg’. However, these statements are vague by definition and in application. For example, what is a high-quality residential environment, and would everyone feel safe in this imagined space or built environment? Perhaps more important, then, were the proposed solutions, the ‘how we responded’, provided by Bonnyrigg Partnerships.

The Bonnyrigg Partnerships Bid ... at a glance: We heard you say ... how we responded text produced in early 2007 by Bonnyrigg Partnerships (2007a) is provided in Figures 46 ad 47 overleaf.
Figure 46 – Bonnyrigg Partnerships Bid ... at a glance: We heard you say ... how we responded, page 1

Bonnyrigg Partnership’s Bid... At a Glance

We want to feel safe in a high quality residential environment
We want to build on existing strengths of Bonnyrigg

Better safer design (no more ‘Radburn’):
- All unsafe walkways gone and most cul de sacs linked to other roads
- Homes face the street
- A better and safer network of roads will link both halves of Bonnyrigg and improve traffic flow

All public housing demolished and rebuilt except older persons' housing:
- 18 small stages over 12 years to minimise impact on community
- At least 6 months notice in writing before any move
- We’ll work with you to ensure everyone in Bonnyrigg and surrounding areas stay safe and comfortable during the redevelopment

Cleaner, safer parks, open space and pedestrian networks with better facilities and lighting

Rights of public housing tenants will be maintained with housing management by St George Community Housing, as part of Bonnyrigg Partnerships

Total of 2,330 new modern homes:
- 70% private & 30% public housing
- Mixed throughout Bonnyrigg
- New public and private homes will look the same from the outside

A new multipurpose community centre with:
- A community hub
- Space for community activities and services
- Bonnyrigg Partnerships service centre
- Possible café and commercial centre and services.

Employment and training opportunities for local people from within and around Bonnyrigg

Figure 47 – Bonnyrigg Partnerships Bid ... at a glance: We heard you say ... how we responded, page 2

We want a range of housing options to meet the current and changing needs of local residents

Enough new public housing for all who have said they want to stay in Bonnyrigg...and most tenants will be rehoused in Bonnyrigg while new homes are built

**Mixture of housing types to suit different ages, families and needs:**
- Houses and townhouses
- Attached homes in groups 4, 6 and 8
- Apartment buildings of 4-6 storeys with lifts

**Modern high quality design that makes the most of outdoor space:**
- Most homes will have access to private yards and balconies
- Apartments and homes without a yard will be close to parks

**Best practice in environmental design:**
- Sound and visual privacy a priority
- Access to sunlight a priority in home & yard design
- Water sensitive design throughout
- More comfortable homes in winter & summer – less heating and cooling costs

**Meeting changing needs as people age or are less mobile:**
- A seniors’ precinct near the Plaza with specially designed independent living units, Aged Care Facility and services
- Smaller more manageable homes close to transport and shops
- Around 20% “adaptable” homes – easily modified as needs change
- Better footpaths and cycleways make it easier to get around

**Want to know more?**
Drop in to Bonnyrigg Living Communities Shopfront in Bonnyrigg Plaza
Phone Bonnyrigg Partnerships on 1300 137 265 OR
You can look us up at www.bonnyriggpartnerships.com.au

In the above excerpts, the initial BLCP aims developed by Housing NSW in late 2004, and outlined in Phase 2 in the *What you’ve told us so far* text, were again discursively reconstructed as ‘community’ narratives. Housing NSW’s aim of addressing the problems that they identified with the Radburn estate design in 2004 and 2005 are (re)represented as a ‘response’ by Bonnyrigg Partnerships to the contributions of public housing tenants and other residents when Bonnyrigg Partnerships states:

How we’ve responded ...  
Better safer design (no more ‘Radburn’)
(Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007a, p.1)

Or, Housing NSW’s public to private tenure ratio changes and the increase in the housing density required to complete the BLCP were (re)represented by Bonnyrigg Partnerships as follows:

How we’ve responded ...  
Total of 2,330 new modern homes:
• 70% private & 30% public housing
(Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007a, p.1)

These were not solely, if at all, responses to the contributions of public housing tenants and other residents. These statements came to be recounted in this text following a range of discursive processes, conducted by many social subjects, that included the continual filtering, reporting and then reimagining of Housing NSW’s aims and objectives contained in a range of BLCP texts from project announcement. The motivation to highlight the ‘Radburn’ design principle as a rationale for the redevelopment of the Bonnyrigg Estate, or the reduction of public housing stock on the estate to 30%, were clearly Housing NSW’s aims in the BLCP Expression of Interest (NSW Department of Housing, 2004c) and the BLCP Summary of Contract (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007) texts.
Further, many public housing tenants initially expressed concerns about the reduction of public housing to 30% on the Estate, and the subsequent increase in private housing stock, in Phase 2 (see Chapter 6). This text clearly demonstrates that the aims and objectives of the BLCP, authored by Housing NSW from late 2004, were partly driving text production related to ‘community consultation’ by Bonnyrigg Partnerships in early 2007. Certainly, the private-sector contractor and subcontractors were ‘listening’ to and ‘consulting’ with the community in early 2007, but what the contractor and subcontractors were ‘hearing’ was partly Housing NSW’s master problem-solution narrative of the BLCP, and partly a ‘community’ narrative constructed by Housing NSW from fragmented (strategically selected and rejected) public housing tenant and other resident ‘community consultation’ data.

_Transition – From October 2007_

In 2009, a senior member of a private-sector contractor working on the ground remarked:

[During] the Transition phase, when we actually got the handover from government and, and you know, we started to deliver on the ground ourselves – 100% - and I suppose both during Mobilisation and Transition the work being done with all of the different stakeholders, so you know at the beginning with Fairfield City Council, because they’re in an assessment role, we could not do the level of partnerships that we wanted to with them until the Masterplan was, you know assessed and passed through ... In terms of the community, very much about getting early runs on the board. So meeting their expectations around facilities maintenance as a first port of call. Building those relationships with the Housing Managers and the maintenance team ... in terms of the Community Development ... starting to develop the community development program. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

Later in 2007, when Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) and Judith Stubbs and Associates (Community Consultation Consultant) had conducted their ‘community consultations’ in Bonnyrigg, the reported ‘community’ narratives were more aligned with the Development Plans. In the excerpt below, taken from Bonnyrigg Partnership’s _What we heard you say_ text, the ‘community’ narrative is
largely focused on the built form relating to the Concept Plan and the Home Design Plan. These were the two Development Plans released at the time of the Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP) consultations. Bonnyrigg Partnership’s states:

What we heard you say

- We have some concerns about the attached homes
- We are concerned about storage and car accommodation
- Small streets
- We’d like toilets separate to bathrooms
- What about clothes lines and drying areas
- How will you look after the parks and open areas
- We’d like the Seniors Living Area built sooner

(Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007o, p.1)

I do not suppose that in this, or any other case, Housing NSW, the contractor or the subcontractors actively set out to misrepresent or exclude the contributions of public housing tenants or other residents in BLCP texts. Instead, what this and the previous chapter shows is that the conditions of possibility at any point in time shaped what was included and excluded in community consultation texts or represented as a community narrative. It may well have been the case that a significant proportion of the public housing tenants and other residents actively lobbied Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) and Judith Stubbs and Associates (Community Consultation Consultant) in the consultations on the points listed in the What we heard you say text. These points may even have originated from public housing tenants and other residents, along with many other fears, concerns, suggestions and observations (also see submissions to Fairfield City Council below).

However, these points were listed in this text by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) to allow the counter-argument, the solution, to be highlighted. Therefore, in the What we heard you say text, the ‘community’ narrative of ‘We have some concerns about the attached homes’ is countered with:
• We have reviewed the timing of the 6 attached homes so that they start in later stages
  (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007o, p.1)

Equally, the ‘community’ narrative of ‘We are concerned about storage and car accommodation’ is countered with:

• All homes will have lockable car spaces. The majority will have garages or carports and most homes will have space for two family cars on the property
  (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007o, p.1)

And ‘small streets’ is countered with:

• The small streets will now have more front entrances, transparent fencing and less garages to improve safety
  (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007o, p.1)

However, there was more driving the contractor and subcontractors at this point in time than simply a desire to address these suggested ‘community’ concerns after ‘hearing’ what public housing tenants and other residents ‘had to say’. In only one of the consultation processes, listed below from the Have your say about Bonnyrigg’s future (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007d) text, were citizens formally (and legally) afforded the right to participate in a governance process relating to the BLCP plans as citizens. Bonnyrigg Partnerships allude to this process by stating:

PHASE 3 – OCTOBER TO DECEMBER 2007
Final Plans are lodged for approval.
Final plans will be drawn up, taking into account all the comments received during the previous consultation sessions, and will be lodged with Fairfield City Council. Council will do the assessment of the plans and will invite you to make formal submissions on them. (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007d, p.1)
The formal submission in response to Development Applications is a mechanism available to all citizens as part of the formal review of all Development
Applications in New South Wales, Australia. In Bonnyrigg, Fairfield City Council is the delegated Development Application approval authority for the BLCP, despite the project being declared State significant under Part 3A of the Act by the Minister for Planning. As noted above, Fairfield City Council is conducting the approvals process through an IHAP, the process established within the organisation in 1999 to review Development Applications (Fairfield City Council, 2006a,b, 2007, 2008; Williams, 2005). Fairfield City Council suggest that

As a principle, the community under this policy should have a say in decisions about actions that could affect their lives. The requirement for notification [Development Application exhibition] is a balance of timeframes, resources and levels of potential impact in the decision to be made in the development or activity approval process. (Fairfield City Council, 2006b, p.1)

To facilitate this process, Fairfield City Council requires all Development Applications to be advertised in the local newspaper and placed on exhibition at the Fairfield City Council Administration Centre. The Administration Centre is located 4 kilometres from the Bonnyrigg Public Housing Estate. In the BLCP case, the exhibition of plans and texts was facilitated by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) and Judith Stubbs and Associates (Community Consultation Consultant) staff in the local shopping centre, as outlined above. This ameliorated any concerns about access to the development material, and Fairfield City Council suggest that:

- *Any person* may inspect the development application and any accompanying information and make extracts from or copies of them; and
- *Any person* may make written submissions to the consent [in the BLCP case approval] authority with respect to the development application. Council advises that it is prohibited from exhibiting certain documents as a result of legislative restrictions. (Fairfield City Council, 2006b, p.7; emphasis in original)

Of all the consultation processes conducted by Housing NSW, Fairfield City Council, the various consultants, and the contractor and subcontractor from
BLCP announcement until *Transition*, this would be the first process guided by legislation that provided public housing tenants with a legal mechanism to influence the BLCP. With legislated certainty, this mechanism also represented the only consultation process that was not mediated by Housing NSW, the contractor or the subcontractors. In other words, neither Housing NSW nor the contractor held the decision-making power in this case to decide the degree to which public housing tenants’ views would be incorporated into BLCP planning.

Further, in this process, public housing tenants, residents and a range of community service providers could author their own narratives and submit them directly to the IHAP through Fairfield City Council. In all the other ‘community engagement’ functions (Bonnyrigg Tenants’ Support and Advocacy Service, Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group, Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group and community consultations), the decision to include or exclude public housing tenants’ narratives, or the ability to fragment and selectively incorporate ‘community’ views into BLCP texts resided, at different points in time, with Housing NSW, consultants and the contractor or the subcontractors.

Following *Transition*, public housing tenants and other citizens had the ability to produce their own texts, create their own narratives, in response to the BLCP Development Applications, and submit them unencumbered by any organisation or body directly to the Development Approval authority who, in this case, had an established and independent process for reviewing the submissions. Further, individuals and organisations not resident in Bonnyrigg, but with an interest in the BLCP, were also afforded the right to provide submissions to IHAP.

For a more detailed chronology of the planning consent and approvals processes under Part 3A of the Act in Bonnyrigg, see Appendix 21. However, in summary, on 9 May 2007 a “Planning Focus Meeting (PFM) was held at [Fairfield City] Council offices” (Urbis, 2008b, pp.4–5) attended by: Fairfield City Council representatives; the contractor and the core members of their consultant team; and public authorities including the state planning authority, the state transport
agency, the state road and traffic authority, the state education and training authority and the state health agency. The Director General’s Environmental Assessment Requirements under Part 3A of the Act (commonly referred to as the DGR) for the Concept Plan and Stage 1 (see Figure 48 below) for the BLCP were issued by Fairfield City Council “on behalf of Director General” for Planning on 29 May 2007 (Urbis, 2008b, p.5).

Figure 48 – Stage 1 plan: Private-sector promotional material

Then, on 25 October 2007, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) lodged an Environmental Assessment with the Council as a “test of adequacy in accordance with the provisions of Section 75H of the Act” (Fairfield City Council, 2008, p.28). On 8 November 2008, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) lodged the Development Applications with Fairfield City Council for the Concept Plan and Stage 1 Project Application to cover works for the first stage of the redevelopment. Between 14 and 27 November 2007, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) and Fairfield City Council corresponded
directly regarding “a range of issues” related to the Environmental Assessment for both the Concept Plan and the Stage 1 Project Application, before Fairfield City Council deemed the assessment adequate for public exhibition (Fairfield City Council, 2008, p.28).

The Environmental Assessment, “prepared in association with the Part 3A application for the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project” (Urbis, 2008b, p.20), was publicly exhibited in Bonnyrigg Plaza and in the Fairfield City Council administration building for 58 days, between 19 December 2007 and 15 February 2008 (Urbis, 2008b, p.20). The Minister for Planning delegated the approval authority to Fairfield City Council for this Environmental Application as follows:

The Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project proposes the renewal of the estate over 13 years, with 18 stages ... The Part 3A application seeks approval for a Concept Plan to guide the staged renewal of the estate and a Project Application for Stage 1 which seeks approval for the subdivision and construction of 106 dwellings, roads, public open space, stormwater infrastructure and associated works. The permissibility of the proposed development relies upon the provisions of Part 3A, having regard to the type of dwellings proposed and the required zone boundary adjustments, arising from the reconfiguration of open spaces and the realignment of Bunker Parade to run parallel to the public open space. (Urbis, 2008b, p.69)

However, it must be noted that this process of public exhibition, and the submissions to Fairfield City Council that would follow, have to be understood in the context of what was open ‘to comment’. Not only had many of the key decisions been made in the BLCP (as outlined throughout Chapters 5 and 6) but, further, citizens who chose to provide submissions in this process would only be allowed to comment on the plans submitted to Fairfield City Council at this time, and not on broader issues or concerns. Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) directed public housing tenants and other residents with broader issues or concerns to alternative ‘engagement’ spaces, including the Bonnyrigg Tenants’ Support and Advocacy Service, Bonnyrigg Community Reference Group, Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group and other community consultation spaces (see below).
In this particular process of formal submission by citizens to Development Application under the Act, the comments and submissions (texts) were highly formulaic in the sense that the narratives were constrained by the scope of what was acceptable comment as defined by the Act. In other words, the citizen commentary or alternative citizen narratives (texts) were shaped by the Act and needed to address, directly, the Concept Plan and Stage 1 Project Application before Fairfield City Council in the context of the Act. However, as demonstrated below and notwithstanding these limitations, a range of citizen actors understood the power being afforded to them through this process and took significant steps to engage in this urban governance mechanism, with surprising results.

On 27 February 2008, the proponent made a presentation to the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) to brief the Panel members regarding the background to the project and discuss the fundamental issues associated with the Concept Plan and their application in the Stage 1 Project Application. (Urbis, 2008b, p.6)

Following the public exhibition of the Concept Plan and Stage 1 Project Application, from 16 February 2008 Fairfield City Council received 43 written submissions signed by a total of 58 citizens in three languages (Public submissions, 2008). These submissions were from the general public, including individuals, local property owners, local businesses, public housing tenant representative bodies, non-government organisations and local interest groups. Additionally, a range of local and state public authorities also provided submissions to Fairfield City Council.

The general public submissions written in Vietnamese and Spanish represent the first occasion on which Fairfield City Council received written submissions in languages other than English (Public submissions, 2008). Fairfield City Council (2008, p.45) divided the submissions into three distinct groups: submissions by public authorities; submissions by non-government organisations and interest
groups; and submissions from local residents and landowners. As would be expected from a major project such as the BLCP, written submissions (texts) were received from the following public authorities:

- The local government authority on behalf of the Council’s corporate and civic interests – Fairfield City Council (2008).
- The state housing authority – Housing NSW (2008b, 2009).
- The state road and traffic authority responsible for managing the road network, road capacity, road maintenance and driver licensing matters in NSW – The Roads and Traffic Authority (2008, 2009).
- The state health agency responsible for all public hospitals and health care facilities in central and southwest Sydney – Sydney South West Area Health Service (2008, 2009).
- The state urban fire and rescue service for NSW – New South Wales Fire Brigades (2008) and Fire and Rescue NSW (2009).

Written submissions were also received from non-government organisations and interest groups, including:

- The peak body for the social and community services sector in New South Wales – Council of Social Services of NSW (2008, 2009).
• The local non-government organisation currently funded to provide the Independent tenant advocacy service for the BLCP – Fairfield Migrant Resource Centre (2008, 2009).

• The local public tenant group supported by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) – Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group (2008).

• The local private landowners supported by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) – Bonnyrigg Private Home Owners Group (2008).

• A range of local sporting clubs – for example, St Johns Park Sports Club (2008) and Hajduk Wanderers Soccer Club (2008).

The texts outlined above were, perhaps, expected from the government agencies, non-government organisations and interest groups who had become involved in the BLCP. However, the contractor and subcontractors were not expecting such a strong representation from local residents acting independently of these groups (Rogers, 2011). Urbis (2008b, p.1), the consultant that prepared the Preferred Project Report in “response to the issues raised in those submissions” in accordance with the Act for Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), suggests that

Further, a significant number of submissions were received from local residents and land owners, the majority of which are currently living on the estate ... Each of the issues raised in the submissions is listed in the Submissions Response Table ... This table provides a summary of the issues raised in the public submissions and documents the response by the relevant specialist consultant in the proponent team. (Urbis, 2008b, p.45)

This final collection of texts contains individual and community narratives, certainly constrained by the scope of the Part 3A Development Application assessment and IHAP process, but often unmediated by an intermediary at this point in the assessment process. Equally, from the submission of these texts to the IHAP assessment process, the texts would now be two-way mediated between Fairfield City Council and the author. The private-sector contractor, subcontractors or Housing NSW would not mediate these texts.
Fairfield City Council, acting as the delegated Development Approvals authority, would now mediate the transfer of information between local residents and the contractor and subcontractors (and their plans) within a clearly demarcated invited space, with specific rules regarding local residents’ contributions and private-sector accountability. Perhaps unsurprisingly, when the local residents were given the opportunity to provide their own narratives, even within this tightly controlled invited space with a very narrow ‘issues’ range that focused on the built form and planning principles, they returned to previous issues outlined by them at BLCP announcement. These included the proposed tenure ratio targets (Urbis, 2007, p.7) and housing allocation (Urbis, 2007, p.7), but also the BLCP timeline, as shown by quotes from public housing tenants taken from public submissions:

I am concerned about the slow process of moving people. In my street people do not feel safe because so many houses are vacant and vandals have entered and trashed the properties. (Public submissions, 2008)

My concern is the seniors’ complex is in stage 12 because this is a long time away. There are a lot of seniors on the estate. I am 78 now so waiting a long time for appropriate accommodation is not possible. Consider making the seniors complex development sooner. Bring it forward in time for myself and all the people that need this specialised housing. (Public submissions, 2008)

Public housing tenants also continued to question the appraisal of the built form:

Because I wish to continue on this premises due to the facts that is close to the shops and my sons schools. I don’t wish to be relocated because the current house I am living in doesn’t have any major issues at all. I have been living here for 9 years and I’m fine with the home and its location. (Public submissions, 2008)

Many of these public housing tenant narratives were in conflict with the ‘community narratives’ provided by Housing NSW and the private-sector contractors in the What you’ve told us so far and How we responded texts. This draws attention to the importance of providing unmediated spaces for tenant input and
comment, to facilitate the articulation of various ‘voices’, and not simply consensus.

After the texts had been submitted to Fairfield City Council, the contractor and their consultants, guided by the Development Application processes and their contracts and subcontracts, began to fragment and realign these individual and community narratives with their current business needs. These business needs at this point in time were: (1) to analyse, fragment and reorganise the submission text information thematically, to better reflect their contract and subcontract arrangements and the development of their management plans; (2) to address these thematic ‘issues’ by determining to what extent the contractor and subcontractors were required, by contract, to address these ‘issues’; and (3) to determine the contractor and/or subcontractors responsible, determine the relevant development or management plans, and allocate a ‘response’ accordingly (Urbis, 2007).

Not only were local residents rehearsing old concerns and issues that had been in circulation on the ground from BLCP announcement in these new public submission texts, but they also made new demands of the contractor and subcontractors, relating to the built form (both are explored further below) (Public submissions, 2008).

