Chapter 5
Summary and Conclusions
Chapter 5

Summary and Conclusions

5.1 Summary - The Enduring Strands

5.2 Conclusions - Theoretical and Practical
5.1 Summary - The Enduring Strands

5.1.1 Introduction
This Chapter summarises the evaluations of the individual Area Strategies in Chapter Four using the enduring strands.

5.1.2 Buildings and their grouping
In Section 2.4, The enduring strands, the time-honoured urban form configurations of Buildings and their groupings were outlined. These included the group cluster, the streetscape and the courtyard, these being the main components of the Program’s urban built forms, particularly housing. Of these generic forms and their variants, the courtyard was found to be a particularly successful urban form providing a satisfactory environment from a number of perspectives, these being:

- its sense of enclosure and hence feeling of community;
- an acoustic shield from the outside traffic noise;
- the opportunity to develop well-designed community space with adjoining private spaces at ground level and generous overlooking balconies at the upper floors;
- the provision of excellent informal surveillance;
- the opportunity to group all parking out of sight in a basement, and
- the ability to absorb different, but sympathetic adjoining housing styles, as in the Church Street housing development Inner North East Suburbs Brisbane Area Strategy, providing further visual enrichment to the development.

Successful courtyard outcomes included the following: Church Street described above, the student housing directly behind Wickham School Newcastle, and the many examples at South Melbourne.

Single and two-storey housing, designed according to AMCORD URBAN, persistently resulted in an excess of hard paving. Such paving combined parking, vehicular and pedestrian circulation areas into a common undifferentiated space, virtually swamping the development and drastically reducing the opportunity for soft landscaped works. The tight planning constraints also placed individual but adjoining units ‘check by jowl’ with the inevitable concerns as to the level of acoustic privacy. There were many examples of this, including: New Haven, South Australia; Palmyra, Western Australia; East Preston, Victoria, and Tolosa Street, Hobart, Tasmania.

Often the existing, frequently uniform grain established the outcome of the urban form, particularly where the Program’s developments were extensions, and not a fresh start on a cleared and vacated or greenfield site.

Streetscapes presented a very mixed visual outcome. The clearly evident trend for housing to have very high site coverage and for individual houses to either directly adjoin their neighbours or retain a narrow canyon space between them, combined with the desire for individual elevational expression, frequently resulted in outcomes bordering on visual cacophony. Such an example would be the ‘Amsterdam’ housing adjoining the canal along Henry Lawson Walk East Perth, dismayingingly detracting from what is otherwise probably the most successful of all the Program’s Area Strategies. The prudent, possibly conservative designers, who stayed with a single design theme were assured of a more restrained and coherently urbane outcome. An example of the latter is the modest housing development at the Horwood Bagshaw site Mile End Western Area Strategy South Australia.
Buildings other than housing, but an integral part of the individual Area Strategy, generally conformed to the constraints of the established street pattern and grain.

The high site coverage, particularly in the Program’s inner city Area Strategies, driven as they were by high land values and the excessively tightly planned, frequently single storey housing developments and in accordance with AMCORD URBAN guidelines should be revisited and reconsidered in any such future initiatives.

5.1.3 Public domain

The summary commentaries on the public domain are for reasons of reader accessibility distributed as follows. Those areas of the various Area Strategies that have an immediate relationship to internal site-specific, individually designed, and landscaped public spaces are generally covered in Landscape. Issues of amenity and enhancement to areas such as public streets and footpaths, and which directly relate to particular examples, are covered in Circulation. The generic issues of the public domain remain here in this Section.

The Program had much to say about issues of access and its provisions. Access covers many concerns, including: provisions for those with disabilities; access to transport, shops and services; access to work and job opportunities and ease of access for emergency services and vehicles to name but a few. The public domain in its various roles provides a means of access. To conduct such a study on the Program’s 26 Area Strategies would be a task without end, as it aims at a constantly shifting scene, given all the possible variables many of which are subject to change.