It is important to note that the private sector was not expecting this level of public response to the Development Applications, and some contractor staff expressed disappointment with Housing NSW for encouraging such an ‘aggressive’ response from local residents and public housing tenants (Rogers, 2011). In any case, Urbis (2007) fragmented these submission texts and brought them in line with the Masterplan, Concept Plan and Stage One plans, and defined the content in ways that could be addressed by the contractor and subcontractors, as shown in Table 18 overleaf.
Table 18 – A summary\textsuperscript{111} of the local residents’ submissions in response to the Part 3A Environmental Assessment and Planning Act 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue/concern outlined by local residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built form inconsistent with surrounding development (Urbis, 2007, p.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient lighting will lead to crime (Urbis, 2007, p.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchens, bathrooms and toilets to be provided with appropriate ventilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms need to be spacious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient bathrooms/toilets in larger homes (Urbis, 2007, p.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase size of dwelling/provide larger backyards (Urbis, 2007, p.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in dwelling size/private open space (Urbis, 2007, p.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing residents have made requests for specific types of housing and facilities, location of housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and allocation within specific stages (Urbis, 2007, p.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling designs to take into account cultural issues (Urbis, 2007, p.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance from residents due to potential acoustic issues (Urbis, 2007, p.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned that seniors’ housing is too far away (Stage 12) (Urbis, 2007, p.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation is considered to be insufficient (Urbis, 2007, p.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving house will be a costly and difficult exercise, particularly for tenants with mobility issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Urbis, 2007, p.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust during construction period (Urbis, 2007, p.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise rubbish in parks and streets (Urbis, 2007, p.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public art spaces in community to reflect community diversity (Urbis, 2007, p.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road should be wider to facilitate waste collection and emergency access (Urbis, 2007, p.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock-up garage preferred, with at least two car parking spaces for a large family (Urbis, 2007, p.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide parking spaces for visitors (page 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident demand for recycled water, water tanks and greywater usage (Urbis, 2007, p.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground existing power lines (Urbis, 2007, p.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncovered stormwater drains are unsafe for young children (Urbis, 2007, p.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, as part of the fragmentation of public housing tenants’ and other concerns that arose through the Part 3A submissions process, and the realignment

\textsuperscript{111} As summarised by Urbis (2007) in the Preferred Project Report.
of these concerns with the contracted tasks required of the contractor and subcontractors, ‘consultation’ was further demarcated as a planning process in the BLCP. The Part 3A submissions process was now addressing issues, as determined by the submission process, relating to urban density, Estate and dwelling design, design principles related to safety, open space, transport and traffic, and broader infrastructure and environmental issues.

‘Capacity building’ and ‘community engagement’ were still contracted tasks for the contractor and subcontractors, to be addressed through the ‘Services Management Contract’. However, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) had planned to address local residents’ issues and concerns through the consultation and engagement spaces that they were required to create and control through the BLCP contracts. Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) anticipated that the ‘Community Renewal Services’ and ‘Community Consultation and Communication’ plans would guide these spaces, including the Mobilisation Community Consultation (BP) information and consultation spaces outlined above.

Both Housing NSW and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) staff informed me at the time that they were surprised at the local residents’ response to the Part 3A Development Applications in February 2008 (Rogers, 2011). Interestingly, while Housing NSW staff offered the local residents’ submissions as evidence of the success of the BLCP capacity building processes and community engagement strategy, senior contractor and subcontractor staff, by contrast, informally reported that the submissions could seriously delay the approvals processes by creating additional work and increased financial risks (Rogers, 2011). Some senior contractor and subcontractor staff were clearly disgruntled with locally based Housing NSW staff for encouraging public housing tenants and other residents to ‘go outside’ the consultation spaces that they had created to engage local residents in the BLCP (Rogers, 2011).

Through the process of revision undertaken as part the Part 3A, the contractor and subcontractors returned to the management plan texts to address concerns
related to the ‘community engagement’ processes. These included public housing tenant consultation and involvement structures, and employment and volunteering programs. What is clear in the texts from this point is a discursive move to (re)position the redevelopment in terms of the ‘future community’ by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager). This is contrast to the discursive focus on public housing tenants and other long-term residents that had accompanied the announcement, and had been a key focus of the state-led consultations. In the Preferred Project Report in response to Part 3A submissions, Urbis state that

The Masterplan has sought to plan for the renewal of the area based on a deep appreciation of the needs of the current and future community and adopting a specific approach to physically accommodating the community. (Urbis, 2008b, p.22)

To address “Social Impact Issues” (Urbis, 2008b, p.44) and “Social Impacts and Community Services” (Urbis, 2008b, p.51) issues raised in the Part 3A submissions, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) returned to the management plans, as outlined in the Preferred Project Report below:

Council’s correspondence dated 24 April 2008 raised a number of issues with regard to social impacts. Specific responses to each of Council’s comments are provided below:

• The Community Renewal Services Plan prepared by Bonnyrigg Partnerships (attached as Appendix 3) has been updated ...

• A Rehousing Strategy will be prepared and issued to Council following the submission of the PPR [Preferred Project Report]. The Strategy will aim to minimise the impacts on current tenants as well as private home owners. (Urbis, 2008b, p.44)

The importance of the management plans in the Part 3A approvals processes is further highlighted below, in another excerpt from the Preferred Project Report.

In response to Fairfield City Council’s Part 3A submission, Urbis states that

The major issue raised in [Fairfield City] Council’s original submission with regard to social impacts and community services was the location and detailed design of proposed community facilities ...
Each of these has been addressed as outlined below:

- All details relating to the design and maintenance of assets will be addressed in the Draft VPA [Voluntary Planning Agreement].
- An employment, training and economic development strategy has been incorporated into the Community Renewal Services Plan which is included at Appendix 3.
- A Rehousing Strategy and an Affordable Housing Strategy will be prepared and issued to Council following submission of the PPR. (Urbis, 2008b, p.51)

Urbis conclude the Preferred Project Report by providing an overview of the “Modifications to Part 3A Application” (Urbis, 2008b, p.56). These modifications, while noted in the Preferred Project Report, were communicated and implemented through the management plans. In terms of public housing tenant involvement in the BLCP, The Community Renewal Services Plan and The Community Renewal Implementation Plan were significant texts. For example, Urbis (2008b, p.56) argue, in the Preferred Project Report, that

The Community Renewal Services Plan has been updated ... A Community Renewal Services Implementation Plan has been prepared to provide the overall approach and framework to community renewal and outlines a range of community development initiatives which are directed towards enhancing social inclusion, strengthening community life and supporting the well being of residents. (Urbis, 2008b, p.56)

The other significant text informing The Community Renewal Services Plan and The Community Renewal Implementation Plan was the Social Impact Assessment for the BLCP. Social impact assessments are commonly completed by external consultants and review a range of predetermined ‘social impacts’, set by the contracting authority, or less commonly by the contractor, relating to infrastructure projects and other development interventions. In Bonnyrigg, the Social Impact Assessment (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007d) was completed by Judith Stubbs and Associates (Community Consultation Consultant) to

Fulfil the requirements of relevant heads of Considerations of the NSW Department of Planning’s Environmental Assessment Requirements (EARs), specifically, those related to ‘the likely social (including cultural) and
Like the Preferred Project Report, the Social Impact Assessment also sought to ameliorate social impacts by proposing ‘mitigation measures’ that located the arising issues within the BLCP Management Plans (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007d). Once the issue was identified and allocated within a Management Plan(s), Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) then held the contractor or subcontractor accountable for addressing that issue/concern. Therefore, the style, structure and functionality of the text (the management plans), and the organisational and contracted function of the social entity (the contractor or subcontractor) allocated to ameliorate the task, shaped the discursive response to the issues raised in the Part 3A submissions and Social Impact Assessment. Provided below is an example of how a ‘social impact’ issue would be located within one or more of the Management Plans:

> Community and health services will also be impacted by the project, particularly those related to community support, mental health and occupational therapy. A number of mitigative measures are proposed in relation to these services, some within the Community Renewal Services Plan, and others additional to this plan. (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007d, p.22)

Through this process, not only were new ‘issues’ located within one or more of the Management Plans, but so too were other more established public housing tenant involvement structures drawn into these plans. An important example is the Bonnyrigg Tenants’ Support and Advocacy Service (explore further below). More broadly, however, Judith Stubbs and Associates (2007d, p.95) suggest:

> Finally, in terms of increasing opportunity for public involvement and participation in environmental planning and assessment process (Object (5c)), we note the high level of community involvement in the wide range of consultation activities offered by Bonnyrigg Partnerships from April 2007, and by the Department of Housing and Fairfield City Council for two years prior to this.

For established public housing tenant involvement structures, such as the Bonnyrigg Tenants’ Support and Advocacy Service, Judith Stubbs and Associates
(2007d, p.50) argue that “[g]eneral concerns regarding increasing safety, compliance, etc” should be addressed through the “Community Renewal Service Plan”. Furthermore, the plan directs Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) to an existing service provider who can address these concerns for the contract manager. Further, it is a service, termed the “Tenant Advocate Service” in this text, that they will fund as part of the Community Renewal Service Plan. Judith Stubbs and Associates (2007d, p.50) provided the following recommendations:

BP [Bonnyrigg Partnerships] to support funding of an Independent Tenant Advocate Service through the CRS [Community Renewal Service] Plan to advocate for and follow up on concerns raised by the community or individuals. (Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007d, p.50)

Therefore, an ‘issue’ identified through a community consultation event conducted by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) and Judith Stubbs and Associates (Community Consultation Consultant) in Bonnyrigg was fragmented and (re)organised according to the texts and discursive processes of these organisations. In the process, the scope and functionality of the Bonnyrigg Tenants’ Support and Advocacy Service, a service managed by a local non-government organisation but funded by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) from Transition, was also reimagined by the contractor and subcontractors through these texts and discursive processes.

These texts include the Social Impact Assessment, The Community Renewal Services Plan, The Community Renewal Implementation Plan and the funding agreement with the non-government organisation providing the tenant advocate service progressively. As will be demonstrated below, what was ‘imagined’ by Judith Stubbs and Associates (Community Consultation Consultant) in the Social Impact Assessment – namely, a tenant advocacy service that advocates and follows up on concerns raised by tenants – may not be comparable with what was ‘imagined’ and funded by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager)
through their Community Renewal Implementation Plan and the funding agreement between the parties following Transition.

The scope and funding for the independent tenant advocacy service, as outlined in the ‘Services Management Contract’ between the local non-government organisation and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), was at least partly structured by the Community Renewal Services Plan. Throughout the Community Renewal Services Plan text, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) refers to the independent tenant advocate service as: a project for which funds should be allocated (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008c, p.4); and an intensive tenancy management program that will attempt to “avoid service interruptions that may cause tenant stress and anxiety” through Transition (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008c, p.53).

This is further refined in the Community Renewal Services Implementation Plan text, where these broad statements are discursively constructed as strategies and actions under various sub-plans. Tables 19 and 20 below show this discursive move.

Table 19 – Sub-plan 5: Community Capacity Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeframes</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource a Tenants’ Advocate Service</td>
<td>Investigate the suitability of the model provided by HNSW</td>
<td>January 2008</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg Management</td>
<td>Model Reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund an independent agency to assist public housing tenants in navigating BP’s appeals and complaints mechanisms</td>
<td>October 2007</td>
<td>Bonnyrigg Management</td>
<td>Service Funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 – Sub-plan 13: Intensive Tenancy Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeframes</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource a Tenants’ Advocate Service</td>
<td>Implement Sub-plan 5: Community Capacity Building</td>
<td>[Not listed]</td>
<td>[Not listed]</td>
<td>As per Sub-plan 5: Community Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Through this discursive process, from ‘community consultation’ through to the development of the Community Renewal Services Implementation Plan,
Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) makes ‘actionable’ certain processes that will be used to meet their contracted objectives under the BLCP Deeds. In this case, this included funding an independent tenant advocate service to meet their ‘community capacity building’ and ‘intensive tenancy management’ objectives. As also shown above, the measures for assessing these two sub-plans – ‘community capacity building’ and ‘intensive tenancy management’ – include: (1) reviewing the independent tenant advocate service model that was previously funded by Housing NSW; and (2) funding a service following this review. The analysis returns to the funding agreement negotiations for the independent tenant advocate service below, as a Social Event consideration.

**Representations: How Bonnyrigg Partnerships defined community engagement**

In this section, the analysis shows how certain discourses, ways of representing, were enacted in the genres and genres chains outlined above (Fairclough, 2003). The analysis demonstrates that the master discourses associated with urban renewal and social reform that were articulated in BLCP texts in Phases 1 and 2 were further incorporated and reimagined in the BLCP texts shaping ‘community engagement’ in Phase 3. In the final section of this chapter, the analysis will turn to how these texts were used to guide a range of social events, including the information and consultation events, funding of the independent tenant advocate service and other events, and how public housing tenants responded to these discourses and texts in different ways.

*Privatisation and Partnership: Confining the Bonnyrigg Dream*

Once the BLCP Deeds had been signed, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) moved to implement their various Management Plans in accordance with these Deeds. These texts would now define ‘community engagement’, outline the spaces that would facilitate public housing tenant and other resident
input and be assessed according to the KPI attached to the actionable tasks. In keeping with the market-based evaluative space that had been created by Housing NSW for the BLCP, *performance measures* became a significant mechanism by which ‘community engagement’ would be designed, deployed and assessed. For example, in the excerpt below, from the Community Renewal Service Plan, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) outlines three measures by which they will assess their Intensive Tenancy Management programs:

5.4.3.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy

Overview

There are essentially 3 parts to BP’s Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy:

- Annual customer satisfaction survey with relevant KPIs against which we are required to report regarding performance on tenancy management, client service, maintenance and repairs, and the like. This is dealt with elsewhere in this services manual.

- Longitudinal outcome-based evaluation by an independent evaluator (UNSW partnership).

- Proposed process based monitoring and feedback in the form of a 3-year PhD Scholarship offered by UWS to a student already engaged by DoH and FCC in community consultation and community renewal activities. (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008c, p.53)

The first measure is a KPI assessment based on the annual Customer Satisfaction Survey that the contractor was contracted to fund. The other two measures involved external evaluations by university research centres. Both the longitudinal study that was required by contract and my PhD research experienced significant delays in implementation as a result of independent negotiations between the research centres and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager).

As my study was independently funded and fieldwork was under way with public housing tenants by 2008, the negotiations between the University of Western Sydney and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) were focused on access to social subjects, the research methodology and reporting. No research agreement was signed for this study. As of late 2010, the longitudinal study had not commenced, due to protracted negotiations between Bonnyrigg Management
Pty Ltd (The Manager) and the City Futures Research Centre at the University of New South Wales regarding the research scope, methodology, funding and reporting (Rogers, 2011).

Despite the inability to reach agreement on the terms of the longitudinal and my PhD study, Bonnyrigg Management (The Project Manager) promoted these two studies to public housing tenants as processes for ‘having their say’, and as evaluative and monitoring mechanisms, as shown in the excerpt from the Have your say (Newleaf Communities, 2008a) text in Figure 49 overleaf.
Figure 49 - Tenant participation: Promotion of monitoring and evaluation strategy

**Customer and Tenant Satisfaction Survey (CTSS)**

Newleaf Communities undertakes an annual independent customer satisfaction survey. The CTSS is a key instrument by which our performance is measured and gives qualitative information about how residents experience our services. Residents are encouraged to participate so they can provide feedback on Newleaf Communities.

**Longitudinal Study**

The Longitudinal Study will monitor the experiences of residents over the next 15 years. The study will look at whether the community renewal process improves the lives of residents. Individuals who are part of the study will be revisited every 4 years and their experiences compared to previous years. This will be undertaken by the University of NSW.

**Tenant Participation Study**

University of Western Sydney PhD candidate Dallas Rogers is researching tenant participation in the Bonnyrigg redevelopment and is currently working closely with residents and Newleaf Communities. The research is supported by Bonnyrigg Partnerships and Dallas hopes his findings will be used to improve the delivery of services. Rogers’ thesis will be completed by March 2010.

Therefore, the only evaluative measures connected to the contracts for the Intensive Tenancy Management programs between Transition in April 2007 and late 2010 were the KPI assessments attached to the Customer Satisfaction Survey. While the Customer Satisfaction Survey was a simple and comparatively insignificant process within the broader BLCP process, what it shows quite clearly is the connection between defining ‘community engagement’ and ‘community renewal’ objectives in the Management Plans and then assessing them according to a technocratic evaluation process that is typical of private-sector management processes, as outlined below:

5.4.3.2 Customer Satisfaction Survey

Bonnyrigg Partnerships will conduct a comprehensive annual Customer Satisfaction Survey (CSS). The CSS will provide an evaluative tool to measure the performance of BP against a range of KPI’s, as well as providing an indication of community perceptions about our performance and the renewal process taking place. The CSS forms part of our continuous quality improvement. This data will also provide valuable opportunities for us to understand some of the less tangible aspects of the process from the community’s perspective as well, and inform the ongoing review of other strategies, including our Draft Community Renewal Services Plan and Draft Communication and Consultation Plan. (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008c, p.57)

Defining and assessing BLCP functions became the most important task for Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) following Transition, as these were connected to the BLCP Deeds and their payment schedule. Therefore, while the research negotiations had stalled between the University of Western Sydney’s Social Justice and Social Change Research Centre and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) with regard to a formal research agreement for my study, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) requested that I provided a fee proposal to conduct the Customer Satisfaction Survey. In this personal communication, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) stated:

We are currently seeking a market research company to undertake the first of a series of Customer Satisfaction Surveys to measure our performance ... As part of its obligations under contract to HNSW [Housing NSW], Bonnyrigg Partnerships must commission an independent customer satisfaction survey each year ... The CSS is a key instrument by which our performance is
measured and should be also give qualitative information about how residents experience the tangible aspects of the process. The survey must measure delivery of service in the following key areas for customers:

- Communication and Consultation Services
- Community Renewal Services

The survey must: ...

2. Measure Bonnyrigg Partnerships Performance against a range of KPIs (see attachment 1 – Relevant Survey KPIs asterisked and attached for reference). (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008b)

This was perhaps the type of ‘research’ Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) had envisioned for my study when they stated in the Community Renewal Services Plan at the same time:

Process-Based Evaluation

Bonnyrigg Partnerships has received a University of Western Sydney proposal to provide a PhD Scholarship to a student currently working for both DoH and FCC in community consultation and community renewal activities within the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Area. Dr Judith Stubbs has also reviewed his honours thesis, which was an evaluation of the community consultation process to date within the context of a PPP framework. It is likely that the PhD as proposed will contribute significantly to an understanding of the complexities of community participation in the context of Public Private Partnerships for both BP and DoH. (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008c, p.57)

In response to their request, I suggested that a study investigating the complexities of community participation in the context of public–private partnerships might be ill focused if guided by the KPIs outlined in the Customer Satisfaction Survey proposal. Instead, I directed Bonnyrigg Partnerships Pty Ltd (The Project Manager) towards the research processes that I was proposing with public housing tenants for consideration. While I acknowledge that this was a self-indulgent suggestion, within this discussion resides not only the seeds of what would become an untenable research arrangement between Bonnyrigg

112 Note that the University of Western Sydney was not suggesting that the contractor should fund the PhD scholarship, as the candidate already had been granted a scholarship through the University of Western Sydney and was working in Bonnrigg on the study. Instead, the negotiations regarded access to contractor and subcontractor staff for research purposes.
Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) and I but, more importantly, the survey was also the framework through which ‘community engagement’ and ‘community renewal’ would now be represented.

Community engagement and renewal were being discursively repositioned by: (1) a range of texts describing and (re)scribing the community engagement terms; and (2) the management processes through which they were governed. As highlighted in the excerpt above, within this market-based management space, a ‘market research company’ would now determine public housing tenant satisfaction with the BLCP. It is significant that Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) was “seeking expressions of interest from appropriate organisations to design the survey and methodology in consultation with key [contractor] staff” (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008b), for it had been the research scope, design and methodologies that had been issues of contention in negotiations between the two research centres noted above and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) to date.

The keen interest by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) in these types of research projects is connected to the governance and payment schedule for the BLCP. In this new market-based space, public housing tenant satisfaction had been commodified; it had a commercial value to Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), who would be subjected to economic penalties, through a “Performance Failure Points” appraisal mechanism within the BLCP Deeds, if public housing tenant satisfaction could not be demonstrated (Blake Dawson Waldron Lawyers, 2007c). Further, even the social entities within Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) were being discursively reconstructed within this space.

The Customer Satisfaction Survey letter itself is a reflection of the discursive move to reimagine public housing tenants and other residents as ‘customers’ and community development professionals as business professionals. The latter is illustrated by the creation of a new role, the “Community Relations Manager”,
within Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Project Company), who signed off on the letter (Rogers, 2011; Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008b). By mid-2008, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) was representing ‘community engagement’ through the set of Management Services that the contractors and subcontractors had been contracted to deliver. Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) now represented “community engagement’, to which the Customer Satisfaction Survey would report, as a set of deliverables, as outlined below:

The survey must measure delivery of service in the following key areas for tenants:

- Facilities Management Services
- Community and Consultation Services
- Community Renewal Services
- Tenancy Management Services
- Tenancy Support Services
- Rehousing Services

(Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008b)

The discourse of partnership is noticeably absent in most of these texts, while the effects of the market seem significant. This is in contrast to the representations in Phase 2 of the BLCP, which played down the effect that the market might have, while promoting the discourse of partnership between the ‘local community’ and other BLCP entities at local events and in BLCP texts. To better understand how public housing tenant involvement was discursively represented in Phase 3 of the BLCP, while noting that public housing tenants went outside the invited spaces created by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) and engaged directly with Fairfield City Council through the Part 3A submission process, for example, the analysis will now turn to the specific management plans that guided the management services listed above.
Neo-communitarian and social integrationist approaches to community building

From early 2007, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) began discursively realigning the information sessions, consultation events, capacity building objectives, volunteer programs, public tenant groups and the independent advocate service within the Community Renewal Services Plan and the Community and Consultation Services Plan. Through this process, these ‘community engagement’ processes were further demarcated from one another, until there was no recognizable schema that held these processes together other than their relationship to the management plans and the contracts.

These processes were no longer discursively constructed around a notion of partnership that would grant local residents a degree of citizen power in the local governance of the BLCP. Instead, the infrequent references to partnership that remained in some private-sector texts were often in reference to the broad BLCP ‘principles’ that they had adopted and borrowed from Housing NSW, such as the following, in the Community Renewal Services Implementation Plan:

**Principles**

Develop a **partnership** with the local community and other key stakeholders in all activities associated with the renewal of Bonnyrigg throughout the life of the project.

(Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007b, p.6; emphasis in original)

In short, these ‘community engagement’ processes had been further fragmented and compartmentalised by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), to be addressed as independent and contracted functions that were broadly defined and controlled by the two plan texts. Neo-communitarian and social integrationist discourses are deeply embedded in these two management plan texts, and have provided much of the discursive framing for the community engagement programs and processes that these texts articulate. Throughout the BLCP, much of this discursive framing has been inherited from one BLCP text to another – say, a text produced by Housing NSW in 2005 could have been copied and
incorporated into several other texts until it was again coped into a management plan text as a program objective in 2007. The following analysis focuses specifically on the Community Renewal Services Implementation Plan, as this plan provides guidance and instruction for the tangible implementation of the plans and outlines specific rationales and programs.

For example, sub-plan 5 from the Community Renewal Services Implementation Plan continues with the discursive features of building social capital and cohesion implicit in many Housing NSW BLCP texts. Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) suggest that the objective of sub-plan 5 is to: “Foster, strengthen and grow existing social capital within Bonnyrigg” by “actively participat[ing] in and support[ing] ... representative and consultative bodies”, including the Community Reference Group, Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group and Private Owners Group (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007b, p.14). The sub-plan also notes that St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) established an additional Bonnyrigg Tenants Advisory Group (BTAG) within the organisational structure of St George Community Housing (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007b, p.14) as part of the strategy to build social capital. However, the involvement of Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) and St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) in these local resident groups was not unproblematic, and will be explored further below – but suffice to note, at this point, that these discursive features have continued in the private-sector texts.

So too the social integrationist discourse is pervasive in the management plans. Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) argue, in The Community Renewal Services Implementation Plan, that

It is recognised that employment is a contributor to sustainable change in disadvantaged areas. There are higher than average levels of unemployment in Bonnyrigg. (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007b, p.17)
Key Action

Economic Development programs including a pilot business development program, volunteering opportunities, vocational English and local employment through the project to support residents towards self-sufficiency.

(Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007b, p.9)

In the context of employment and training, and guided by “Sub-plan 7: Bonnyrigg Employment, Education and Training Strategy”, the discourse of partnership continues. However, partnership in this context is not describing a relationship of shared decision-making or program design; instead, it is used by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) to enlist a range of local government and non-government bodies to assist the contractor and subcontractors in meeting their contractual requirements.

Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) suggest that the Bonnyrigg Employment, Education and Training Strategy aims to “work in partnerships with a range of services and networks to develop a comprehensive plan” (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007b, p.17). However, it must be noted that the local government and non-government bodies enlisted by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) to undertake these employment and training functions have the capacity, in many cases, to undertake this work and these bodies are, in some cases, also independently funded to do so. The important point in the BLCP case is that the BLCP management structure proposed by Housing NSW would ideally seek to transfer the recruitment processes and some of the funding responsibility to the private sector.

This transfer of decision-making power and funding responsibility, and the dangers of such an approach, are demonstrated in the BLCP case by the ‘review’ of the Independent Tenant Advocate Service and the associated funding restructuring by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) (investigated further below). It is also demonstrated by Housing NSW’s decision to attempt to defer the responsibility for employment, education and volunteer programs, and
associated funding requirements, to a contracted third party (the private-sector) in Bonnyrigg. The Newleaf Communities’ pamphlet provided overleaf in Figure 50 is a good example of the discursive linking of BLCP volunteering programs at the local level with welfare entitlements and the Welfare to Work reforms at the federal level.

Figure 50 – Volunteering in Bonnyrigg

Volunteers enjoy a number of benefits:

- Meeting new people and making friends
- Using and improving existing skills
- Developing new skills through FREE on-the-job training
- Building self-confidence
- Making contacts that may be able to assist with finding paid work in the future
- Meeting Centrelink requirements

As a Newleaf Communities volunteer, you will also be invited to attend an annual event to thank you for your contribution to our community.

Source: Newleaf Communities (2009c, pp.1 & 2).

In the above text, the new ‘requirements’ placed upon citizens under the Welfare to Work reforms – regulated by Centrelink, the federal government department responsible for issuing welfare payments – and the BLCP volunteering and
employment programs were brought together. These volunteering and employment programs were part carrot and part stick. Certainly, public housing tenants could ‘choose’ to participate in BLCP volunteer or employment activities, but if they ‘chose not’ to participate they would have to demonstrate their compliance with the new Centrelink ‘requirements’ in another way (Newleaf Communities, 2009c, pp.1 & 2).

This move was indicative of the welfare reforms of the centre-right Howard government and the broader political landscape in Australia at the time. These social reforms were inscribed in state and federal policies, as well as manifesting in the plans that structured the BLCP at the local level. Another example is the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy, which operates at the state level with strategic aims including a focus on providing employment opportunities for ‘disadvantaged communities’ through the private sector (NSW Government, 2005c). Yet another is the Reshaping Public Housing policy program, which sidelined broader structural issues by positioning public housing tenants as both the pathology and the vehicle through which social reform would be mediated (for a discussion of these policies and plans, see Chapter 6). All of these state and federal policy reforms and locally deployed programs are dialectally and discursively linked.

Subsequently, Bonnyrigg Management’s (The Project Manager) language in the management plan texts that outlines their employment, education and training strategy and approach displays the discursive features of these government texts. Like the Welfare to Work policy program, which has been widely theorised within moral underclass and social integrationist discourses by political and social theorists in Australia the UK and the USA (Abdala, 2000; Arthurson and Jacobs, 2003, 2004; Levitas, 1998; Martin, 2006; Millar et al., 1997), the language is structured around ‘initiative and incentives’, ‘volunteerism’ and ‘disincentives for welfare dependency’ (see Chapter 3). Examples from the Community Renewal Services Implementation Plan text by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) include these features:
Maximise opportunities for local employment and training ... 7.2.2 Work with FCC [Fairfield City Council] to improve support for volunteers ... 7.8 Reduce disincentives for tenants to improve their situation. 7.8.1 Implement and promote the Tenant Employment Incentive Scheme. (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007b, pp.18–19)

The Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) employment and training strategy, through the Community Renewal Plan, was also aligned with some of the key demographic groups targeted by the federal government’s Welfare to Work policy program (Commonwealth Government, 2005), including:

Existing public housing tenants ... sole parents who will often be re-entering the workforce ... long-term unemployed ... people with disability who require particular forms of support to make the transition to training and employment ... (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2008c, pp.34–35)

Again, the measurement of these employment, education and training objectives in the BLCP will be assessed through the technocratic management processes typical of market-based spaces. Urbis (2008b, p.44) suggest, in the Preferred Project Report, that

The Community Renewal Services Plan prepared by Bonnyrigg Partnerships (attached as Appendix 3) has been updated to incorporate the following:

- Clear KPI for employment targets.

In this way, the contractor and subcontractors became part of a surrogate policy delivery mechanism through which a range of state and federal government policy programs are being delivered. Further, while the private sector is ‘locked-in’ to these policy frameworks, there continues to be widespread disagreement about the methodological and empirical grounds for these policy programs and interventions, as shown in Chapter 3. In the next section, the analysis moves on to how these texts shaped the social events on the ground.
Social Event: Bulldozing the past

In this section, the analysis turns to how the texts outlined above shaped the social events and social actors throughout Phase 3 of the BLCP (see Figure 51 overleaf). At this level of the analytical process, the focus is on styles or ways of being (see Table 3 on page 120). Therefore, there is a focus on the subjective aspects of the discursive strategies deployed by the various social actors.

The analysis looks at how the identity and subjectivity of the social subjects shaped how narratives were created about particular aspects of the BLCP, especially when these representations and narratives were in conflict with other discursive constructions of the same process, or discursive constructions from other phases. In these cases, the identity of the social subjects and their subjectivities played an important role in how they identified with, or rejected, previous arguments or discursive constructions; amended or borrowed various discursive features of past or current texts; or started anew, with new texts, without reflecting on the past.

The analysis is particularly interested in how the identity of public housing tenants, private-sector staff, the now less visible public-sector staff, journalists and other social actors shaped their responses, either by producing new texts in the new BLCP spaces, copying older BLCP texts or even participating through non-action. Furthermore, in Phase 3 of the BLCP, the coordination of time and space flattened out again as the private sector assumed responsibility for the BLCP. Here, the rhythm and pace of the everyday lives (Jarvis, 2011, p.3) of the various social subjects – whether they were employees of the private-sector contractors completing a work role or tenants of the state, whose tenancies have been subcontracted out to the private sector – is explored by focusing on their lived experience as they were drawn into new social sites and experiences.
Figure 51 – BLCP Phase 3: Micro-level timeline with social subjects and invited spaces
Implementation of the discursive strategy: ‘Community engagement’ under a private partner

The analysis below returns to exposing the numerous and diverse ways in which subjugated bodies control populations (Knights and Vurdubakis, 1994) and how various social subjects have mounted resistance against these same techniques (Foucault, 1975). The transition to the private-sector contractor in Phase 3 was accompanied by an increase in political and media activity, including the following:

The Minister for Housing [NSW], Matt Brown, welcomed the handover of the estate to Bonnyrigg Partnership ... and a positive step for the community ... As part of the handover, from the 20th October 2007 the management of all public housing in Bonnyrigg will be transferred from Housing NSW to St George Community Housing, with few changes for tenants, (NSW Department of Housing, 2007a, p.1)

while the journalist Michael Duffy’s piece in the Sydney Morning Herald followed the same discursive path, if not subscribing a little more to Housing NSW’s tenant participation narrative. Duffy writes under the headline:

Bulldozing the past
At Bonnyrigg ... It’s more complicated than most public–private partnerships because ... it involves a community housing organisation called St George Community Housing. Community housing involves not-for-profit organisations managing, and in some cases owning, housing for poor people and is a growing phenomenon ... At Bonnyrigg, St George is responsible for most dealings with tenants, and there’s been a lot of consultation. (Duffy, 2008, p.1)

while Josephine Tovey (2009), rehearsing the problem-solution narrative, opted for a pun in the Sydney Morning Herald in 2009:

Troubled housing estate turns over Newleaf
The $733 million redevelopment, called Newleaf Bonnyrigg, will contain a mix of 70 per cent private and 30 per cent community houses, built in
streetscapes redesigned to eliminate the classic features of public housing blamed for contributing to crime ... The previous estate had been built to the notorious "Radburn" design, an American model for housing estates featuring inward facing houses, empty spaces and cul-de-sacs, that had been blamed for fostering anti-social behaviour.

What was clear from commencement of BLCP management by the private sector in October 2007 was a discursive realignment of the BLCP towards market-orientated models of management, with contract management tools typical of neo-liberalised spaces. This included the use of KPI for each private-sector contractor or subcontractor and contract. Discussing “St George Community Housing out here at Bonnyrigg” (Private-sector contractor, 2009), one private-sector employee stated:

“So, I have to make sure ... [the] policy and procedures and making sure that they’re being monitored. Um, making sure that we’re meeting our KPIs and so forth, yeah”. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

When asked in the interview if St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager), had “any specific KPIs that relate to involving tenants? Is there any way of measuring that?” this private-sector employee responded:

“Um, under the community renewal plan [there] would have some KPIs there? I don’t think St George does. Ours is more about the tenancy management ... Yeah, although we do have a policy”.113 (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

Other private-sector employees associated with different private-sector contractors outlined similar commitments to KPIs within their organisations. A private-sector contractor from Spotless Pty Ltd (The Facilities Services Manager) stated:

“Well, Spotless are the FM [facilities management] company for maintenance services on the site obviously and ... we are within the consortium for all matters related to maintenance ... our role’s to facilitate that and make sure we meet the specifications of

113 The private-sector employee is referring here to the organisation’s generic tenant participation policy and not a tenant participation policy specific to the BLCP. See Appendix 25 (St George Community Housing Limited, 2009).
the contract and we comply with all the KPIs that are written in those documents”. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

while a private-sector employee associated with Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) stated:

"Ah, I work for Bonnyrigg Management, who is one consortium ... partner in Bonnyrigg Partnerships ... who is keeping control of all the documentations from the different consortium members - St George Community Housing, Spotless, and Bonnyrigg Management – all three ... quality standards which has all the set KPIs for Housing [NSW]”. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

Finally, another private-sector employee working closely with public housing tenants discursively framed the Customer Satisfaction Survey (Sweeney Research, 2008) within a business model typical of neo-liberalised spaces. This included qualifying tenant participation by KPIs and outsourcing other processes:

"[W]e do have a survey that goes out to the tenants 'cause we've got our KPIs to meet to see whether they're happy with our service. But yeah, because, as a Housing Manager, I suppose, we don't have any input on what's going to happen, on what will happen, what's going to improve it. We're basically here to maintain the tenancy and keep the tenants happy. So, and that's what basically I try to do, keep them happy, give them as much, as much information as we can and outsourcing as we can if they need it”. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

Therefore, as expected, the BLCP was now conceptualised by the employees of the private-sector companies as another business transaction, to be ‘contract managed’ through a complex set of contractor and subcontractor contracts, and measured by way of KPI and other ‘performance-based’ management tools. Further, it seemed that tenant involvement had been reconceptualised in this processes, as the quotes above suggest.

However, when asked directly about ‘tenant participation’ or ‘tenant involvement’, it seemed that the discursive construction of tenant participation as a function of citizenship remained. However, this construction of tenant participation was typically conflated with other discursive strategies – partnership
or capacity building – within definitions given by employees. The three quotes below, taken from interviews with senior employees of the private-sector companies working on the ground, draw attention to the discursive legacy of tenant participation within the BLCP. They show the conflation of tenant participation, conceived of as tenant involvement in decision-making, with other discursive features – including, in this case, partnership, capacity building and empowerment:

“OK, I guess it’s much more than sort of tokenism, much more than consultation and that kind of thing. It’s really about the tenants here steering our processes in terms of our programming, everything. So it’s about them being involved, and in the decision-making. Now obviously we do that in partnership, so it doesn’t mean that everything that they want is going to be necessarily what we can do”. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

“… generally I would see it as tenants being involved in decision-making and how we um, put out our programs, what our programs are about … how we can improve our services and … what kind of community activities or programs we can develop to build skills and um, capacity”. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

“… to me that’s what it’s all about, is how you actually bring those people in and actually get them to feel like they actually have a voice in the project, not just someone who’s being communicated to about, “this is who we are, this is what we’re doing, this is what’s going to happen to you”. How do you actually empower them to actually be more involved?” (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

There is little doubt that, in Phase 3 of the BLCP, the contract particulars specific to independent contractors or subcontractors, the KPI’s attached to these job functions and the job roles and daily tasks of employees shaped how ‘tenants’ were conceived and ‘tenant involved’ was implemented. To highlight this point, the following vignette shows how the subjugating effects of a profession, in this case Public Relations, combined with the discursive effects of the institutional site to manifest, in particular, constructions of ‘work roles’ or ‘tenants’ for various social subjects.
This vignette needs to be prefaced with an observation. When Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) assumed responsibility for the BLCP contract in October 2007, the company reimagined a whole host of employment roles on the ground that had previously been undertaken by the Community Building Team. This political exercise of reimagining the work functions on the ground was really a discursive process of bringing these work functions ‘in line’ with the business needs of Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager). Many of the roles were previously staffed by Housing NSW and Fairfield City Council employees, who were now being seconded or recruited by various private-sector contractors into what appeared to be the same roles, but often had slightly different titles and drastically different functionality.

The clearest example is perhaps the creation of the Community Relations Manager position. If we return to the three Management Services contracted to Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), under this plan Community Services had two components: Communication and Consultation Services; and Community Building Services. In Phase 3 of the BLCP, tenant involvement was facilitated through these two contract streams. However, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) did not employ a Community Consultation Manager, but instead a Community Relations Manager.

One of the several people who held this position throughout the research period described the position as follows:

“The role entails, ah, predominantly ... it's around communicating, um, with tenants and with the general community. So, private owners as well as tenants ... Whereas at this point it's more of a public relations role, from a, you know, like, just writing media releases, putting newsletters out, so you're feeding out all the time”. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

Then the staff member describes the subjugating effects of the work role – the processes that facilitate intertextuality and mediation between texts, and the

114 Staff turnover in this role was high during the research period.
broader technology of power at work in this institutional site – with meticulous accuracy:

“Given that there’s public relations [PR] and then you’ve got community relations. Um, PR to me is kind of my background where, yeah, you are more feeding out information, and yeah you’re taking in what’s being said to you so that you can judge where that goes. So, that’s more of a role where you actually, yeah, producing flyers and brochures and yeah constantly delivering information. Um, I guess to me community relations is part of that as well, but to me it’s more that you’re actually out there meeting with people and involved in and hearing, and then you can take all of that and put it into what you’re putting back out there, so ... So, you’re kind, um, dealing more face-to-face with people”. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

However, on the ground, the diverse ways in which bodies are subjugated and populations are controlled was, was at times, less subversive and more overt. Two public housing tenants, very active community organisers in Bonnyrigg, stated in the interviews that they had often been approached by Housing NSW and now Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) to talk to the media, meet with politicians or present positive community narratives at different social functions. As the excerpt from an interview (Public Housing Tenant, 2009) with two public housing tenants below suggests:

Interviewer – “So, the Minister is coming out to Bonnyrigg, and they grab you two and they say you’ve got to get up there and talk to the minister. Now, the ministers’ a normal pol ...”

Rose\textsuperscript{115} – “We’ve done that”.

Dallas – “You’ve done that?”

Max\textsuperscript{116} – “We always do that, Dallas”.

Rose – “This is what we want you to say Rose. “Hello ...”

Max – “Yeah, yeah. We’re told what to say ...”

Rose – “... how things are, just tell ‘em how pleased you are that they’re going ahead”.

Dallas – “So, talk to me about this, who tells you to do that?”

Rose – “Well, St George do. Yeah, when we met with them, they’ll just say ‘oh, just say how you feel about the whole thing you know and ...”

Max – “Especially [Community Relations Managers\textsuperscript{117}], [They’re] very on the ball”.

\textsuperscript{115} Not the participant’s real name.

\textsuperscript{116} Not the participant’s real name.

\textsuperscript{117} Not the participant’s real name.
Public housing tenants discussed similar incidents where otherwise well-presented and articulate tenants were coached and groomed for media or other events by private-sector staff members:

“No, this is how I feel. I was on the bus that took all the overseas people [a delegation of international guests] around the other week, and I go up to the office and [Sue\textsuperscript{118}] was looking up and down, seeing if you're presentable enough to go on the bus”. (Public Housing Tenant, 2009)

“You should say this ...’; only say good things, don't talk about anything that you're not happy about, we only want a feel good story. That's exactly what I was told”. (Public Housing Tenant, 2009)

“... they listened to everything I said, then as I went back to the car [Claire\textsuperscript{119}] said “I hope you watched your Ps & Qs”. Like you said [gestures to another tenant] It's as if they, and [Claire\textsuperscript{120}] had rung me the day before saying there was gonna [be a] talk, and had told me what I should say”. (Public Housing Tenant, 2009)

“It's like [Harry\textsuperscript{121}] at the back of you, letting you know you better behave yourself and do the right thing because, you know, like a [mother or father], I'll smack your backside if you say the wrong thing”. (Public Housing Tenant, 2009)

Managing the public image and media representations of the BLCP was a key concern for Housing NSW in Phase 2, and it had continued to be a major focus for Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) in Phase 3. A senior member of a private-sector company employed on the ground in Bonnyrigg during Phase 3 suggested:

“Ok, yep, so um, yes in this first little bit, like I said concentrate on Stage One. We didn't have any sort of major dramas and um everything sort of went along pretty well. Managed to get everybody out by the 31\textsuperscript{st}October date without any blowups or media panics or anything like that you know”. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

\textsuperscript{117} Name removed.
\textsuperscript{118} Not the participant’s real name.
\textsuperscript{119} Not the participant’s real name.
\textsuperscript{120} Not the participant’s real name.
\textsuperscript{121} Not the participant’s real name.
However, not all things stayed the same in Bonnyrigg. The private sector’s new approach also introduced structural changes within existing public housing tenant groups. The withdrawal of Fairfield City Council from on-the-ground engagement with tenants in the latter part of Phase 2 directly impacted the Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group. This group had previously been coordinated by the Housing NSW funded Fairfield City Council employee working within the Community Building Team and operating quasi-independently of Housing NSW.

As such, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) assumed the coordination role for the Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group in Phase 3, and when I commenced discussions with public housing tenants about this study in 2008, they asked me to coordinate this group as part of the action research process. I coordinated the Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group from October 2008 until early 2010.

At the first meeting I coordinated, on 31 October 2008, located at Cabrogal Cottage on the Estate and attended by public housing tenants, representatives from Becton Property Group Pty Ltd and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), two interesting agenda items were discussed. First, public housing tenants had asked Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) in the previous meeting if tenants who had been moved off the Estate as part of the BLCP would be included in the Customer Satisfaction Survey (Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group, 2008, p.1). Second, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), on behalf of St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager), put forward a motion to create yet another public housing tenant group, the Bonnyrigg Tenant Advisory Group (BTAG) (Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group, 2008, p.2).