Whilst matters of safe provisions for people with disabilities can be determined, service providers and their destinations, transport provisions and employment opportunities may all alter or shift. Another view is to aim for flexibility of planning, for a loose fit that allows change, with minimum disruption, that can rise to meet altered circumstances despite the high degree of permanence of the built environment. In considering such issues, any observations can only be qualitative, but from observation of the many Area Strategies there was little found that had such a high degree of fixedness that they could not adapt to change. On the other hand, no innovative examples were found that foreshadowed change and built in a preparedness to receive it.

5.1.4 Safety and security

Safety and security is an essential enduring strand. The strand has both day and night aspects as well as a private and public presence. Beyond the merely physical modifications that can be made to the urban environment lie further levels of safety and security provisions including an array of electronic systems. Within the time constraints of field visits, evaluation of the night aspects, private domains and electronic systems lay beyond this research. Observations and evaluations were based on accepted CPTED principles, in the public domain during daytime hours. Given these constraints most of the familiar safety and security principles appeared well covered and better than might have been expected. Considerations of safety and security were almost without exception, and certainly in matters of detail, absent from the Program’s literature.

5.1.5 Activity

Whilst much of the activity is generated by housing, with commercial, retail and other activities depending on the nature and scale of the individual Area Strategy, there was evidently some effort to encourage social activity by way of parks, active frontages and provision for recreational and entertainment activities. It seemed a much greater effort could have been applied to encouraging creative social outcomes given the change in Australians’ social patterns in eating out, promenading and seeking recreational and entertainment activities. No example was found that could claim to be an exemplar in this area. In regard to the range of activities, it is useful to return to the categories identified in Activity (refer Section 2.4 The enduring strands).
Medium density housing

Generally medium density housing in terms of its presentation to the public domain was exceedingly disappointing. Perceived design shortcomings are commented on in the evaluations of the individual Area Strategies. The courtyard solutions, referred to in Buildings and their grouping, generally presented well, possibly because this particular form is well understood and even in unexceptional design hands can deliver a presentable outcome. Examples of medium density housing as streetscapes that generally succeeded would include those at Lynch's Bridge and Subicentre. Examples of poor or indifferently elevationally-designed medium density housing were numerous, but a representative sample would include Eveleigh and the Sir Thomas Elder Mews, in the Western Area Strategy, South Australia.

AMCORD URBAN

Many of the housing outcomes were influenced by AMCORD URBAN recommendations. The results were several, and have been commented on elsewhere in this research, but include particularly uncomfortable and tight planning outcomes. Other design manuals were developed to simplify the design process, and possibly ease its spatial outcomes. The latter consideration constitutes an extended and separate study.

Affordable housing

Affordable housing ran the risk of being caught in the difficulties of resolving the challenges of social mix; as well as being indifferently designed, inadequately detailed and poorly constructed. Whilst this was not necessarily the main outcome, examples were found that fitted with the above description, and included those at Bishopgate and Railway Streets, Honeysuckle. However, affordable housing outcomes that can be regarded as successful include the following: Church Street housing Brisbane; Theatre Mews Wapping, Hobart; the student housing directly behind Wickham School, Honeysuckle and the City West housing at Ultimo-Pyrmont.

Adaptive reuse

A considerable number of adaptive re-uses were conversions from previous industrial premises to housing, mostly aimed at the middle to upper end of the housing market. Of those visited all were regarded as successful adaptations, but especially West Australian Newspapers Ltd, Fremantle and Boan’s Warehouse, East Perth.

Urban consolidation

Urban consolidation was a respected government policy and repeated mantra during the life of the Program. Troy’s belated warnings (Troy, P. N. 1966, The Perils of Urban Consolidation) as to the illusory nature of anticipated gains from consolidation have clearly not taken root, and consolidation continues apace in both the Area Strategy sites and elsewhere. However, urban consolidation has been defended on the grounds of offering housing options. If the outcomes of pursuing such a policy are as serious as Troy believes, then such a defence may become harder to maintain, although clearly there will always be exceptions where such a policy meets economic and environmental standards.

High-rise

The extent of high-rise in the Area Strategies was limited, Ultimo-Pyrmont being the predominant focus both in apartment and commercial buildings. The Lend Lease waterfront apartments might
have achieved a better contextual response. Their intimidating bulk, near absence of modelling and want of visible environmental responses, exhibit shortcomings in responding to this most precious waterfront resource.