The first issue, the question of including ‘off estate’ public housing tenants in the Customer Satisfaction Survey, was addressed quickly. Public housing tenants reported that Housing NSW confirmed between meetings that “no ‘off estate’ public housing tenants will be interviewed” (Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group,
2008, p.1). As if seeing into the future – for this survey would become the surrogate instrument for measuring tenant involvement, as shown above – public housing tenants had questioned the rigour of the ‘customer’ satisfaction survey instrument in previous meetings. They reported that their questions were to the following effect:

If the BLCP was about improving the lives of public housing tenants living on the Estate in 2004, then how can you measure the success of the BLCP, community engagement or other tenant related activities if you only interview public housing tenants who remain in Bonnyrigg? (Rogers, 2011)

The flawed logic was easy to highlight in this case, but Housing NSW’s response was final. The second request, BTAG, was somewhat more involved. The meeting minutes state that

[Sam] asked the group about forming BTAG – Tenants decided to review the ‘Tenant Participation Plan’ for BTAG at the next meeting before deciding on the best course of action regarding BTAG. (Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group, 2008, p.2)

St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) put forward what appeared to be a coherent and logical argument for incorporating the institution’s ‘tenant participation’ protocol into the structure of the Bonnyrigg Public Housing Tenants Group (BPTG). Then, in the February 2009 meeting,

[Sam] updated BPTG on BTAG requirements – Paper work including ‘BTAG Possibilities’ and St George Annual Report ... BPTG went through the ‘possibilities’ document and compared listed items to current activities and initiatives. BPTG voted to locate BTAG within BPTG. BTAG ‘ideas/issues’ to become an agenda item on BPTG agenda. Members noted that the BPTG should retain its independence. (Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group, 2009)

---

122 Paraphrased here by the author.
123 Further, this issue was raised with Housing NSW back in 2005, when researchers from the University of Western Sydney were in negotiations with Housing NSW about developing a longitudinal study. At this time, the researchers were proposing to interview public housing tenants who had left the Bonnyrigg Estate after the announcement of the BLCP. The study aimed to measure tenant outcomes related to the BLCP.
124 Not the participant’s real name.
However, by Phase 3 of the BLCP, there were a number of different resident
groups established in Bonnyrigg, shown overleaf in Figure 52 is an unofficial, and
possibly contested, hierarchy developed from my involvement in these spaces and
observations of resident group functionality.

Figure 52 – Informal hierarchy of resident groups

Source: Author, from involvement and observations of these groups between
2005 and 2010 (Rogers, 2011).

The decision to proceed with the BTAG is important, for it was wholly driven by
the BLCP contract and the institutional structures of St George Community
Housing (Tenancy Services Manager). It was not a process led by public housing
tenants. St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) had a
responsibility to the consortium under their contract – Community Services – to
involve public housing tenants in tenancy management. Further, they also had an
organisational protocol, a policy under development at the time, which would
require the team in Bonnyrigg to undertake tenant participation under the
organisation’s policy and procedure for tenant participation, irrespective of the
site or the local conditions.
This protocol, *St George Community Housing: Policies and Procedures* (St George Community Housing Limited, 2009), was released around 30 days later and had clearly informed St George Community Housing’s push for a ‘Tenant Advisory Group’. When the policy was released on 1 April 2009, it stated:

SGCH [St George Community Housing] tenants are provided with the opportunity to influence and guide the organisation’s service delivery. Tenants are actively encouraged to participate in the Tenant Advisory Group (TAG). (St George Community Housing Limited, 2009, p.12)

So, from February 2009, the Bonnyrigg incarnation of St George Community Housing’s TAG (BTAG) became embedded within the Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group. What this shows is that despite there being absolutely no need for another public tenant group in Bonnyrigg, St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) implemented another one nevertheless, to fulfil a contractual requirement to facilitate tenant participation. Therefore, it was the BLCP contract and St George Community Housing’s (Tenancy Services Manager) institutional frameworks that mandated this process in the name of tenant participation, as outlined by a senior member of Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager):

"actually because St George Community Housing typically run what they call a TAG – Tenants Advisory Group – and so it was an interesting process in terms of how the Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group already operate in that space. There was a contractual promise made that we would run a TAG, and so what we did was we went to the Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group and we asked them how would they like us to operate that and basically we support now the already established autonomous group and use them as our TAG". (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

The structure of the BLCP contract and the broader institutional frameworks were now infiltrating existing, well-functioning and independently chaired tenant organising spaces. This affected the structure and independence of this tenant organising space, although it must be noted that this space had always had a degree of informal infiltration from public- and private-sector employees prior to
BTAG. Nonetheless, their ‘independence’ was always valued by the group, as shown by the following public housing tenant member’s comment:

“Bonnyrigg Public Tenants’ group is, residents on the estate that’ve gotta be public tenants, they can’t be private owners. And we get together, we’re not with any other formal group, we’re not with anyone that can – any government groups – that can force us into their way of thinking”. (Public Housing Tenant, 2009)

In the end, BTAG became an agenda item on the Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group meeting agenda. Therefore, a member of St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) was required to not only attend the meeting but to facilitate discussions around that agenda item. In summary, not only did the public housing tenants accept a process that they did not request or need, but it possibly weakened their own system of tenant organising in the process. And on top of all that, the TAG policies and procedures (St George Community Housing Limited, 2009) had very clear management guidelines that would now apply to the way in which the Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group ‘engaged’ with St George Community Housing (Tenancy Services Manager) (see Appendix 25).

We have already seen above that the public housing tenants were aware of some of the subjugating effects of the BLCP – how various strategies were used to control various social subjects, and deployed to attempt to control the discursive construction of the BLCP by public housing tenants in public meetings and events. In another example, public housing tenants also mounted resistance to ‘feel good’ BLCP narratives. In the following quote, the inner mechanics of the technologies of power are brought closer to the surface:

“Yeah, but we’ve gone to the media and they haven’t known. They don’t like it! They get quite annoyed when you do. And the thing is you’re concerned that it will backfire onto you. If you say something, they get angry, they’re rehousing you! They can be quite mean if they want to be and you can’t say they can’t, so you have a fear of speaking out, um, that it will affect you ‘cause you’re the little person. So it is a bit scary”. (Public Housing Tenant, 2009)
There are many more examples of how this neo-liberalised space controlled and constrained the social subjects, but there is insufficient space to explore them here. To conclude this chapter, therefore, the analysis moves to highlight two unique examples. One is focused on a BLCP structure, the Bonnyrigg Tenant Advocate Service. The other considers issues of individual agency and is focused on one of the action research cycles, where research findings were reported to Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager). Both examples bring to the surface, in diverse ways, a more nuanced picture of the subtle ways in which social subjects can be drawn into various technologies of power that may be working towards an end of which the social subjects may not be aware.

*Cracks become holes: On the ground as subjugated citizens*

As shown in Chapter 6, accepting or rejecting one part of the problem-solution narrative of the BLCP pulled other aspects into question. As a result, different social subjects or social entities stepped in to shore up these discursive strategies at different times. Central to these processes of discursive action was the lubricating effects of two broad space–times: the fast-paced global market-based space within which the public–private partnership was located; and the local interpersonal space within which the public housing estate was located.

Each space–time brought with it a different subjectivity for the social subject occupying that space at any moment in time. Further, it is possible to track changes in a social subject’s subjectivity over time. Here, two intersecting vignettes highlight this point and show explicitly the way in which neo-liberal spaces activate diverse techniques that subjugate bodies and control populations, but also how they produce resistance against these same techniques (Foucault, 1975). The two vignettes provided here are: (1) the Bonnyrigg Tenant Advocate in Phase 3; and (2) my status as a university researcher and my role in the action research study. This includes the integration of my study within the BLCP and, in
particular, my interactions with senior contractor staff on the ground in Bonnyrigg between 2007 and 2010.

Without doubt, my role as a university researcher structured the way in which I conceptualised the BLCP. At the very least, the requirements of the academy and degree program I was enrolled in, as well as the international field to which I now belonged, structured the type of knowledge I would attempt to generate. This knowledge would be based on international literature outlining similar studies, and would be guided by techniques for the creation of knowledge approved by my peers. Certainly, however credible and reliable these research tools may be, the subjective experiences of the academy and research practice have a subjugating effect on the social subject. This is no less the case for a social subject in academia than it is for a social subject in the private sector.

In Chapter 4, I put forward reflexive ethics in an attempt to ‘come clean’ about my own subjectivity in the BLCP. I ‘owned up’ to the political nature of my study and the positionality of the researcher (Carmody, 2001; Cunliffe, 2009; Lincoln and Cannella, 2009; Taylor, 2011). Then, in the Social Event section of Chapter 6, I showed how another staff member and I attempted to engage in critical reflection of ‘ourselves’ and The Community Building Team in Phase 2, through different university research projects conducted in partnership with Fairfield City Council. As shown in Chapter 6, the other researcher/practitioner challenged many of the subjugating effects of the BLCP and The Community Building Team in the Researcher Reflections text (Stevens, 2006b). In late 2006, we were both employees of The Community Building Team and university researchers, and roughly occupied a similar subjectivity, constructed from co-locating in the BLCP as research/practitioners. We can use this as a subjectivity baseline, a moment from which to track changes in our subjectivity over time.

Therefore, the space–times that we occupied after late 2006 become important. From early 2007, I no longer undertook contract work for Housing NSW and
Fairfield City Council in Bonnyrigg. Instead, I began this study as a university researcher, without any formal relationship with Housing NSW, Fairfield City Council or the private-sector contractors. By contrast, from early 2007, the other researcher/practitioner no longer undertook research functions in Bonnyrigg and continued working on the BLCP before securing full-time employment with the private-sector contractor in Bonnyrigg.

Therefore, as a baseline, we had both provided critical reflections of our own practice and the BLCP to The Community Building Team in 2006. But from early 2007 I had become a full-time academic and the other social subject had become a full-time senior employee of the private-sector contractor. Throughout 2007, as the University of Western Sydney and Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) attempted to negotiate and finalise a research agreement between the two parties, this senior member of the private-sector contractor was very supportive and advocated for my proposed study within Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager). Further, this staff member was pivotal to me securing access to contractor and subcontractor staff for interviews in 2009 and, despite no formal research agreement being signed, providing me with office space for two days per week within the community centre, located within the public housing estate, throughout my fieldwork.

Then, in March 2010, a Community Relations Manager with Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) requested a research report from me on behalf of the senior staff member noted above.

Hi Dallas,

Hope all is going well ... Anyway, just seeing if you've got anything to report on your work, I'll be doing my monthly report soon. Can you also cc me in on any correspondence with [senior staff member] regarding your PhD? As I'll be back on board four days a week shortly, so will be the contact for all research projects. (Personal communication by email, dated 23/03/2010)

However, I continued to work for Housing NSW on different urban redevelopment projects at other sites.

Name removed.
While there was no research agreement between the university and the private-sector contractor, I had informally agreed to give the senior staff member a Discussion Paper of the study in late 2009. These discussions and my commitment to provide a discussion paper were framed within the negotiations that had taken place in late 2008 between the university and the private-sector contractor such that, had a research agreement been signed, it would have stated:

The candidate will produce a report of the findings (Bonnyrigg Partnerships Report) and/or other aspects of the study as deemed beneficial by Bonnyrigg Partnerships co-researchers. While the exact study outputs will require further negotiation between the candidate and Bonnyrigg Partnerships, these outputs may include: writing up the results in a format that is most beneficial to Bonnyrigg Partnerships for future projects; co-presenting the results at academic conferences; or the co-publication of findings in industry or academic journals. (University of Western Sydney, 2007)

I felt, given the informal support given to the study by the private-sector contractor, that I would provide a Discussion Paper for review and comment in early 2010. Additionally, this fitted well with the ethos of action research and my original research plan of collaborative learning. Therefore I responded:

I’ve got a Discussion Paper for Newleaf ... Then the next step will be to meet with [the senior staff member] to discuss the paper – after [he/she] has read it of course – so we can decide on the next steps for the paper for Newleaf. My proposal at this point in time is to send the paper to [the senior staff member] first for review and thoughts. This of course will be a confidential Newleaf document. (Personal communication by email, dated 24/03/2010)

This Discussion Paper, titled *Tenant Participation in Bonnyrigg: Emerging themes from the tenant participation study* (Rogers, 2010b), had clear aims:

This discussion paper sets out the emerging themes from the University of Western Sydney (UWS) tenant participation study in Bonnyrigg. This confidential discussion paper has been prepared to facilitate discussion between the researcher and Newleaf Communities about emerging themes from the study ... An important part of the PhD research methodology includes ‘reporting’ emerging themes back to ‘research participants’ for verification, discussion and if applicable review of current practice ... The emerging themes are presented as a starting point for discussion. As noted
above, some of the themes are retrospective observations and may have more relevance to future projects, however some might be considered within the context of the current [BLCP] project. (Rogers, 2010b, p.3)

The report concluded, in general terms:

while participation practice in Bonnyrigg was increasingly linked to contractual arrangements between Newleaf Communities and Housing NSW, residents were generally positive about the redevelopment project ... Newleaf Communities has been working closely with tenants to implement a complex set of community development and partnership projects to meet the requirements of the Community Renewal Plan. (Rogers, 2010b, p.3)

In terms of improvements to current service, the report

explore[d] the complexity of involving tenants in urban renewal projects with public and private stakeholders and set out some conceptual and practical issues that should be addressed. (Rogers, 2010b, p.3)

In this section, the Bonnyrigg Tenant Advocate Service was put forward as “a good illustration of the way different understandings of participation influenced service delivery in Bonnyrigg” (Rogers, 2010b, p.22). As outlined throughout this thesis, the Bonnyrigg Tenant Advocate Service has its discursive roots in Housing NSW’s Minto redevelopment project, which preceded the BLCP in South-Western Sydney (Stubbs 2005). In the BLCP, this service was made manifest as the Bonnyrigg Tenants’ Support and Advocacy Service (BTSAS), established in June 2006 by Housing NSW. Chapter 3 showed how Housing NSW reconfigured the role in Bonnyrigg and structured the advocate position to be more aligned with the aims of the BLCP. The stated aim of BTSAS was to provide tenancy information and advocacy to public housing tenants affected by the redevelopment project, as shown in Figure 53 overleaf by an excerpt from the Have your say text from 2008.

Housing NSW funded a non-government organisation, Fairfield Migrant Resource Centre, to provide the service until Transition, and tensions did exist between the two stakeholders around the capacity of the service to ‘advocate’ on
behalf of tenants during this time (Rogers, 2011). Housing NSW originally provided $63,500.00 in funding to Fairfield Migrant Resource Centre for the period June 2006 to November 2006, and then a subsequent $58,000.00 in funding for the period January 2007 to May 2007 (Cultural Perspectives, 2007, p.2; Fairfield Migrant Resource Centre, 2007, 2008). Therefore, the total budget for the 11-month provision of service between June 2006 and May 2007 was $121,500. In this period, BTSAS employed one full-time staff member at 35 hours per week and five part-time workers at between 7 and 10 hours per week each (Cultural Perspectives, 2007, p.2; Fairfield Migrant Resource Centre, 2007, 2008).

Figure 53 – Promotion of the Bonnyrigg Public Tenant Advocate Service: Have your say text

Bonnyrigg Independent Tenant Advocate

The Bonnyrigg Independent Tenant Advocate is run by Fairfield Migrant Resource Centre and based at Cabrogal Cottage, 1 Kennedy Way, Bonnyrigg. The Advocate can act on any tenant’s behalf to help resolve any housing or tenancy issues.

Office hours are Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays between 9:30am and 3pm. Phone: 9823 9550 or 0431 405 901.

If you don’t speak English help is available in other languages. Call the interpreter on 1300 137 265. Say the language you speak, your name and phone number. We will call you back with an interpreter.

Source: Newleaf Communities (2008a, p.2).
In a review of the service for this period, conducted by Cultural Perspectives on behalf of Housing NSW, the authors conclude that the service was underfunded:

This perceived lack of a strong advocacy voice was seen as a lost opportunity and one which the service could enhance. At the same time informants were keen to stress that the service’s funding was not adequate to support this systemic advocacy role ... Therefore the consultants would suggest that there is no existing service capacity ... this capacity could only be available through an increased level of funding ... (Cultural Perspectives, 2007, pp.10–11).

When Cultural Perspectives (2007, p.12) asked a member of Fairfield City Council about the service delivering capacity building programs, the employee responded:

“How could they? They are grossly under funded to do so”.

In any case, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) renegotiated the funding structure and services scope of the Bonnyrigg Tenant Advocate Service when they assumed responsibility for funding the service following Transition under the BLCP Deeds. In simple terms, from Transition, the Bonnyrigg Tenant Advocate Service would be exposed to market forces and rationalised accordingly, while Fairfield Migrant Resource Centre would be positioned as a contractor providing a service in a competitive market. Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) replaced the non-government organisation Funding Agreement with a Consultancy Services Contract, as was now standard practice for contracts between Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) and other subcontractors.

Through this service appraisal according to market principles, Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) suggested that their ‘in-house’ community development team was resourced and funded – indeed, required by the BLCP Deeds – to provide the ‘support’ component of the service. Therefore, the scope of the service was discursively realigned and brought in line with the contract requirements in the BLCP. Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) was
required to “Resource a Tenants’ Advocate Service” as part of “Sub-plan 5: Community Capacity Building” and “Sub-plan 13: Intensive Tenancy Management” (Bonnyrigg Partnerships, 2007b, pp.14 & 24), and so, under this market-based rationalisation of the required service, they decided to prepare a contract for a tenants’ advocate service. A senior member of a private-sector contractor stated:

“No when we took over, that ground work had already been done, we were going to be, we were already starting to move Stage One people, so the focus [of the tenant advocate] really had to be on them, the rehousing of those people. Because there are other services like SWRTA [South Western Regional Tenants Association] and what not that do the generalist sort of stuff for tenants”. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

As the quote above suggests, through this re-scoping exercise, general advocacy was constructed as another organisation’s responsibility, while the Tenant Advocate Service in Bonnyrigg was repositioned to focus on ‘rehousing’ and BLCP functions contracted to the private sector. Further, the organisation listed above and suggested as an alternative tenant support service for ‘generalist sort of stuff’, South Western Regional Tenants Association, was not funded to provide an advocacy service in Bonnyrigg. As a result, ‘support’ was dropped from the title of the service and ‘independent’ was added. As such, the Bonnyrigg Tenants’ Support and Advisory Service became the Bonnyrigg Independent Tenant Advocacy Service (BITAS).

However, behind this name change lurked a more threatening funding restructure: the annual budget under the private sector was set at $46,000.00, compared to the annual funding level provided by Housing NSW of $132,545.00127 (Fairfield Migrant Resource Centre, 2007, 2008, 2009; Rogers, 2007–2010). From Transition, BITAS was funded to provide one part-time employee at 21 hours per week and a different non-government organisation, Macarthur Legal Service, began running BITAS in late 2009. A senior member of a private-sector contractor stated:

127 Projected from the $121,500.00 provided by Housing NSW for 11 months of service delivery.
“[T]he Tenant Advocate. Now that was a really, in terms of the set up process, and getting an understanding around that, it was quite a fraught process ... but what I was alluding to before around the troubles that we had in setting it up. There are very ... few service providers in that area ... when we did the process to try and get a, this new model funded and a service up and running ... there was a lack of understanding around this change, this shift, and it was seen as defunding so, it caused a fair bit of difficulty I suppose, in trying to get that one back up and running”. (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

The BLCP Deeds were clearly guiding the reframing of the Tenant Advocate Service, and this reframing also introduced new reporting requirements linked to the contract requirements of Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager). The Tenant Advocate Service was required to report individual cases to Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager), discouraged from collective organising around specific tenant concerns, and contracted to run capacity building programs as determined by Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) (Fairfield Migrant Resource Centre, 2008, 2009; Rogers, 2007–2010). A tenant advocate suggested in 2009 that

BITAS’ strong but independent partnership with Newleaf Communities has benefited tenants through the development and delivery of the Tenants’ Rights and Responsibilities workshops. Tenants were able to attend workshops delivered in community languages (Khmer, Lao, Spanish and Vietnamese), which led to a greater understanding of their rights and responsibilities, as well as gaining an overview of Newleaf Communities. BITAS designed and facilitated the workshops and an average of 10 participants attended each workshop, as well as representatives of St George Community Housing. (Fairfield Migrant Resource Centre, 2009, p.62)

It seems that not only was the discourse of partnership pervasive in the BLCP, but so too the discursive strategies of the various contractors infiltrated the independent Tenant Advocate Service. The quote from a senior member of Bonnyrigg Management Pty Ltd (The Manager) draws attention to the aims of these workshops, and it appears that these aims could have been more focused on responsibilities than rights:

“And so what we did in that long period, was we asked the tenant advocate service to um, to provide some rights and responsibilities workshops so tenants were more fully
armed about what was expected of them and what they could expect from us. We thought that that was a good way to use their time ...” (Private-sector contractor, 2009)

The public housing tenants felt that these funding mechanisms worked against their understanding of advocacy. One public housing tenant suggested:

“Partly because [tenant advocates are] being paid to do just that. They've got a role and they're paid by ... before they were paid by Housing [NSW] ... and now BP [Bonnyrigg Management] so they're told you do this, you do that ...” (Public Housing Tenant, 2009)

Other public housing tenants that felt these reporting requirements conflicted tenant advocates:

“But the ones [tenant advocates] that try to stick up for us, they get rid of ... [tenant advocates] used to get howled down because [they'd] be trying to tell something what was important and they'd say - no, that's not ready for this meeting.” ... “Make it briefer, make it briefer, should report that at a separate meeting” ... Yeah, you get that all the time ... We weren't supposed to hear it”. (Public Housing Tenant, 2009)

Others commented more broadly on the scope of the service:

“... it's not strong. I don't think advocacy is strong here at all ... They only do individual stuff ... Apart from that they had no big impact”. (Public Housing Tenant, 2009)

Therefore, as an independent tenant advocate service has the potential to be an important tenant participation process in a redevelopment project such as the BLCP, the 2010 Discussion Paper put forward these points for reflection, first for comment by the senior member of the private-sector contractor. Because this person had engaged in critical researcher reflections of the BLCP in Phase 2, and experienced resistance from other staff about the observations in the Researchers Reflections text (see Chapter 6), I assumed that my observations may not be welcome feedback, but would nonetheless be taken as constructive and explored.
However, it seems that we had become more subjectivity dislocated from each other than I had allowed myself to realise over the passing 3 years. I was no longer an insider–outsider, researcher–practitioner, but an outsider researcher in a private-sector space. Further, my colleague was no longer connected to the academy, but was a senior employee of a private-sector management company. The initial response to the 2010 Discussion Paper was a short email questioning the methodology and objectivity of the study. The email stated, “You say that this is PAR [Participatory Action Research] but it does not reflect our understanding at all. Our voice is not heard ...” (Personal communication by email, dated 28/05/2010) and it concluded with the following questions:

Do you feel that you understand the constraints of both HNSW [Housing NSW] and BP [Bonnyrigg Partnerships]?
When can we get together?
When are you expecting to publish?
(Personal communication by email, dated 28/05/2010)

We met soon after and discussed the study at length. We went over the report and reflected on the BLCP. However, it seemed that our diverse subjectivities were preventing us from seeing each other’s assessments of tenant participation in the BLCP. I was being asked to “acknowledge constraints” and to “incorporate understandings of triple bottom line processes” into my analysis, while the report was pointing to these processes as key constituents that led to the subjugation of citizens (Personal communication by email, dated 15/06/2010). However, I conceded that the action research processes with the private-sector contractor and subcontractors had been fraught and had failed.128 We had not engaged in regular cycles of reflection and review, and we had not changed practice. Following this meeting, the staff member emailed:

   Dear Dallas,
   A bit of self-reflection from me. I’d like to acknowledge that I’m also on a learning journey with all this. I know that I got a bit intoxicated at the idea of

128 Although the action research process with public housing tenants had been successful.
you opening up to other possibilities but, to be really honest, I know that I have to do likewise. I’m an idealist at the best of times and can be blinkered by my unbridled positivity ...