There was a flow-on or catalytic effect generated by some of the Area Strategies. This was evident in private sector development of other initiatives including high-rise apartment buildings. Such catalytic effect was an expectation of the Program and has been claimed for several Area Strategies of which Newcastle was one, in its claim to recently constructed apartments at the corners of Parry and Hunter Streets and Scott and Watts Streets.

5.1.6 Conservation and heritage
Of all the strands, Conservation and heritage was consistently the best resolved. Of the many adaptive reuses visited during the field trips, not one was found that was poorly conceived or executed. The high standard of design resolution, raises the general question as to why this genre of architecture succeeded so consistently, when much of the new work ranged in design terms from average to the less frequent examples of excellence. Possible explanations might be that heritage work imposes a greater number of design constraints requiring a higher degree of design discipline, but also imagination to achieve successful outcomes. Another explanation might be that the original building or buildings engender respect, possibly reverence, from the designer so that many sensitive solutions are both a conscious but partially unconscious response to the integrity of the original fabric. Whatever the explanations, conservation and adaptive reuse were remarkably well handled in the Program. Heritage buildings are part of cultural heritage and in their turn provide welcoming backgrounds and homes for public art that is reflective of historical and cultural themes. They also serve equally as backdrops for contemporary art works. The inherent integrity of most heritage buildings provides them with the ability to receive effectively a wide range of art works. Chapter Four discusses a number of adaptive reuse projects, so there is no need to re-evaluate them again here, other than to recall some of the best exemplars which include: West Australian Newspapers Ltd, Boan’s warehouse and the many examples at Wapping Hobart and Ultimo-Pymont.

5.1.7 Landscape
Spines, greenways and waterfronts

In Section 2.4 The enduring strands, the role of landscape contributing to urban design at a number of scales was discussed. On a large scale, in a number of the Area Strategies, the landscape design achieved a high level of success, wherein it established early the skeletal structure for the fleshing out of the other built components. These include the circulation spines, sometimes called greenways, described for East Perth and Subicentro but also found in the earlier DURD initiative of Woolloomooloo in the traffic-free extension of Forbes Street, and its transformation into a pedestrian haven. In the same vein, the contiguous development along waterfronts belong to this category of large scale spinal structures. Waterfront spines present design dilemmas of their own, possibly more difficult to surmount than those of East Perth, Subicentro and Woolloomooloo.

The difficulty with contiguous waterfront landscape development is that whilst the water body, be it ocean, harbour or river, provides an edge it does not establish any sense of strong visual containment.

The waterfront landscape space literally spills out into the sometimes extensive water body. Boardwalks, seawalls and tree planting can assist in strengthening and containing the edge, but these may represent excessive expenditure or maintenance issues. On the land side of the water-
front, definition and containment is frequently diminished, wherein a waterfront road further
distances the edge-defining buildings and apartments by the width of the road and its reserva-
tions. These difficulties confronted a number of Area Strategies but its challenge was evident
along the Geelong waterfront. Despite the several favourable aspects of this landscaped develop-
ment the space is simply too diffuse to achieve a satisfying level of urbanity.

Commons

At Kensington Banks and to a lesser degree at the Horwood Bagshaw development Mile End site
Adelaide, attempts were made to create a central ‘common’ encircled by housing. Both fell short
of the mark for reasons outlined in Chapter Four. Such efforts need further study of their histori-
cal antecedents to understand better the issues of scale, degree of enclosure and mix of encircling
activities, in order to distance them from their contrived ‘real estate’ interpretations.