Thanks for the opportunity of exploring this space with you.

(Personal communication by email, dated 15/06/2010)

On reflection, we attempted to chain together two space–times – private-sector and academia – by means of an action research project that was purposely designed to challenge the subjugating effects of the market. However, we underestimated the power of the neo-liberalised space within which we were operating. It seems that the power and subjugating effects of these neo-liberalised spaces are even more effective when they are hidden from view behind the daily tasks undertaken by different social subjects (Foucault, 1994).
Part III
The central research task of this study was to explore the ways in which the actions of public- and private-sector actors within a public–private partnership were shaped by neo-liberal ideology and how these actors reconceptualised public housing tenant participation strategies in the BLCP.

In this concluding chapter, I return to the central research task to show how neo-liberal ‘conditions of possibility’ (Foucault, 1969) within the BLCP demarcated and regulated public housing tenant participation strategies in ways that were dynamic and constantly changing. A central observation from the study shows that while these conditions of possibility may be time and place specific, in the BLCP they were brought together by social subjects with a degree of ideological specificity that shaped how public housing tenants could exercise decision-making power. In short, the public housing tenant participation strategies were shaped and constrained in the neo-liberalised spaces created by the public and private sectors (Peck and Tickell, 2002).

In this chapter, the findings of the study are presented under three headings: National and Supra-national Structures; Discursive Action; and Social Action. These headings correlate with the spatial reading of the data developed in the previous three chapters to highlight the key findings of the study at each level of discursive practice (Fairclough, 2003).

The National and Supra-national Structures section discusses structural issues and the mechanics by which ‘master discourses’ (Fairclough, 2003; Foucault, 1969) came to define, influence and shape the BLCP. The Discursive Action section turns to the formation of policy and the development of the BLCP problem-solution narrative to show how various structural issues and master discourses constrained these processes. Finally, the Social Action section draws on
critical reflections of my own work as a practitioner–researcher in the BLCP between 2005 and 2010.

While the practitioner–researcher role that I occupied introduced significant challenges to the research site, it also provided a unique vantage point from which to undertake research. Importantly, these contract/research experiences, and consequent interactions with public housing tenants and other project staff, provided important insights into the way in which citizens might be subjugated in neo-liberalised spaces. These insights, constructed within the analytical frame of critical reflexivity, are not readily available through other research methods.
Supra-national and national structures: The power and policies of neo-liberalised spaces

Neo-liberal theory proposes that social subjects’ well-being can be advanced by promoting a framework of strong private property rights, free markets, free trade and the introduction of market principles wherever possible (Bourdieu, 1985; Harvey, 2005; Rose, 2003). This study shows that while neo-liberal approaches to human well-being have been normalised in contemporary approaches to urban governance such as the BLCP, as states open up social and urban policy to the market, their institutional structures are increasingly subjected to the regulation of international markets, neo-liberal constructions of social and urban pathology and the disciplining effects of a range of supra-national structures (Bevir, 2010; Burchell et al., 1991; Gordon, 1991; Harvey, 2005; Lemke, 2001).

As these new structures and relations of power transform the nation-state, our understanding of economies, corporations and governments is also transformed, so notions of home and citizenship also cannot be viewed as static (Sheller and Urry, 2006). New information systems, mobile technologies and the supra-national movement of information and policy have “enhance[d] the mobility of some peoples and places and heighten[ed] the immobility” and discrimination against others (Sheller and Urry, 2006, p.207).

In the BLCP, the state housing authority delineated social subjects and geographical space according to internationally mobile discourses of urban and social pathology, but constructed them as localised urban ‘realities’ with corresponding market-based solutions. Viewed in this way, the BLCP is a technology of governance, an exercise of power, whereby a set of social actors were afforded the right to define the ‘subjects’ and ‘objects’ of the intervention by drawing on master discourses, including: poverty de-concentration (deFilippis, 2001, 2007) and the neighbourhood effects literature (de Souza Briggs, 2003, 2007); as well as neo-liberal discourses that seeks to bring social and urban policy into the marketplace (Harvey, 2005).
Various social actors, drawing on a range of master discourses and operating within different institutions, created problem-solution narratives (Lemke, 2001) that subsequently shaped and confined the involvement of public housing tenants in the BLCP. These problem-solution narratives placed limits on what was open for discussion through discursive measures that positioned ‘economic’ capital accumulation (Bourdieu, 1985) and market efficiency as the most ‘efficient’ way to achieve the ‘best’ outcomes for public housing tenants.

This discursive strategy required public housing tenants to be constructed as amoral citizens who cannot successfully negotiate the market for themselves, and the state housing authority to be constructed as inefficient and unresponsive, while the private sector was constructed as follows:

The Department believes that significant private sector involvement in the Project will bring enhanced outcomes by harnessing private sector expertise, innovation and experience. This will bring the greatest benefits to tenants and the wider community for the money available. (NSW Department of Housing, 2004b, p.10)

In this neo-liberalised space, when formulating social and urban policy, state housing authorities are required to rethink the social subjects or institutions that they invite to participate in each space (Cornwall, 2004, 2008; Peck and Tickell, 2002) and how decisions should be taken within neo-liberal conditions of possibility. This was clearly the case in the BLCP, with the state housing authority being afforded the right to define the ‘subjects’ and ‘objects’ of the intervention, but only within the confines of neo-liberal understandings of social and urban pathology and market-based solutions.

The state housing authority’s actions were shaped by complex conditions of possibility (Foucault, 1966) that related to national and supra-national discourses and other structural arrangements. These included: market appraisals of property markets, public housing stock and land value; policy transfer between nation-states, such as neo-communitarian understandings of urban and social policy.
(deFilippis et al., 2006); and the stigmatisation of physical and social space through the discursive construction of public housing estates as obsolete or blighted (Beauregard, 1993; Weber, 2002).

These policy frameworks were not constructed within an a-spatial or a-temporal policy environment and then set loose into time and space. The policy frameworks were always in conversation with other policies, discourses and social events. These policy spaces involved complex relationships spanning from the supra-national to the local. In these neo-liberalised spaces, states no longer solely execute sovereign power over their citizens; instead, the interests of supra-national social actors work through diffuse networks to exercise power from a distance over states and state actors, as well as citizens (Foucault, 2001; Gordon, 1991).

The BLCP shows that the genre of ‘governance’ now links the supra-national to the national, and the national to the local, providing a discursive conduit for master discourses and policy transfer (Fairclough, 1989, 2003). Through this transfer of neo-liberal urban governance structures and policy frameworks, the government and non-government, the not-for-profit and private sectors, are increasingly positioned to implement these discursive strategies as their own. As the BLCP demonstrates, in many cases the social actors within these institutional sites take on these discursive constructions of problems and solutions as their own, animating neo-liberal social ‘realities’ through their practice. However, these social subjects can rarely claim these ‘problem’ narratives and ‘solution’ responses as their own, for the discursive roots of the strategies run deep and are diffuse and hidden from view (Fairclough, 1989, 2003).

It is worth remembering that policy ‘formulation’ and ‘implementation’ are discursive terms used to artificially demarcate a single process; formulation and implementation are inextricably linked. The term ‘implementation’ allows the blame for policy ‘failure’ to be placed on those implementing these policies, as the BLCP tenant advocate service vignette illustrates. It is not possible, therefore, to separate the discursive construction of policy from the social event. All policy
actions are connected to issues of power. Placing the blame on non-government organisations or other institutions for poor policy ‘implementation’, ‘inefficient’ use of funding or underperforming in the market should be viewed as an exercise of neo-liberal power. The discursive roots of these programs should be traced back to master discourses and supra-national sites of action where possible, while remembering that there is no smoking gun with regard to policy – the roots of policy are always diverse and elusive.

Policy development is therefore a collective process involving social subjects, master discourses, action and reflection (Barry et al., 1996; Foucault, 1969, 1976; Graham, 2005; Sterne, 2003). Policy development in the BLCP and other neo-liberalised spaces now involves a range of government and non-government actors being drawn into neo-liberal urban and social policy frameworks. So too, citizens are being drawn into these political economies, and it is perhaps more productive to conceptualise contemporary public housing tenants or other social welfare recipients in former welfare states as neo-liberal citizens (Hindess, 2002).

Within neo-liberalised states, the terms ‘consumer’ and ‘customer’ increasingly apply to welfare recipients, to connote a relationship between the ‘individual’ and the market. In the case of the BLCP, the sovereignty of public housing tenants, their rights, was reimagined as a relationship between their social status as ‘housing consumers’ and the housing market. Meanwhile, the discourse of citizenship continues to purport the sovereignty of the individual, citizenship rights, through a relationship to the state as ‘citizens’. However, for public housing tenants in the BLCP, this notion of citizenship may be better described as a fading reality with a strong discursive memory.

At this level of language practice, the discourse of citizenship can be used to unsettle and reframe the debate, to disrupt the interest and political positions. In this study, it was deployed to interrupt the current trajectory of neo-liberal discourse in urban and social policy and to problematise the role of the neo-liberal citizen in this technology of power. In the BLCP, the actions of social
subjects were fashioned and regulated by normalised neo-liberal subjectivities that positioned the market as the solution to a range of policy prescriptions that were also mediated by neo-liberal subjectivities. The continued theorisation of social and urban policy in the context of the neo-liberal citizen could continue to challenge neo-liberal conceptions of ‘individuality’ and ‘freedom’ by espousing old, or creating anew, conceptions of citizenship that are not bound by the discourses of neo-liberalism.
Discursive action: Constructions of problem-solutions

This section turns to the formation of policy and the development of the BLCP problem-solution narrative to show how the various structural issues outlined above confined public housing tenant participation processes. At this level of language practice – discursive strategy – the social subject plays a pivotal role in linking master discourses and political ideology to social action (Fairclough, 1989, 1992, 2003). The final part of this section revisits some of the critical researcher reflections to highlight these research insights.

This study shows that the construction of the BLCP problem-solution was dialectically connected to a range of supra-national structures and discourses, but was equally shaped by a range of localised social events. A localised example from this study includes the state housing authority’s experience of public housing tenant participation in the Minto redevelopment and the subsequent inclusion of tightly controlled participation strategies in the BLCP.

In the Minto example, the state housing authority did not provide public housing tenants with participation spaces within the initial phase of the redevelopment process. Subsequently, public housing tenants organised and decided to operationalise their own participation strategy, over which that state housing authority and the private sector had little control:

With the bulldozers threatening, tenants mounted a campaign to promote their own perspective, which reflects the fact that they did not attach the same meanings to aspects of life in Minto as did [the state housing authority or the private sector] ... residents felt very connected to the local community and, ongoing amenity issues notwithstanding, cited their common experiences as a positive feature of estate life. (Darcy and Manzi, 2004, p.149)

The state housing authority had planned to hand over the redevelopment project to the market and the private sector, but their failure to play an active role in managing the marketisation of the redevelopment meant that the public housing
tenants self-organised outside the market. As a consequence, the private sector took fright due to unforeseen ‘risks’ (Darcy and Manzi, 2004; Stubbs et al., 2005a). This shows, for market-centric policy to be operationalised in the Minto and BLCP cases, that the state was required to intervene by way of public housing tenant participation strategies that would reduce ‘risk’. This in turn raises questions about the conditions and actions required of states in neo-liberalised policy spaces. In the BLCP case, the degree of state intervention required for market-centric social and urban policy to function with the private sector was significant and focused heavily on addressing public housing tenant concerns through ‘participation’ strategies.

Therefore, the above vignette shows that problem-solution narratives connect the supra-national to the local. In the BLCP, these narratives were discursively constructed within institutions at the language level of policy when master discourses, ideology and social experiences were turned into policy texts (Fairclough, 1989, 2003).

In the BLCP, the supra-national discourses of neo-liberalism and neo-communitarianism were linked to the rise of an authoritarian agenda to social reform in Australia, the USA and the UK (deFilippis, 2001, 2007; Levitas, 1998). In these locations, neo-liberal master discourses, constructed through social policy, were manifested in social practices that imposed a range of moral claims on to social subjects. The examples used in this study include the Welfare to Work and Reshaping Public Housing social policy changes that were operating in a national political space auxiliary to the BLCP. These policies had an implicit aim of reducing ‘welfare dependency’ in order to produce (economic) capital accumulating neo-liberal citizens who would then be ‘free’ to source social services in a competitive market (Bourdieu, 1985).

\footnote{In the Minto case, the lack of state-run public housing tenant participation programs resulted in the redevelopment project not securing a private-sector contractor; while in the BLCP, the state housing authority’s public housing tenant participation strategies played a role in securing a private-sector contractor.}
As shown in this study, these social policies are interest laden, authoritarian and make moral claims about citizens, their life choices and their social actions (Levitas, 1998). When structuring a public housing estate redevelopment project such as the BLCP within this authoritarian policy space, the contradiction between free-market individualism and the deeply authoritarian state is a uniquely neo-liberal paradox.

In order for the state to construct the BLCP within a framework of free markets and free trade whereby ‘the market can decide’, the state housing authority needed to structure the market-based intervention with a high degree of social and economic specificity. Employees of the state housing authority were operating and constructing the BLCP through the discursive conduit of state and federal policy frameworks. In the federal sphere, the individual freedoms of poor citizens were being eroded through social policies that were constructing public housing tenants as amoral citizens who needed to gain employment to facilitate their move out of public housing.

As a consequence, in the state sphere the BLCP texts were encumbered with discursive links to federal policies, including education and employment targets and other ‘responsibilities’ for public housing tenants. Further, senior bureaucrats within the state housing authority were required to make financial determinations about the BLCP through technocratic decision-making processes, and not through market-based processes, to plan the redevelopment project and secure a private-sector ‘partner’.

While free-market individualism is often put forward as the ideological modus operandi of the political economy known as neo-liberalism, the BLCP further demonstrates the contradictions between neo-liberal discourse and policy practice so deftly theorised by deFilippis (2001, 2007). This study has highlighted contradictions between notions of individualism (freedom) and the forced participation of public housing tenants in labour markets, or the practical and political barriers to reducing the role of the state in the market place to facilitate
the ‘opening up’ of social and urban policy to the market. The latter point was demonstrated in this study by the state housing authority when they set many of the financial and social outcomes of the BLCP before project announcement.

In other words, to get free-market economics operating in the BLCP, the state housing authority needed to manipulate the market to make the BLCP economically viable, while broader social policy was restricting citizen choice (or providing customer freedom, in neo-liberal discourse). For public housing tenant participation, this meant that these strategies were directed inward towards public housing tenants and not outward, towards the economic, political and social decisions that create social inequalities (deFilipps et al., 2006, p.675).

Therefore, while social and urban policy is spatially and temporally diverse, this study shows that there are often discursive similarities between policy problem-solutions deployed under neo-liberal ideologies. Neo-liberalism has a normative effect on policy irrespective of the historical location or lessons. Transactions of capital are prioritised in this technology of power, and therefore all forms of social action are brought into the market place in pursuit of capital accumulation. In the BLCP, these conditions of possibility structured the public housing tenant participation spaces. ‘Community consultations’ or citizen participation in economic or contract management spaces – spaces that might threaten transactions or the movement and accumulation of capital – were discursively constructed to exclude public housing tenants and other citizens.

Community consultation was reimagined as ‘community building’. Community capacity building was reconceived as a space for public housing tenants to undertake volunteer activities or to gain vocational skills, with the aim of moving them into employment and out of public housing, irrespective of other structural issues. These invited spaces were not democratic, but moral and ideological spaces (Marinetto, 2003; Meredyth et al., 2004).
Therefore, this study that demonstrates neo-liberal conditions of possibility create – demarcate, include and exclude – certain types of public housing tenant participation in public–private partnerships. However, this study set out to investigate how neo-liberalised spaces shape and constrain public housing tenant participation strategies, the mechanics by which these conditions of possibility were operationalised by social subjects.

On reflection of this aim, the key insight from this study exposed the diverse techniques that subjugated social subjects in the BLCP (Foucault, 1994). This involved the way in which social subjects, including my colleagues and I, came to control and regulate public housing tenants through the deployment of neo-liberal ideology and discourse in our daily work roles (Foucault, 1994). However, at times, the study showed that these ideologies and discourses were hidden from view within our daily tasks, while at other times they were clear, and myself and others mounted resistance against them (Foucault, 1975b; Knights and Vurdubakis, 1994).

Foucault’s (1994) subtle and nuanced theorising of power is again useful here. The Community Renewal Plan cooperative research project vignettes from Phase 1 showed how I undertook the short research project under the assumption that I was an independent researcher. However, I came to realise that the structures of the institution within which I was operating, the scope of the research project, and the editing and review processes worked to align the findings of the study with the broader aims of the BLCP. While the study was assumed to be an independent piece of research and the state housing authority could make this claim about research rigour, the conditions of possibility were such that the research findings were tightly bound within the aims of the BLCP. These conditions of possibility had been normalised as ‘constraints’ on the redevelopment project that employees and researchers had to work within. These ‘constraints’ were internalised by a diverse range of social subjects spanning many institutions, myself included. The discourse of ‘helping people understanding the constraints of the BLCP’ was an important discursive feature of the BLCP, and a subtle exercise of power that
helped quiet down practitioner–researcher and public housing tenant voices in this neo-liberalised space.

There were many examples of the disciplining effect of these types of discursive activities from the study. Others include the training processes for community educators that required them to practice ‘question and answer’ narratives that rehearsed various neo-liberal ideologies, or the requirement to preface all BLCP reports and publication – even academic reports commissioned by the state housing authority – with the BLCP problem-solution narrative.

Through these processes, employees of the state, the non-government and private sectors were drawn into these neo-liberalised spaces as subjugated citizens (Foucault, 1997), working towards ends that they may not have been aware of, and through actions that they may not have sanctioned. This understanding of discursive action as a complex diffusion of power and action can assist the practitioner or researcher in working through the paradox that they may have become both an intricate social actor to a neo-liberal cause while also being an unwilling (unaware) participant in the same process.

The power and politics of these neo-liberalised spaces work by way of complex networks of power, action and resistance, and no single social subject or entity is ever solely responsible for action or inaction. The researcher reflections vignette and other cases from Phases 2 and 3 of the BLCP uncovered the subtle ways in which discourse and power subjugated social subjects within the Community Building Team, and how resistance was mounted against the team’s actions from within. The researcher reflections vignette and my 2006 study questioned whether the community engagement spaces were being colonised to alleviate new and continuing concerns that public housing tenants held about neo-liberal approaches to social and urban reform. We also showed that the community engagement spaces were being used to justify the market-based intervention in its own right.
However, these new community engagement spaces had not only become discursive mechanisms for the promotion of neo-liberal ideologies; they were also the means and end to a range of social and policy interventions – that is, to build social subjects’ capacity to undertake volunteer positions or employment, and not to facilitate the exercise of citizenship rights. The discursive roots of these urban and social policy responses had become so deeply entwined with other discursive processes, which stretch back in time to indefinable moments, that to question these spaces now challenged a gamut of ideological and moral positions at multiple levels of language practice from the supra-national to the local. No single institution can construct or deconstruct these complex relationships. No single act or community consultation event can sever these discursive roots. Instead, at each phase of the BLCP, these discourses and invited spaces were taken up and augmented by a new set of social actors as their own actions. However, these actions were always confined by the conditions of possibility within the BLCP.

‘Community building’, ‘community participation’ and ‘locally based decision-making’ become the master narratives through which a range of social actors legitimated their actions and their social and urban policies (Cooke, 2009; Cooke and Kothari, 2001; Hickey and Mohan, 2004). As the BLCP shows, these urban and social policy problem-solution narratives are often connected to an initial construction of the physical site and built form as obsolete, and social subjects as problematic or dysfunctional (Levitas, 1998; Weber, 2002). It becomes a taken-for-granted self-fulfilling neo-liberal prophecy, aimed at devaluing and then extracting the capital from the physical site while at the same time reimagining social subjects as neo-liberal citizens.
CHAPTER 8

Social action: The neo-liberal citizen

This final section draws on critical reflections of my work on the BLCP between 2005 and 2010 as a practitioner and researcher, as well as the important ethical, moral and social spaces between. The spaces between included the self as colleague, academic, friend or foe, or any combination of these, at different moments in time and in the context of different social settings (see Figure 54 on page 396). It was impossible to separate these into demarcated employment, research or social roles in the field. Being a practitioner–researcher presented significant challenges, but also provided unique empirical insights and I will begin this section with one final vignette.

In late 2010, while standing in Bonnyrigg overlooking the Estate with a group of long-term public housing tenants, we got to hear the NSW Government’s ‘solution’ to the public housing ‘problem’:

Ms Keneally was joined today by Housing Minister, Frank Terenzini, and Member for Cabramatta, Nick Lalich, to hand over keys to the residents moving into the stage one social housing homes ... “This public housing area used to be one of the most disadvantaged in NSW, a situation compounded by poor urban and housing design. “That’s why the Government formed a partnership to completely overhaul the suburb, and that partnership is now delivering real results”. (NSW Government, 2010a, p.1)

I turned and asked the public housing tenants accompanying me, as we looked out over the completed Stage One and the construction of Stage Two, “How do you think the BLCP is progressing?” There was a period of silence. For as we stood there, some of these tenants had just been given keys to a new house, while others would have to wait years, but would no doubt also be getting new houses. Surely, these public housing tenants must appreciate the “complete overhaul of their suburb and the benefits of the partnership” outlined by the politicians above.

130 Taken here from the NSW Government’s media release celebrating the completion of Stage One of the BLCP.
After all, as Mr Terenzini continued, the Government had

Deliver[ed] this project after one of the most comprehensive community engagement programs ever undertaken on a renewal project in Australia. (NSW Government, 2010a, p.1)

Therefore, after a minute or so, one tenant smiled and said

You know, it’s like that song, what is it, Everybody knows ... (Rogers, 2011)

This public housing tenant did not sing the song or recite the lyrics. But, on reflection, perhaps this allegorical use of Leonard Cohen’s song Everybody knows best reflects the difficulty of putting into words an experience of the BLCP for public housing tenants. Cohen muses:

Everybody knows that the dice are loaded. Everybody rolls with their fingers crossed. Everybody knows that the war is over. Everybody knows the good guys lost. Everybody knows the fight was fixed. The poor stay poor, the rich get rich. That’s how it goes. Everybody knows. (Cohen and Robinson, 1988)

This study has demonstrated that conceptualisations of public housing tenants as amoral neo-liberal citizens and public housing estates as assets (repositories of capital) sideline the lived experience of public housing tenants when they are constructed as ‘subjects’ in social and urban policy (Marinetto, 2003; Meredyth et al., 2004). Throughout the first 5 years of the BLCP, public housing tenants’ citizenship rights became transient, as direct regulation by the state housing authority was moved towards market regulation and private-sector management.
Figure 54 – Multiple role identities in the BLCP as practitioner/researcher

The following pictures are taken from Housing NSW and Bonnyrigg Management newsletters and promotional material included and referred to throughout this thesis.

(1) Community Educator
Working as a Community Educator under contract to Fairfield City Council in 2006.

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2006c).

(2) Community Development Consultant
Project-managing the Bonnyrigg Mens’ Shed under contract to Housing NSW in 2006.

Source: NSW Department of Housing (2006a).

(3) Researcher
Attending the Community Reference Group as a university researcher in 2008.

Source: Newleaf Communities (2008).

(4) The space between research and practice
A photograph of the Bonnyrigg knitting group in 2009, including a public housing tenant, a private- and non-government sector employee, and myself as researcher.

Source: Newleaf Communities (2009).
In other words, public housing tenants’ rights were pared back as the market replaced the state and citizens were reimagined, at least by policy actors, as neoliberal citizens in the marketplace (Hindess, 2002). An important area for future research would investigate how public housing tenants, their new ‘private’ neighbours and the broader citizenry, (re)imagine citizenship in this neoliberalised space throughout the contract term.

Conceiving of public housing in solely economic rationalist terms (i.e. in the short term and based on profit versus loss) is one of many ways of evaluating this affordable housing tenure type. This study demonstrates that assessments of public housing tenants and estates need to look outside the confines of neoliberalism when defining problems and prescribing solutions.

The social outcome in the BLCP case was that public housing tenants were discursively reconstructed as amoral citizens who would be required, through social and urban policy, to model their behaviour and aspirations on ‘moral citizens’ who have a job, a mortgage and a house, and who would work to maintain these assets in the pursuit for greater capital accumulation (Bourdieu, 1985; Harvey, 1996; Hindess, 2002). It was an ideological and moral space in which I played an active part, both in constructing and resisting, through numerous work roles (Foucault, 1997; Marinetto, 2003). In this space, public housing tenants’ choices were regulated through the promotion of ‘responsibility’ to one’s community, while neighbourhood participation and other ‘empowerment’ and employment programs attempted to shape their actions (deFilippis et al., 2006).

In the BLCP, the social relations, social identifies and social ‘realities’ were constructed around a physical site and a housing tenure type. However, these are not all that defines, binds and differentiates public housing tenants from other abstract and arbitrary social categories. The lived experience of public housing

---

131 It is unknown what ratio of owner-occupiers to private renters will make up the 70% of the private housing stock on the new Bonnyrigg estate.
tenants is related to the space–times that they inhabit (Fairclough, 1995; Harvey, 1996). These experiences accumulate from the localised social practices of public housing estate management, but also from the rhythm and pace of their daily lives and their interpersonal experiences outside redevelopment projects (Jarvis, 2011).

In the BLCP, I attended formal public housing tenant group meetings and assisted public housing tenants to self-organise in others’ spaces, but I also participated informally by attending street meetings and barbecues, and by dropping into the knitting group for a coffee or visiting local residents in their home for a chat.

This localised space–time is very different from supra-national space–times occupied by nation-states, federal and state governments and national and international corporations. While connected to the same physical and social space, the lived experience of public housing tenants is connected in ways that are individually empirical and emotive. The physical space conjures up memories of the past, dreams for the future and concerns about the present for public housing tenants.

There is no place within neo-liberal discourse to accommodate these experiences – no theoretical apparatus by which to ‘rationalise’ these very real and tangible psychological responses to the physical and social spaces that public housing tenants inhabit on public housing estates. Neo-liberal discourse and market-centric urban policy is conditional on ‘rational’ technocratic decision-making and presents little opportunity to make use of these ‘lived experience’ insights. It is therefore important for social researchers to engage with these ‘experiences’.

Voice, however defined – community voice, business voice, government voice or researcher voice – is regulated by the discursive and institutional spaces that surround social subjects and the spaces into which they are invited, or from which they are excluded (Fairclough, 2004, 2006; Foucault, 1969). As the BLCP shows,
challenging the construction of these spaces, their functionality and societal purpose, remains an important research task. In this study, I engaged with this challenge as a methodological\textsuperscript{132} endeavour.

I challenged the research aims desired by the private-sector research ‘partners’ and their requests to ‘understand and accept the confines of the neo-liberal project’ as a methodological \textit{fait accompli}. This was to my peril, and it raised important questions about conducting participatory action research with multiple research partners with significant power differentials at the research site.

It is significant that the private-sector contractor could not finalise two research projects within the first 5 years of the BLCP, one of them a contractual requirement, with an external research institution. In my case, the private sector requested a more thorough review of my research methodology before ‘going quiet’ on the study (Becton Property Group, 2006, p.1). Therefore, my study was not built on a formal research and funding agreement between institutions but, instead, was informed and developed using interpersonal networks and localised embeddedness that allowed me to conduct the study by co-locating in multiple social roles.

By using the construct of the invited space (Cornwall, 2004, 2008), I challenged the discursive framing of the community engagement spaces, created in the BLCP by public and private actors, as the only spaces where public housing tenant participation was possible. Failing to attend to these important research tasks would have required me to accept the neo-liberalised spaces in which I found myself as a social ‘reality’ beyond critique.

However, when either public housing tenants or I challenged these dominant master discourses, or even independent components of these discourses at

\textsuperscript{132} It was also therefore an epistemological endeavour, as methodological questions are inextricably linked to how researchers understand knowledge creation. However, I used reflective ethics as a research method to critically reflect on these discursive constructions, and will therefore define it as a predominantly methodological consideration, in keeping with the theoretical framework.
different times, we invoked both resistance and support from different social subjects (Foucault, 1975b, 2001). Our actions jolted the discursive machine into action and mobilised a diverse array of predicable, but also unpredictable, social actors into action to both discredit and support our social projects. Power and resistance co-located in these spaces in subtle ways (Foucault, 1975b, 2001).

Therefore, Foucault (1975b, 2001) argues that putting one’s voice into action requires a process of accumulated and consolidated action by a vast array of social actors, over extended periods and in multiple sites. Practitioner–researchers and citizen researchers could re-engage and reinvent social activism to create new spaces for social action that are explicitly designed to resist the disciplining effects of neo-liberalised or other discriminatory spaces. This might be a more productive way of conceptualising citizen participation, a conceptualisation that would drastically reconfigure contemporary understandings of ‘community participation’ in local urban governance.

Citizen participation could be conceived as a technology of resistance to counter and challenge neo-liberal problem-solution narratives presented as social ‘realities’. However, this study demonstrates that a single act of resistance, or a series of disconnected public housing tenant resistant acts, was not enough to dislodge the powerful disciplining effects of the BLCP invited spaces. Instead, for citizen participation to become more democratic in projects such as the BLCP, new configurations of social actors may be required to consolidate the totality of resistant acts (Foucault, 1975b, 2001). These might take the form of new social collectives that represent and bring together, as a consolidated strategy, the sum of all small resistant struggles and acts of defiance by many social subjects (Foucault, 1975b, 2001).

In this space, public housing tenant participation, community consultations and building community may be better directed at building civic capacity within disadvantaged groups; building citizens’ capacity to resist dominant and

---

133 By citizen, I mean public housing tenants as citizen–researchers.
discriminatory discourses by challenging negative or misleading constructions of citizens and the social and physical spaces that they inhabit. Public housing tenant participation might be tenant led to challenge the problem-solutions put forward by others.

Within the current paradigm of public housing estate policy development, social subjects are defined and codified, divided and ascribed new social ‘realities’ from afar (i.e. from different space–times). They are compared and grouped with social subjects living on different continents, or living in similar or different housing types, and with those experiencing similar or different forms of discrimination. Our civic engagement projects need to challenge this governmentality (Burchell et al., 1991), this neo-liberal rationality of government that is normative. However, this may not be an easy task within neo-liberalised spaces.

The BLCP demonstrates that neo-liberalised urban governance spaces require demarcation, contract terms, clear lines of accountability, technocratic decision-making, predetermined resource allocation and rigid market mechanisms. In short, neo-liberal spaces sort and divide contract tasks, and this makes reflection or comment on market-centric processes, and the intricate power structures that maintain these processes, difficult to locate, because the decisions taken in one space have an effect on the decisions taken in other spaces (Cornwall and Schattan P. Coelho, 2007b).

While the nature of competitive markets and contracts ‘locks in’ specific tasks that may be easy to locate, these contracts are also inextricably connected to other tasks, social entities and social actions in other spaces. Neo-liberalised spaces are a complex web of interrelated ideology, accountability and decision-making structures, and because of this, citizen engagement in one space alone will not guarantee citizen involvement in a project such as the BLCP.

Therefore, citizen engagement may be required in all spaces within a neo-liberalised redevelopment project, to challenge the different but interconnected
forms of discrimination and misrepresentation. In the BLCP, that would have meant public housing tenant participation in defining the problem, coming up with solutions and, if a public–private partnership was proposed, selecting the private ‘partners’ and managing their contracts.

However, this presents an obvious contradiction. Involving citizens in these decision-making structures challenges the technocratic management structures promulgated in neo-liberal discourse. Technocracy is required to ensure that ‘rational’ decisions are taken to reduce risk and maximise profit in the pursuit of capital accumulation. When viewed in this way, emotive and ‘irrational’ amoral citizens are poor decision-makers. When assessments need to made about the built form, land use, property values and employment ‘incentives’, public housing tenants talk about notions of home, attachment to place, work/life balance, childcare, health, family and friends. Market-based performance measures are ill equipped to inform or assess public housing tenants’ participation strategies, because disadvantaged or marginalised citizens will be subject to these very structures; and these structures militate against the narratives so often used by public housing tenants that are based on the lived experience.

In the BLCP, from the commencement of contract by the private-sector contractor, public housing tenant participation was realigned and reimagined within a market-centric space. The consensus-seeking and normative theories of community participation put forward by the private sector rendered the ideological effects of neo-liberalism and these workings of capital invisible. Therefore, public housing tenant participation in this public housing estate redevelopment was not, nor has it been in other redevelopments, about extending a set of democratic rights to citizens. Those who were afforded decision-making power in the BLCP were those with capital or access to capital, as defined by economic theory and liberalism (Bourdieu, 1985).

Therefore, the playing field for capital accumulation is extremely uneven between social subjects and social entities under neo-liberal approaches to urban and social
governance. The state housing authority defined the ‘subjects’ and ‘objects’ of the intervention in Phase 1 and the private-sector contractors defined the ‘subjects’ and ‘objects’ in Phase 2. But, importantly, these decisions were regulated by broader discursive constructions of social subjects and public housing estates from diverse supra-national institutions including governments, financial institutions and other political ideologies and institutional structures. In a project such as the BLCP, the state no longer holds – as it may never have done – sovereign power of citizens; instead, the state is subject to both a broader supra-national technology of power and to localised events in dynamic ways.

This was exemplified in the BLCP when the state attempted to govern the private sector through the BLCP Deeds from a distance. But as the tenant advocate services vignette shows, the market has a powerful disciplining effect that operates at the level of discursive strategy and social practice. Within this market-based space, the private-sector actors redefined the scope of the tenant advocate service and ‘rationalised’ (i.e. cut) the service funding. Assessments of social processes using market mechanisms can affect the functionality of these social processes and change social events. This is partly because neo-liberal social policy frameworks focus the social actors’ attention on reforming private property relations and implementing market-based social policy that will promote individual responsibility.

In the BLCP, complex and entwined social and urban policy issues, with significant structural dimensions, were individualised and spatialised. In the process, these policy responses avoided structural or redistributive change to address urban poverty. Instead, the BLCP was justified using notions of individual freedom, capacity building and participation. The construction of social subjects as neo-liberal citizens within this policy framework imposed a discourse of neo-liberal morality on to the individual (Hindess, 2002; Marinetto, 2003).

When public housing tenants were invited to ‘participate’ in the BLCP, the participation spaces were constructed to reduce potential threats to the capital
accumulation of powerful corporations. Providing a positive BLCP story, reducing media representations by public housing tenants and seeking public housing tenant ‘buy-in’ became core tasks for the state housing authority (Coates et al., 2008). In the process, more traditional forms of public housing tenant organising and action, that were previously available to public housing tenants, were stifled through the deployment of neo-communitarian discourses by a range of social subjects (deFilippis et al., 2006; Shragge, 2003).

At only one time in the first 5 years of the BLCP were citizen/subjects of the intervention afforded the legal right, however constrained, to exercise decision-making power. In this process, the IHAP responses to Development Applications, public housing tenants demonstrated an overwhelming commitment to being involved in the BLCP as citizens and took up their legal right to shape the decisions that affect their lives. Further, the private-sector contractors perceived these actions as ‘threatening’ and ‘risky’, and counter to market-centric logic. Within this discursive frame, they even stated that the IHAP responses were not in the best interests of the BLCP, the state housing authority and, most surprisingly, the public housing tenants themselves (Rogers, 2011).

Providing unmediated and legal spaces for citizen input and comment, if not the outright transfer of some decision-making power, is a prerequisite for citizenship and democratic activity (Arvanitakis and Marren, 2009; Carson, 2007; Hirst, 2002) – just as the articulation of various ‘voices’ is a necessary condition for well-informed urban and social policies (Wildavsky, 1979). Failing to conceive of public housing tenant participation in this way – as both a legal right of citizenship and as a productive way of developing well-informed policy – may further expose these processes to the disciplining effects of neo-liberalism, allowing them to be further colonised by a range of social actors.

The BLCP cannot be viewed as anything other than a neo-liberal technology of power, as shown by the comment offered at the conclusion of my interview with a senior member of the private-sector contractor (2009) in the BLCP:
"[Y]ou know the bottom line, we've gotta sell homes. If we don't sell homes, the project stops ... You can waft around the outside as much as you like but what we've got there at the moment is we've got a community that generally we want to keep. We want to give them all new homes. To do that is a financial constraint. We need to bring the other community [private home-owners] in to pay for that financial constraint, and at the end of the day there's a financial and commercial outcome. So, maintain the community, renew the infrastructure - the homes - bring the community [new private home-owners] in to do that, and pay for it ... Ideally we'd love to do it in two years, it takes thirteen, it's long, it's drawn out, but to maintain the community ... that's it, we need to maintain the community so there's all those aims and constraints on that so we look after the community, we community consult, we work with them, we provide them with input on the homes, we bring them along for the ride".
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Appendix 1 – Map of the ancient city-state of Athens and the Peiraiás

## Appendix 2 – Typology of public–private partnership (PPP) project types across Australia from 1988 to 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FED</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>QLD</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>TAS</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>TOTAL PPP in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = Economic infrastructure    S = Social infrastructure    U = Urban renewal and associated infrastructure

Appendix 3 - Demas’ list of qualitative research questions to counter dominant research discourses

Demas’ list of qualitative research questions:

*How is resistance to research placed at the center? How do we continually contest our research practices while at the same time continuing to conduct research?*

*How is collaboration constructed in the research community and with the public?*

*How do we foster its emergence (a) without denying difference and (b) without perpetuating the status quo or forced consensus?*

*How do we challenge the positions of privilege that are created by our unconscious ways of functioning that are Western, logical, defined as sophisticated or rigorous, or scientific (however broadly defined)?*

*How do we pursue social justice without imposing our (predetermined) notions of emancipation and our definitions of liberatory transformations?*

*How do we construct notions of research that do not imply inference (even when inference is not our intent)? How can we question “knowing” itself as a purpose of research? Are there other questions that we should be asking rather than “What do we know (or experience)?”*

*How do we create continued challenges to our modernist need for legitimation? How can our research methods provide avenues for people to choose how they wish to be represented?*

*How can we develop/use ways of conceptualizing, defining, and representing data that may not fit traditional literacy/language-oriented forms of representation?*

*How do we work to construct a dialogue with the public that would inform, listen to, and negotiate constructions of research without generating a discourse that becomes the new exclusionary grand narrative?*

*How does this public discourse remain open to ambiguity, uncertainty, and multiple possibilities?*

*How do we critique the power relations generated by our research and always question what we think we know?*

*How do we take critical actions for transformation that do not impose liberatory truth orientations on others?*

Appendix 4 – A diagrammatic representation of the action research spirals

Source: Centre for Enhanced Learning and Teaching (2010).
## Appendix 5 – Sydney Metropolitan Strategy key objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy focus</th>
<th>Strategic aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Economy and employment**     | (1) 1,100,000 more people  
(2) 500,000 more jobs (half of which are expected to be located in Western Sydney)  
(3) Planning allocation of ‘Employment Lands’ for various infrastructure that would support employment activities  
(4) Identification and develop ‘Growth Centres’ |
| **Centres and corridors**      | (1) Five cities (Sydney City, North Sydney, Parramatta, Liverpool, Penrith)  
(2) Three corridors (areas around transport routes that connect centres)  |
| **Housing**                    | (1) 640,000 new homes  
(2) Over three-quarters of new housing will be located in strategic centres, smaller centres and corridors within walking distance of shops, jobs and other services concentrated around public transport nodes  
(3) Housing density increases in these places |
| **Transport**                  | (1) New bus transit ways and strategic bus corridors  
(2) Orbital motorway network  
(3) New light rail networks in the city  
(4) New bicycle and pedestrian networks |
| **Environment and resources**  | (1) Focuses on water recycling, renewable energy, clean air, waterways, beaches, retention of rural lands, and accessible parks and local bushland |
| **Parks and public places**    | (1) Provide parks and public facilities through the renewal of centres and corridors, and in the development of new communities to facilitate active, healthy lifestyles and community interaction  
(2) Promote environmental protection |
| **Governance and implementation** | (1) The Metropolitan Strategy will inform infrastructure investment priorities in the State Infrastructure Strategy and will create certainty for private investment  
(2) The Strategy will integrate planning with investment in the Sydney region beyond the current budget cycle, by improving the information base and by responding to community participation in review |

### Appendix 6 – Data analysis matrix

Spatio-temporal analysis of the BLCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial analysis of the BLCP</th>
<th>Temporal analysis of the BLCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social and institutional sites</strong></td>
<td>Phase 1 of the BLCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The political landscape at BLCP announcement</td>
<td>The discursive framing of the BLCP by Housing NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See page 131</td>
<td>See page 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discursive practice</strong></td>
<td>Transition to the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney’s hellhole to be bulldozed</td>
<td>The creation of parallel invited spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See page 163</td>
<td>See page 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7 – Letter to public housing tenants announcing the BLCP

222-233 Liverpool Road
Ashfield, Sydney NSW 2131
Locked Bag 4001, Ashfield BC 1800

Telephone (01) 2873 8000
Facsimile (01) 2875 8255
www.housing.nsw.gov.au

222-233 Liverpool Road
Ashfield, Sydney NSW 2131
Locked Bag 4001, Ashfield BC 1800

December 2004

Dear Resident

Bonnryigg Living Communities Project

The State Government has announced the Bonnryigg Living Communities Project, a plan for community renewal of the Bonnryigg public housing estate. This renewal project will involve the Department working with other agencies to improve community services such as health, education, employment and training. It will also involve changes in the layout of the streets, improved open space, the replacement or upgrading of Department of Housing homes and the building of new houses and flats.