Parks and squares

The provision of parks, squares and open space, by whatever description seems appropriate, is an
article of faith in planning and urban design. To question their presence and intended purpose
has a whiff of heresy about it. Their inclusion is automatically taken as a good. But the questions
remain do we know who will be interested in the spaces, how they might be used and indeed
whether they succeed in any degree at all? Ultimo-Pyrmont made a concerted attempt to establish
a hierarchy of open spaces with proposals as to their purpose and intended use. However, given
the unknown nature of the public response the assumptions could, all or in part, be misplaced.
In terms of these spaces in the various Area Strategies, it is difficult to reach any conclusion as
to their success or otherwise, since the design professions have incomplete knowledge as to what
really succeeds. The bleak, neglected, deserted, and at times vandalised public spaces, such as
parks and squares, bear witness to this limited knowledge base. Given these circumstances, con-
cclusions as to the success or otherwise of these spaces remains unknown. However, it is apparent
that when such spaces are part of the dynamics of a larger landscape system, as at Lynch’s Bridge,
East Perth and Subicentro, wherein smaller spaces adjoin the circulation spines or greenways,
their purpose and potential use is considerably enhanced.

5.1.8 Environment

Originally the variables that were seen to comprise an environmental response, including an
ecological response, were contained to the one strand, that of Environment. However, in terms
of evaluation it was helpful to separate them into the two strands, Environment and Ecological
responses. The former, Environment, was generally limited to those matters that could be per-
ceived and evaluated externally, such as measures to adequately provide shelter and protection
from the elements of sun, wind and rain including also considerations of orientation. The latter
Ecological response focused more on matters of process and systems, including: site remediation,
energy management, water management and embodied energy. Matters of environmental
response were evaluated for each Area Strategy in Chapter Four with a generalised finding that
these issues were attended to in an indifferent, unconvincing and \textit{ad hoc} manner. Often the provi-
sions were inadequate for their purpose and more by way of poorly conceived design ‘features’.

However, those Area Strategies that deserve commendation for purposefully attending to environ-
mental issues, include the medium density housing at Brisbane’s Inner North East Suburbs Area
Strategy, and the Point Apartments at Ultimo-Pyrmont.
5.1.9 Ecological response

Ecological response, although by no means undertaken uniformly throughout the Program, nonetheless produced a number of commendably innovative solutions.

The reasons for the randomness of the various initiatives is unknown, and given that one of the Program’s original objectives was that of ecologically sustainable development, this would seem an inconsistency in the overall approach.

Those matters of ecological response that did receive varying degrees of attention include the following:

Site remediation

There was nothing to suggest that site remediation was not carried out to the best of current knowledge and practice. Whilst anecdotal stories circulate as to some short cuts, the collective thrust of this endeavour over the Program is endorsed.

Site remediation was a difficult, time consuming and very expensive component of a considerable number of the Program’s Area Strategies. On occasions time was set at large when archaeological investigations were necessary during remediation. Site remediation is an about-face from the way we once perceived the resources of air, land and water. They are no longer seen as capable of taking infinite abuse, and the restoration to relative health of these media, particularly in this context of land but also in some instances waterways, is no small victory for those that are concerned and speak for the environment. The number and nature of the individual remediations are covered in the Area Strategy evaluations in Chapter Four.

Energy management

Perhaps one of the most familiar of ecologically sustainable initiatives is that of energy management, which was not found in any perceived degree in the built works. The now common repertoire of correct orientation, appropriate room configuration, simple passive and active energy systems, solar collectors and the judicious selection of external planting et al., if part of the discourse, was not manifestly so. Where it would seem the application of an energy rating system, as employed, for example in the Australian Capital Territory, might well have been integrated into the requirements to be met in each the Area Strategies, especially those with a substantial housing component, there was no evidence of such an intention. Although specific initiatives such as in the remodelling of Condamine Court (ACT) claim to have been designed with energy conservation measures in mind, these were certainly not widespread examples.

Water management

Although energy management lacked a strong voice such was not the case with water management. A number of bold initiatives are described in Chapter Four including Figtree development, Honeysuckle; New Haven Village, Mawson Lakes North West Area Strategy South Australia; and Condamine Court at Canberra, ACT.

Embodied energy

Embodied energy and its concomitant of prudent resource use was not found as a specific edict of the Program. It may have been assumed to be included in one of the Program’s five original objectives, that of ecologically sustainable development. Essentially, the new built works exhibited little or no response to this environmental objective.
The considerable number of handsome adaptive reuses of wool stores, railway workshops, warehouses and other massively built brick buildings of a previous era represented a substantial repository of embodied energy. On the other hand most of the recent rail-bus interchange enclosures with concerns of future adaptability, combating vandalism and achieving transparency for surveillance employed a palette of materials high in embodied energy, steel, aluminium and glass. Hence, in regards to embodied energy there were wins and losses, seemingly more by coincidence than by intention.