There is no need for action by you at this stage. This letter is to provide you with information about the renewal, which is a long-term project that could take anywhere between 5 to 10 years for the Department of Housing to complete.

As one of the first steps the Department will be working with Bonnryigg residents, community groups, Fairfield City Council and the private sector to put together a detailed community renewal plan for Bonnryigg. This plan will outline the work that is to be carried out on residents’ homes and on public spaces. It will also outline how the Department and other government agencies might improve services to the Bonnryigg community.

I would like to assure you that there will be no immediate impact on you in terms of the replacement or upgrading of housing. The Department does not expect any tenant to have to move before late 2006. It will do all it can to support families during any relocation that may occur as well as fully respecting tenants’ rights. I would also like to assure you that the Department’s ITM office in Kennedy Way will continue to operate.

The Department wants residents to be fully involved and to have a say in the project. Soon we will be holding meetings and talking to residents and community groups about what they want for Bonnryigg. All the information the Department gathers from these meetings will inform what goes into the plan.

Attached is a Fact Sheet and Frequently Asked Questions about the project. The Department will keep you updated as the project develops. If you have any questions, please talk to the staff at the local Department office – Bonnryigg Plaza or Kennedy Way. Alternately, you can ring the Bonnryigg Office on 9822 3999 or the 24 hour housing enquiry line on 1800 629 212.

If you need an interpreter, they will be available at the local office, or you can call the Translating and Interpreter Service on 13 14 50.

Yours sincerely,

Terry Barnes
Director Council

NSW Department of Housing (2004e)
Appendix 8 - Evaluation criteria from the Summary of Contracts

The following is an excerpt from the Summary of Contracts text:

The criteria for evaluating the five Responses fell into eight categories: the proponents’ general understanding of the project and relevant housing issues (5% weighting), their experience, capabilities and approaches in procuring, managing and delivering major capital projects and long-term service contracts (10% weighting), their experience, capabilities and approaches in working with communities and tenants (25%), their experience, capabilities and approaches in bidding for and delivering “public private partnerships” or similar projects with appropriate risk transfers and the provision of long-term value for money (20%), their property development experience, capabilities and approaches (15%), their experience, capabilities and approaches in the planning, design, refurbishment and construction of land and housing projects on occupied sites (10%), their housing facilities management experience, capabilities and approaches (10%) and the compliance of their Responses with the requirements of the Request for Expressions of Interest (a mandatory criterion, 5%). (NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.3)
Appendix 9 – Eight evaluation criteria from the Expression of Interest

The following is an excerpt from the Expression of Interest text:

6. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation criteria defined in this section will be used to evaluate Responses.

It is a mandatory requirement that Responses must address all of the PPP Services set out in Section 4.2.1 (including tenancy management services) in order to be considered for evaluation.

The evaluation criteria are not listed in any special order of priority and may not be given equal weight. In evaluating Responses additional information may be sought from Proponents and/or third parties. The ranking of Proponents will not be disclosed at any time during or after the EOI process.

6.1 CRITERIA 1 – GENERAL UNDERSTANDING

The extent to which the Proponent’s experience and approach to the Project demonstrates an understanding of the following:

(i) The aims and objectives of the Department.

(ii) Social Housing and Affordable Housing arrangements in NSW.

(iii) Tenant, community and government issues relevant to Social Housing in NSW including constraints, processes and procedures.

(iv) The nature of disadvantage and stigma in low income communities and the principles underpinning social and physical regeneration in those communities.

6.2 CRITERIA 2 – PROJECT AND CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

(i) The Proponent’s experience, capability and capacity in relation to the procurement, management and delivery of major capital projects and long-term services contracts, particularly with respect to:

a. Procurement processes for large scale PPPs or similar.

b. Managing and delivering projects and contracts against fixed budgets and to tight deadlines in complex human services environments, including management of the public-private interface.

c. Management of relationships with industry stakeholders, government entities, local and other relevant authorities, unions, contractors and the wider community.

d. Implementing quality management and quality assurance procedures and practices.

e. Compliance of quality, occupational health and safety and environmental assurance systems with NSW Government requirements.
(ii) The extent to which the Proponent’s approach to project and contract management for the Project supports the Department’s aims and objectives.

6.3 CRITERIA 3 – WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY AND TENANTS
The Proponent’s experience, capability and capacity in relation to:

a. Developing and delivering consultation and communication programs for projects with potentially significant social impact and requiring a large degree of community engagement and input into project formulation.

b. Minimising negative social impacts in projects where the potential for negative impacts is high.

c. Identifying and engaging with the community and relevant stakeholders including peak housing groups, community groups, local advocates and government with respect to significant housing renewal projects.

d. Planning, designing and implementing housing projects that are responsive to community requirements and that engender community support.

e. The regeneration of communities, particularly disadvantaged and low income communities and culturally diverse communities.

f. Working with culturally and linguistically diverse communities.

g. Maintaining and strengthening community cohesion among diverse income and cultural groups, public and private residents and long-standing and new residents.

h. The management of social housing or similar communities and associated tenancies.

(ii) The extent to which the Proponent’s approach to working with the community and tenants for the Project supports the Department’s aims and objectives.

6.4 CRITERIA 4 – FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL
The Proponent’s experience, capability and capacity in relation to bidding for and delivery of PPPs or similar with appropriate risk transfer and long-term value for money, particularly with respect to:

a. Provision of the necessary human and financial resources to participate in the EOI and RDP process and achieve financial close, including willingness to appoint appropriate legal, financial and technical resources to provide advice, support the process and undertake due diligence.

b. The Proponent’s understanding of PPPs and past performance in entering into similar long-term commercial arrangements with government entities.

c. The Proponent’s past performance in assuming, managing and mitigating risk as indicated by the Request.
d. The Proponent’s past performance in arranging appropriate finance to cover capital and operating costs, including the know-how and capacity to implement risk mitigation strategies to support such finance and deliver value for money to the Department.

e. The financial strength of the Proponent and its parent companies, including the ability to commit equity and balance sheet support consistent with the risk allocation outlined in the Request and the requirements of providers of finance.

(ii) The extent to which the Proponent’s financial and commercial approach to the Project, supports the Department’s aims and objectives.

6.5 CRITERIA 5 – PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT

The Proponent’s experience, capability and capacity in relation to:

a. Development of large-scale residential housing projects.

b. Understanding of the residential real estate market relevant to the Project.

c. Renewal of poor amenity residential areas and repositioning of those areas within the relevant real estate market to uplift property values, including relevant marketing and sales activity for both private housing and Affordable Housing.

d. Development of housing projects that reflect the principles of sustainable development.

e. Development of housing projects that integrate Affordable Housing and/or Social Housing with private housing.

(ii) The extent to which the Proponent’s approach to property development for the Project supports the Department’s aims and objectives.

6.6 CRITERIA 6 – PLANNING, DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION

The Proponent’s experience, capability and capacity in relation to planning, design, refurbishment and construction of land and housing projects on occupied sites and delivery to time, budget and quality, particularly with respect to:

a. Masterplanning and delivery of housing estates incorporating a mixture of Social Housing (or similar) and private housing to meet output based specifications and statutory planning instruments.

b. Designing and constructing Social Housing (or similar) and associated infrastructure while meeting an output based specification and optimising costs on a whole of life basis.

c. Designing and constructing housing and associated infrastructure in accordance with the principles of sustainable development.

d. Staging of physical works to minimise impact on residents.
e. Planning and management of resident and tenant relocations, including management of multiple small development projects, property acquisition activity and head leasing activity to provide accommodation for relocated residents and tenants.

(ii) The extent to which the Proponent’s approach to planning, design and construction for the Project supports the Department’s aims and objectives.

6.7 CRITERIA 7 – FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The Proponent’s experience, capability and capacity in relation to:

Facilities management of Social Housing or other comparable assets to optimise social and financial objectives over a long term and including:

Development and implementation of long term asset management plans.

Whole of asset life cycle costing and funding.

(ii) The extent to which the Proponent’s approach to facilities management for the Project supports the Department’s aims and objectives.

6.8 CRITERIA 8 – COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS

The extent to which Responses comply with the content requirements defined in Section 7, (including the quality, conciseness and clarity of Responses) and the terms and conditions defined in Appendix 1.

(NSW Department of Housing, 2004, pp.26–29)
Appendix 10 – EOI Key Outcomes: Community Consultation

The following is an excerpt from the Expression of Interest text:

3.6.4 Consultation and Communication Outcomes

Community engagement and support is critical to the success of the Project. The Department commenced comprehensive consultation and communication with the community in Bonnyrigg in December 2004. It has also commenced discussions with other key stakeholders including Fairfield City Council and peak bodies representing Public Housing and Community Housing interests.

The Department intends that consultation and communication will continue in parallel with and inform the EOI and RDP processes and will continue at least through to completion of the physical renewal works as follows:

- During the EOI process, the Department will continue to explain its community renewal objectives to the community and will consult the community in detail to identify key issues that may influence the Project in terms of its planning, design, timing, staging, or processes. Information coming out of this consultation will be factored into the RDP.

- During the RDP process, the Department will continue to keep the community informed and to consult on matters including any impacts on the Department’s tenants, relocation policies and procedures. If this consultation uncovers issues that are material to submitted Proposals, then the Department will communicate these issues to Short-Listed Proponents.

- Following execution of a Project Deed, the Department expects that the Proponent will assume communication and consultation responsibilities. The Output Specification will contain specific performance measures in relation to this communication and consultation and the Project Deed will incorporate specific remedies for failure to perform in this regard – measures that may include step in rights and payment of compensation to the Department. Proponents will need to demonstrate that they have the skills and experience and other capabilities necessary to achieve positive community support and to work closely and constructively with the Department to ensure successful outcomes for the Department’s tenants and other residents.

(NSW Department of Housing, 2004, p.14)
## Appendix 11 – Invited Space 3: ‘Community engagement’ events between December 2004 and December 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of process def</th>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2004</td>
<td>Information sessions (eight sessions)</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2005</td>
<td>Information session General public</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2005</td>
<td>Information session Lao language group</td>
<td>Targeted to language group</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2005</td>
<td>Information session Spanish language group</td>
<td>Targeted to language group</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2005</td>
<td>Information session Khmer language group</td>
<td>Targeted to language group</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2005</td>
<td>Consultation Stakeholder workshop</td>
<td>Invite only</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>Information session Arabic language group</td>
<td>Targeted to language group</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>Information session Vietnamese language group</td>
<td>Targeted to language group</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>Information session Private owners group</td>
<td>Targeted to interest group</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>Consultation A week with a camera</td>
<td>Targeted to interest group</td>
<td>172 (School students from two schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2005</td>
<td>Information and consultation SpeakOut</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2005</td>
<td>Information session Arabic language group</td>
<td>Targeted to language group</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2005</td>
<td>Information session Vietnamese language group</td>
<td>Targeted to language group</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2005</td>
<td>Information session Khmer language group</td>
<td>Targeted to language group</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>Two consultation workshops Our Bonnyrigg Dream</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>169 (Two workshops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>Information session Vietnamese language group</td>
<td>Targeted to language group</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>Information session Carers project group</td>
<td>Targeted to interest group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2005</td>
<td>Information sessions Bonnyrigg High School</td>
<td>Targeted to interest group</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2005</td>
<td>Community feedback What you’ve told us so far</td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2005</td>
<td>Capacity building Urban design workshops</td>
<td>Targeted to interest group</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2005</td>
<td>Capacity building Urban design workshops</td>
<td>Targeted to interest group</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2005</td>
<td>Community consultation TalkAbout</td>
<td>General public</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2005</td>
<td>Capacity building Dream workshops</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2005</td>
<td>Community capacity building Dream workshops</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building Site visits</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building Dream workshops and site visits</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>383 (Two workshops and three site visits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building Dream workshops and site visits</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>231 (One workshops and three site visits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

134 Attendance as recorded and reported by Housing NSW.
Invited Space 3: ‘Community engagement’ events between December 2004 and December 2006 – continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of process</th>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehousing policies workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building the dream and site visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building the dream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transeultural mental health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community voice counts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working across cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (collated by author from Coates et al., 2008, p.27).
## Appendix 12 – Key BLCP events from BLCP announcement to Transition to the private-sector contractor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key event in the private partner selection process</th>
<th>Key event in the community engagement process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2004</td>
<td>Redevelopment project announcement</td>
<td>Redevelopment project announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2005</td>
<td>28/01/2005 – Request for Expression of Interest (EOI)</td>
<td>Information sessions – General public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2005</td>
<td>24/02/2005 – Community consultation Stakeholder Workshop</td>
<td>Information sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>30/03/2005 – Five consortia respond to the EOI</td>
<td>Information sessions Language and interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2005</td>
<td>02/04/2005 – Community consultation SpeakOut</td>
<td>Information sessions Language and interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>Community capacity building Dream Workshops and site visits</td>
<td>Information sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>Information sessions Language and interest groups</td>
<td>Information sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2005</td>
<td>Information sessions</td>
<td>Information sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2005</td>
<td>12/08/2005 – Three consortia short-listed from the EOI process</td>
<td>Community feedback What you’ve told us so far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2005</td>
<td>19/09/2005 – Request for Detailed Proposals (RDP): the three short-listed consortia are requested to provide detailed proposals</td>
<td>Information sessions Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2005</td>
<td>Capacity building Urban Design Workshops</td>
<td>Information sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2005</td>
<td>Community consultation TalkAbout</td>
<td>Information sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2005</td>
<td>Capacity building Building the dream</td>
<td>Information sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building Site visits</td>
<td>Information sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2006</td>
<td>15/03/2006 – Two consortia submit detailed proposals, following an extension on the closing date</td>
<td>Capacity building Building the dream Site visits Safety Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building Building the dream Site visits</td>
<td>Information sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building Site visits</td>
<td>Information sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2006</td>
<td>Capacity building Rehousing Policies Workshop</td>
<td>Information sessions Tenancy Management Workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key BLCP events from BLCP announcement to Transition to the private-sector contractor – continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key event in the private partner selection process</th>
<th>Key event in the community engagement process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2006</td>
<td>05/07/2006 – <strong>Pre-selection</strong>: advised the two consortia that they will begin pre-selection negotiations; following these negotiations the consortia submitted Revised Detailed Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pre-selection</strong> negotiations with consortia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2006</td>
<td><strong>Pre-selection</strong> negotiations with consortia</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2006</td>
<td><strong>Pre-selection</strong> negotiations with consortia</td>
<td>Building the dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2006</td>
<td>11/09/2006 – Two consortia submitted <strong>Revised Detailed Proposals</strong></td>
<td>Site visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2006</td>
<td>18/10/2006 – Bonnyrigg Partnerships announced as the <strong>Preferred Proponent</strong></td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2007</td>
<td><strong>Final</strong> negotiations with Bonnyrigg Partnerships</td>
<td>Creative Communication Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October-December 2006</td>
<td>23/12/2006 – <strong>Project Contracts</strong> executed(^{135})</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2006</td>
<td><strong>Project Deed</strong> was executed on 12 February 2007, but did not become legally binding until 20 April 2007</td>
<td>Working Across Cultures Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2007</td>
<td><strong>Financial Close</strong> – The Project Deed was executed on 12 February 2007, but did not become legally binding until 20 April 2007</td>
<td>Information/Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20/04/2007 <strong>Mobilisation</strong> begins</td>
<td>Community Information Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2007</td>
<td><strong>Transition</strong> from the public sector to the private sector</td>
<td>Stakeholder Briefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2037</td>
<td><strong>Contract ends</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (developed by the author from Coates et al., 2008; Judith Stubbs and Associates, 2007; NSW Department of Housing 2007; NSW Department of Planning, 2006; NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007; Sarkissian Associates Planners, 2005).

\(^{135}\) Four contracts remained and were executed between 23 December 2006 and 20 April 2007.
Appendix 13 – ‘Community Renewal’ as defined in the EOI

The following is an excerpt from the Expression of Interest text:

The Department will work with the Bonnyrigg community, Fairfield City Council, the Department’s chosen Private Partner, other government departments and community organisations to renew the Estate and help create a stronger community in Bonnyrigg. The Project will be guided by a community renewal plan for the Estate, which will be developed with input from all the Department’s partners, including the community. The plan will have three main objectives:

• Providing better services and creating new opportunities. In partnership with other agencies and community leaders, the Department will identify ways to upgrade public safety, improve health and community services and create new opportunities for residents, in particular to improve their education and skills and find work.

• Building a stronger community. The Department will work with the Bonnyrigg community to help build the skills of residents, improve communication and strengthen community networks and leadership. In doing so, the Department hopes to reflect and build on the rich cultural diversity of the Bonnyrigg community.

• Renewal of houses and public areas. In partnership with a Private Partner, Fairfield City Council and the community, the Department will replace or upgrade poor quality Public Housing and improve street layouts and public areas, increase the proportion of private housing and better match the type, size and configuration of Public Housing to tenant needs. Many new houses and apartments are expected to be built.

(NSW Department of Housing, 2004, p.9)
Appendix 14 – ‘Community Engagement’ as defined in the EOI

The following is an excerpt from the Expression of Interest text:

1. Executive Summary

Bonnyrigg is one of a number of large public housing estates in Western Sydney that were built in the 1970s and 80s using Radburn urban design principles. Bonnyrigg has many strengths as a community, but the deteriorating condition of the housing stock and the high level of concentration of public housing have resulted in it shouldering a high burden of social and economic problems.

The Bonnyrigg Project was developed with the aim of making Bonnyrigg a good place to live, a place offering good quality homes, facilities and services.

The Bonnyrigg Project is the first to carry the ‘Living Communities’ brand, an approach representing the most recent thinking by Housing NSW on the renewal of large disadvantaged public housing estates. The Living Communities approach signifies an integrated response to the social and physical environments in estates. The approach has three simple core objectives:

1. Providing better services and opportunities for residents.
2. Building a stronger community.
3. Renewing the houses and public areas.

The Living Communities approach has a strong emphasis on community engagement. Community engagement was conceived as a means of developing community support and enthusiasm for the project by giving the community an important role and a voice in shaping the project implementation.

Community engagement is sometimes used as a synonym for community consultation, but in Bonnyrigg it denoted a more complex set of functions and activities. The project adopted the following working definition for community engagement:

activities and processes that seek to **inform** affected people about the project, **include** them in project decision making structures, **consult** them about their views, **involve** them, where possible in decision making, provide opportunities and support for residents to **participate** in community projects, committees and events and **partner** with them on specific aspects of the project. This has entailed significant **capacity building** to provide them with the skills and confidence to enable local people to make a meaningful contribution to the project.

This definition was reflected in a simple schema developed for community engagement work, as follows:

INFORMATION ⇒ CONSULTATION ⇒ PARTICIPATION ⇒ CAPACITY BUILDING

(Coates et al., 2008, p.3)
Appendix 15 – We are Bonnyrigg Partnerships

We are Bonnyrigg Partnerships

Bonnyrigg Partnerships is a highly skilled and capable group made up of:
- St George Community Housing
- Becton Property Group
- Spotless Services Australia
- Westpac

...and we've been chosen by DoH to join the Bonnyrigg Living Communities team as the new partner in the renewal of Bonnyrigg. We look forward to getting to know you and working with you!

Why Bonnyrigg Partnerships?
The members of Bonnyrigg Partnerships are very experienced in:

Working with communities like Bonnyrigg

St George Community Housing is the largest community housing organisation in NSW, and manages over 1600 tenancies. This includes tenancy management services for DoH at Riverwood public housing estate. It provides many opportunities for tenants to be involved.

Managing and maintaining housing and facilities

Spotless Services Australia is one of Australia's largest property management and maintenance companies. It currently provides maintenance services to DoH tenants at Bonnyrigg – so Spotless already understands your maintenance needs.
Appendix 16 – Housing NSW’s powers to enter into the BLCP contracts

The following is an excerpt from the Summary of Contracts text:

The bases of Housing’s powers to enter into the project’s contracts are:

- Its statutory functions and powers under the Housing Act, including, in particular, its functions and powers to develop and redevelop land for housing, to manage, develop, redevelop and lease its land and to enter into contracts for the construction of buildings on its land and the sale and leasing of its land, taking account of the housing and other objectives of the Housing Act

- More specifically, its powers under the Housing Act to enter into ventures with others for the acquisition, development and management of land for residential, business, public and other purposes, the provision of housing services and/or implementation of the objectives of the Housing Act, subject to the approval of the Minister for Housing (which was granted, under section 60 of the Housing Act, on 19 December 2006) and the NSW Treasurer (which was granted, under section 22L of the Public Authorities (Financial Arrangements) Act (NSW), on 20 December 2006), and

- An approval granted by the NSW Treasurer, on 20 December 2006, for Housing to enter into the project’s financing arrangements, in accordance with section 20(1) of the Public Authorities (Financial Arrangements) Act.

(NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.5)
Appendix 17 – Overview of BLCP Deeds

The BLCP deeds include (Blake Dawson Waldron Lawyers, 2007a–k):
Bonnyrigg Living Communities Deed of Amendment (2007a).
Bonnyrigg Living Communities Fixed and Floating Charge (2007c).
Bonnyrigg Living Communities Independent Certifier Deed (2007d).
Bonnyrigg Living Communities PPP Project Deed (2007e).
Bonnyrigg Living Communities PPP Project Deed (Schedules) Volume 1 (2007f).
Bonnyrigg Living Communities PPP Project Deed of Guarantee (2007g).
Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project Equity Hold Deed Poll (2007h).
Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project Development Side Deed (2007i).
Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project Services Side Deed (2007j).
Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project Tenancy Services Side Deed (2007k).

A summary of the BLCP deed is provided in this text:
Contract Particulars (NSW Department of Housing, 2007).
Appendix 18 – Private-sector Services Manual: Inspection, compliance and reporting mechanisms

The following is an excerpt from the Service Manual text:

3.4.7 Services management plans, manuals, monitoring, reports, inspections and audits

3.4.7.1 Management plans and manuals

As indicated in sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4, the Project Company must develop, complete, comply with and from time to time amend and update a large number of management plans and protocols for its services, assembled into an overall Services Manual.

This Services Manual must include:

- A Management and Integration Service Plan, incorporating an Integration Service Plan, the Quality Standards (Services) plan, an Information Management Plan, an Occupational Health and Safety Plan, an Environmental Management Plan, a Disaster, Fire and Emergency Management Plan, a Risk Management Plan, an Employee Training Management Plan, an Employee Conduct Management Plan, an Industrial Relations Management Plan, a Performance Monitoring System Plan and Helpdesk procedures

- A Communication and Consultation Service Plan, setting out how the Project Company will comply with the Communication and Consultation Protocol

- A Community Renewal Service Plan

- A Facilities Management Service Plan, incorporating the Cyclical Maintenance and Replacement Plan, the Project Company’s annual “stock condition” survey reports, the Dwelling Modifications Protocol, a Dwelling Modifications Works Program, an Access Protocol, a Scheduled Cleaning Program, a Vacant Dwelling Protocol and a Pest Control Program

- A Tenancy Management Service Plan, incorporating a Tenancy Management Manual and all associated protocols, a Tenant Information Protocol, a Tenant Participation Protocol, a Complaints and Appeals Protocol, the Allocations Protocol and a Rental Fraud Action Plan

- A Tenancy Support Service Plan, including a Cultural Representation Protocol and a Community Support Protocol

- The Rehousing Service Plan, incorporating a Rehousing Assessment Plan, the 12-month Rehousing Plan, a Tenant Moving Service Manual and a Tenant Damage Compensation Protocol

- An Off-Estate Housing Plan, and

- Any other service-related management plans, programs, reports and protocols developed by the Project Company, with descriptions of the
Project Company’s intended “outcomes”, approaches, key activities and resourcing for the delivery of its services.

Detailed requirements for the content of each of these plans and protocols are set out in the Specification. Initial versions of the Services Manual and its immediately relevant subsidiary plans and protocols are presented in the Project Company’s Proposals for the project and are reproduced in a schedule to the Project Deed.

(NSW Land and Housing Corporation, 2007, p.44)
Appendix 19 – Becton Property Group letter of support

Dr Michael Darcy
Acting Director
Social Justice and Social Change Research Centre
University of Western Sydney
Locked Bag 1797
Penrith South DC NSW 1797

Dear Michael,

We have reviewed your draft proposal and consider the research to be a worthwhile endeavour. It is likely to contribute significantly to an understanding of the complexities of community participation in the context of Public Private Partnerships. The research is highly relevant to public policy in Australia at the present time, and we note your proposal for a comparative case study from the United Kingdom in this regard. This is also likely to be valuable due the UK’s experience to date, and will provide opportunities to explore the differing issues in the two countries. The opportunities for your research to provide critical reflection to us as part of “action research” will also be valuable. The need for reflexive practice in such a complex and sensitive process as public housing redevelopment is paramount if we are to ensure that there are positive outcomes and minimal negative impacts on the community from the Bonnyrigg PPP. It is likely also that your proposal will provide highly relevant learnings for other social housing PPPs, as the process is extended to other housing estates as a core part of government policy.

We are therefore pleased to provide in principle support for your proposal. However, due to the early stage of this project, we provide this support subject to the following:

- Achieving commercial close (projected as mid-December 06);
- A more thorough review of the research proposal and methodology;
- An assessment of our capacity to work with Mr Rogers based on an interview with him and discussions with key Bonnyrigg stakeholders with whom he has been working over the last two years. (We note in this respect that our initial discussions with Fairfield City Council and the NSW Department of Housing indicate that he appears to be highly regarded due to his previous work in Bonnyrigg); and
- Ultimate approval by Bonnyrigg Management Board.

Thank you for your proposal. We look forward to further discussions soon after Commercial Close.

Your Sincerely,

Matthew Reszka
Development Manager
Becton Property Group Ltd

Source: personal communication, December 2006.
Appendix 20 – Fairfield City Council IHAP assessment process

Appendix C: IHAP Flow Chart

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION RECEIVED

NOTIFICATION required under DCP

NO OBJECTIONS

Determination under delegated authority

OBJECTIONS

REVIEW OF OBJECTIONS
(Initially carried out by assessment officer) in accordance with Council policy / standard or merits

CONTACT OBJECTOR/S
Advise the following:
* Planning process
* Discuss and confirm objection or concern and advise of staff evaluation of such relative to Council policy (standards or objectives)

CONTACT APPLICANT
Advise of planning process and concern of objectors and seek resolution

RESOLUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH CODE / POLICY

Determination under delegated authority

NO RESOLUTION
No agreement between objectors and applicant

REFERRAL TO PANEL
for hearing of objectors and applicants, assessment of DAs and recommendations

RESOLUTION OUTSIDE OF PROVISIONS OF CODE / POLICY

TO COUNCIL FOR DETERMINATION

Appendix 21 – BLCP Part 3A assessment chronology

The following is an excerpt from the Preferred Project Report text:

3 Part 3A Application Process

The preparation of the Part 3A application, comprising a Concept Plan and Stage 1 Project Application, was subject to a lengthy process, including extensive consultation with existing residents, neighbouring land owners, Council and the likely future community, liaison between the proponent, State and local government and other key stakeholders, and detailed investigations, research and analysis by a range of specialist consultants.

Since the lodgement of the application in November 2007, the proposal has been subject to a rigorous assessment process, including the public notification of the proposal for 58 days (December 2007 to February 2008), review of submissions from a range of stakeholders and a comprehensive assessment lodged in association with the Concept Plan and Stage 1 Project Application.

Key dates in the preparation, lodgement and assessment of the Part 3A application are outlined as follows:

December 2004

The Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project was announced by the State Government.

December 2004 to June 2006 –

Fairfield City Council (Council) and Housing NSW undertook a series of community consultation initiatives to ensure that the views of the community were considered in the process.

30 June 2006

The Minister for Planning (the Minster) formed the opinion that the proposed staged renewal of the Bonnyrigg Estate is a development to which Part 3A of the Act applies.

18 October 2006

Bonnyrigg Partnerships was announced by the NSW Government as the preferred bidder for the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project. The 30 year Public Private Partnership with the NSW Government includes the urban renewal of the estate over 15 years and the management of the estate for a 30 year period.

October 2006 to November 2007

A significant number of meetings, briefing sessions and workshops (i.e. over 80 meetings) were held with Council officers, Councillors, the Department of Planning, Housing NSW, other government agencies, key stakeholders and the community regarding the proposed Masterplan, the Stage 1 dwelling designs and the preparation of the Part 3A application.
11 April 2007
The Minister delegated all assessment powers in relation to the project to Council. The Minister retained the consent role.

20 April 2007
Bonnyrigg Partnerships signed the Project Deed with Housing NSW to undertake the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project.

30 April 2007
A Preliminary Environmental Assessment (PEA) was lodged with Council (and the Department of Planning) in accordance with Section 75F of the Act requesting that Director-General’s Environmental Assessment Requirements (DGRs) be issued by Council for the Bonnyrigg Living Communities Project.

9 May 2007
A Planning Focus Meeting (PFM) was held at Council offices and attended by the proponent, core members of the consultant team and a range of public authorities and agencies, including:

- Fairfield City Council.
- NSW Department of Planning – Strategic Assessments.
- NSW Department of Planning – Sydney Region West.
- NSW Roads and Traffic Authority.
- Ministry of Transport.
- NSW Department of Education and Training.
- Sydney South West Area Health Service – NSW Health.

29 May 2007
The DGRs were issued by Council on behalf of the Director-General outlining the matters to be addressed in the Environmental Assessment.

25 October 2007
An Environmental Assessment was lodged with Council for a test of adequacy in accordance with the provisions of Section 75H of the Act. Correspondence was subsequently issued on 14 November 2007 directing that a range of issues are required to be addressed within 21 days of the date of the letter.

8 November 2007
An application seeking approval for a Concept Plan Approval for the renewal of the estate and approval for a Stage 1 Project Application for demolition, subdivision and construction of the first stage of the planned renewal was lodged with Council. The Environmental Assessment lodged with the application was prepared in accordance with the provisions of Part 3A of the Act and the Environmental Assessment Requirements.
Documentation was also lodged regarding a proposed amendment to the Local Environmental Plan and Development Control Plan and the preparation of a Voluntary Planning Agreement.

27 November 2007
Additional documentation was lodged with Council, responding to the matters raised in Council correspondence dated 14 November 2007 regarding the test of adequacy.

19 December 2007 to 15 February 2008
The Part 3A application, comprising the Concept Plan and Stage 1 Project Application, was publicly exhibited for 58 days.

8 February 2008
Correspondence was issued by Council regarding three key issues identified in the preliminary assessment process:

• Urban Design (Stage 1 Project Application).
• Width of Rear Laneways (Concept Plan & Stage 1 Project Application).
• Car Parking (Concept Plan & Stage 1 Project Application).

22 February 2008
Copies of all submissions received by Council during the public notification process were provided to the proponent, including:

• Fairfield City Council.
• Housing NSW.
• Transport agencies – Ministry of Transport, Roads and Traffic Authority.
• Service providers – Sydney Water, Integral Energy.
• Sydney South West Area Health Service - NSW Health.
• Non-government organisations.
• Sporting clubs.
• Existing residents.

It is acknowledged that the Fairfield City Council submission was prepared on behalf of Council’s corporate or civic interests and is not related to Council’s role as the assessment authority. Further, Council’s submission included a separate document prepared by architects, which peer reviewed the urban design component of the application.

27 February 2008
The proponent made a presentation to the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) to brief the Panel members regarding the background to the project and discuss the fundamental issues associated
with the Concept Plan and their application in the Stage 1 Project Application.

February to May 2008

A series of meetings were held with Council staff to discuss issues arising from the public notification and associated submissions, including separate meetings with various members of Council’s submissions and assessment teams and ongoing discussions regarding the format and content of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and the expected timeframe for infrastructure delivery.

24 April 2008

Correspondence was issued by Council providing specific comments regarding the assessment of the Concept Plan and Stage 1 Project Application, some of which was previously provided in Council’s correspondence dated 8 February 2008:

- Submissions to the Proposal.
  IHAP (Concept Plan & Stage 1 Project Application).
- Urban Design (Stage 1 Project Application).
- Density (Concept Plan & Stage 1 Project Application).
- Car Parking (Concept Plan & Stage 1 Project Application).
- Width of Narrow Streets (Concept Plan & Stage 1 Project Application).
- Open Space Issues (Concept Plan & Stage 1 Project Application).
- Traffic Access (Stage 1 Project Application).
- Stormwater and Drainage Issues (Concept Plan & Stage 1 Project Application).
- Acoustic Issues (Concept Plan & Stage 1 Project Application).
- Social Impact (Concept Plan & Stage 1 Project Application).

Appendix 22 – Private-sector consultation framework

The following is an excerpt from the Bonnyrigg Partnerships Community Engagement Feedback text:

The consultation process implemented from late April to July 2007 (Phase 1 of Community Engagement) was designed to build upon consultations undertaken by the NSW Department of Housing and Fairfield City Council during the two years following the announcement of the project (from early 2005). To a large extent, Phase 1 of Bonnyrigg Partnerships’ consultation was an extension of the preceding two years of consultations, and took into account community input received during the Bonnyrigg Baseline Survey (Stubbs, Randolph and Judd 2005), Our Bonnyrigg Dream, and Building the Dream consultation series in the design of the Phase 1 process.

In accordance with the expectations of the Department of Housing and the approach set out in the Communication and Consultation Plan in the Bid documentation and subsequent Draft Communication and Consultation Strategy for the period to Transition, the objectives of community engagement for Mobilisation can be summarised as:

- Working co-operatively with the Department of Housing to ensure a seamless transition as Bonnyrigg Partnerships takes on responsibilities for communication and consultation during Mobilisation;
- Maximising community participation in the renewal process;
- Ensuring accurate, timely and culturally appropriate information is provided to the community;
- Ensuring that the community is clear on the extent to which it can influence various aspects of the project, whilst also ensuring that all key feedback is captured and fed into project plans where possible;
- Ensuring access and equity for all community stakeholders, including culturally and linguistically diverse communities, older people, people with a disability, young people and other hard to reach groups, through a diversity of consultation methods, use of culturally appropriate methods and materials, and a flexible and responsive approach to enabling community input;
- Community capacity building through a range of consultation-related activities linked to the Community Renewal Services Plan;
- Supporting the community through a process of significant change; and
- Risk management for the Department, Bonnyrigg Partnerships and the community, particularly in Phase 1 following the release of the main Bid plans.

The Draft C&C Strategy, developed by Bonnyrigg Partnerships in consultation with the Department, sets out the specific strategies that will be implemented during Mobilisation, and a comprehensive calendar of events. This has been fully implemented during Phase 1, with a range of flexible and
responsive strategies to augment perceived gaps in coverage or special needs as they arose (see Draft C&C Strategy for detail). Discussions with the Department part way through Phase 1 provided the opportunity to use other ‘support’ activities such as BBQs and other special events as consultation opportunities as well.

The Draft Strategy sets out:

- The messages that will be contained in all written materials to be used in consultation during Community Information Days, Workshops, Shopfront and Plaza displays, BBQs, home visits and all other contact with the community;
- The processes that will be implemented;
- Themes around which information and consultation activities would be organised;
- The requirement to provide feedback to stakeholders.

Appendix 23 – Letter of request for the ‘Customer Satisfaction Survey’

June 18, 2008

Re: Request for Fee Proposal – Customer Satisfaction Survey – Bonnyrigg Partnerships Project

Dear Mr Rogers,

Bonnyrigg Partnerships is undertaking a unique and groundbreaking community renewal project in Sydney’s western suburbs. The project involves the comprehensive social and physical renewal of a public housing estate over a 30 year period.

Bonnyrigg Partnerships (BP) is a consortium of four organisations undertaking the renewal of the public housing in Bonnyrigg. BP provides tenancy and maintenance services for housing tenants, consults closely with, and communicates with the tenants in a variety of ways.

We are currently seeking a market research company to undertake the first of a series of Customer Satisfaction Surveys to measure our performance.

I attach our brief for this Customer Satisfaction Survey, including a proposed timeline. The survey results will need to be reported by early November 2008.

I am seeking a proposal from you that meets the requirements of the attached brief. The proposal will need to include (among other things) a quote for completing the customer satisfaction survey, a timeline for undertaking the survey and reporting its findings that is consistent with the proposed timeline and any exclusions to your proposed fee.

We will conduct this survey annually, so there may be opportunity for future work. However this request for fee proposal is for the 2007 – 2008 annual survey only.

Please ring me on 9616 9130 or email me on: Emily.tinson@bonnyriggpartnerships.com.au if you have any questions. Please provide the proposal by email. I will need to receive your proposal by 4 pm Friday June 27, 2008. We will be awarding the tender on Monday June 30.

In anticipation of your proposal,
Yours sincerely,

Emily Tinson
Community Relations Manager
Bonnyrigg Partnerships

Appendix 24 – Key Performance Indicators for the ‘Customer Satisfaction Survey’

**KPI Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI Detail and Target</th>
<th>Achieved in Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPI202: Completion and submission of the Customer Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>Survey completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI204: Customer Satisfaction with the overall quality of the Communication and Consultation Service – target for years 0-2 = 60%</td>
<td>81% were very/fairly satisfied with information they receive from Bonnyrigg Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI302: Customer Satisfaction with the overall quality of the Community Renewal Service – target for years 0-2 = 60%</td>
<td>78% were very/fairly satisfied with the services provided by Bonnyrigg Partnerships since October 2007 78% were very/fairly satisfied with Bonnyrigg as a place to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI404: Tenant satisfaction with the overall quality of the Facilities Management Service – target for years 0-2 = 60%</td>
<td>76% very/fairly satisfied with overall quality of the facilities management service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI509: Tenant satisfaction with the overall quality of the Tenancy Management Service – target for years 0-2 = 60%</td>
<td>83% were very/fairly satisfied with the overall quality of the tenancy management service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI602: Customer satisfaction with the overall quality of the Tenancy Support Service – target for years 0-2 = 60%</td>
<td>85% were very/fairly satisfied with the information/support provided by their housing manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI704: Tenant satisfaction with the overall quality of the Rehousing Service – target for years 0-2 = 60%</td>
<td>76% of those who had received a housing interview (n=118) were very/fairly satisfied with the information and support provided 53% of those who had received a re-housing interview were very/fairly satisfied with the prospect/process of moving to another house 89% of those who had been relocated (n=9, caution of small base size) were very/fairly satisfied with their new home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI502: Tenant satisfaction with the efficiency and effectiveness of the Housing Allocation process – target for years 0-2 = 60%</td>
<td>Sample we received did not flag which tenants have joined the project from the HNSW Waiting List.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bonnyrigg Partnerships (2008a,
Appendix 25 – St George Community Housing: Policies and procedures for tenant participation

St George Community Housing
Policies and Procedures
Section 8 — Tenants’ Rights and Participation

8.3 The Tenant Advisory Group

Scope
SGCH tenants are provided with the opportunity to influence and guide the organisation’s service delivery. Tenants are actively encouraged to participate in the Tenant Advisory Group (TAG).

Policy

Tenants Advisory Group role
The role of the Tenant Advisory Group is to:
- Provide comment and advice to the Board of Directors, via the Tenant Director, about any issue relating to the management and service delivery of the organisation.
- Develop tenant participation mechanisms and structures.
- Develop social or other activities for the benefit of the tenants of SGCH.
- Meet quarterly at SGCH’s offices for two hours.

Who can attend?
- Any person who is a tenant of SGCH can attend.

Meeting arrangements
At meetings the following will be provided to enable tenants to attend:
- Childcare
- Refreshments
- Assistance with travel costs. Funds will be available where public transport has been used, or where meetings are held at night and taxis have to be used for safety purposes.
- Meetings to be held at the best time for as many tenants as possible to attend.

Decision making
The Tenant Advisory Group is to operate by consensus, and where consensus cannot be reached then a one person, one vote system is to be used. Only one person per household has a vote.

In the event of a tie, the Chairperson has the casting vote.

Accountability
The Senior Housing Manager or their delegate is responsible for the Tenants Advisory Group. They are responsible for advising the tenants group on matters raised by the Board that is relevant to tenants and to also keep the Board informed of relevant matters raised by the tenants.

Terms of Reference
The Tenant Charter was approved by the TAG in July 2009.
8.4 Tenant Participation

General principles
- To foster tenant involvement in the planning, delivery, evaluation and management of SGCH business.
- To maximise individual satisfaction, in ways that are appropriate to the needs of all tenants.

Level of participation and strategies

Informal feedback on an individual level
- Encourage individual tenants to express their concerns during home visit, property inspection or office interview.

Formal individual feedback
- Satisfaction surveys, evaluations and suggestion boxes etc.
- Conduct an annual tenant satisfaction survey.

Input into formal consultations or advisory committees
- Establish a Tenant Advisory Group to provide an opportunity for tenants of SGCH to comment on policy and service delivery.
- Organise open Tenant Forums at least twice a year.

Control and decision making about the management of their own dwelling or block/housing complex
- Organise block/complex tenants meetings on a quarterly basis to address asset management issues.

Involvement in decision making about the policies and activities of the Cooperative through membership of sub committees
- Encourage new tenants to apply for the organisation’s membership during sign-up interviews.
- Invite interested tenant members to take part in the sub-committees of the organisation.

Control and decision-making about the organisation through membership of the Board
- Encourage tenant members to join the Board as Directors.

Communication strategy
- Publish a tenant newsletter quarterly to facilitate tenant participation.
- Produce information leaflets/packs about important issues as they arise.

Source: St George Community Housing (2009, pp.6–7).
Appendix 26 – Public- to private-sector comparison of tenant participation

The following table is from the Tenant Participation in Bonnyrigg: Emerging themes from the tenant participation study text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bonnyrigg: Information and Consultation Programs 2004 – 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCE Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precinct BBQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Owners Group (POG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Youth Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Tenant Advocate (BITAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters/ Community Calendars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reference Group (CRG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnyrigg Public Tenants Group (BPTG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Sydney Public Tenants Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11 As defined by project staff and tenants in the interviews.

Source: Rogers (2010, p.8).