5.1.10 Circulation
Successful modifications to vehicle circulation at the macro scale, implicit in the Area Strategies’ objectives, whether part of Program funding or from other sources, would include such sensible initiatives as the down-grading of the Railway Terrace as an arterial road in South Australia’s Western Area Strategy. Similarly, and at the same scale, modifications to existing railway alignments would embrace the major work described at Subicentro, reconnecting the long divided suburb of Subiaco.

The Brisbane to Gold Coast railway line, a very extensive circulation-oriented Area Strategy, is to some degree controversial for the reasons outlined, and can only be seen as a successful outcome if The Report Vol. 2, pp. 45-46 viewpoint is accepted.

Within the built up development of the Area Strategies, circulation routes and their separation of vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists were generally well considered and executed. Some of the generally vehicle free solutions were fresh and innovative in an Australian context, as in the previously described circulation spines and greenways.

In particular cases public bus routes and services were reorganised to provide improved services to the new Area Strategy development, as described for both East Perth and Brisbane Inner North East suburbs. Circulation whether at macro or micro scale was in the main well handled.

5.1.11 Public art
Public art and its concomitant companion of cultural heritage, with its potential for visual expression, fared very poorly in the Program, sometimes in terms of quality, but most frequently by its almost complete absence. The rich possibilities for artistic expression discussed in Section 2.4 The enduring strands, Public art were not visible. The works were mostly solid and tangible, although venturing into the abstract realm from time to time, and on one occasion with movement, provided in that instance by the tides, as at the Pyrmont waterfront. Notwithstanding, East Perth was an exception, as a sensitive and stimulating example of the integrated role public art can play in new development. Geelong foreshore, whilst not artistically challenging, provided an abundance of pleasure and delight particularly in its seaside theme totem figures. One or two, but far too few, quality sculptures were found along the waterfront domain of Ultimo-Pyrmont and after these few exceptions the remaining Area Strategies were reduced to isolated pieces or frequently no public art expression at all.

5.1.12 Social
The most difficult of all the enduring strands to evaluate was that of the social outcomes of the various Area Strategies. Assessment of issues of social mix, sense of community and social capital are complex and belong to the domain of the social scientist. Considerations of health or well-being as indicators of social success were not pursued because of their multi-variate nature. Social evaluation then was based on the general goals established for the Program and particular goals set for the individual Area Strategies. Against the background of social objectives at the birth of the Program were those of social justice, equity and access. Nonetheless, one observation that
was apparent throughout the research was that if the urban layout encouraged social interaction, then it contributed to a sense of wellbeing and security. Accordingly, those Area Strategies that responded best were those where public domain provisions encouraged this interaction. In this regard, the generous circulation spines of East Perth, Subicentro and Lynch’s Bridge were highly successful, as were the contiguous waterfront recreation areas of Ultimo-Pyrmont, Geelong foreshore and Bayswater foreshore park.

5.1.13 Management processes

In Section 2.4 The enduring strands - and the following observation was born out by the research in Chapter One - the position adopted was that urban design overlaps both planning and architecture, and this is found to be particularly so in insertions into the existing built fabric. In so doing, it inherits the principles and tools of both, in particular those of planning. The everyday discourse of planning in terms of SEPPs, LEPs and DCPs, plot ratios, site coverage, densities, zoning, precincts, design guidelines, set backs, public comment processes and a host of other requirements and regulations, become by adoption the tools of urban design in the development of built form. However, urban design has extended the boundaries of some of these tools, especially in terms of design guidelines and public participation, including charrettes. The research with its accompanying interviews and field trips confirmed this position.

Of all the processes involved, the one that needs ongoing review and refinement is that of design guidelines. Despite excellent examples of generic guides, such control documents, seem unable to prevent cases of misinterpretation and occasional instances of what can only be interpreted as a deliberate and confrontational flouting. A particular example of this is shown in Illustration 4.73, Arden Street, East Perth.

Despite the existence of well-considered and clearly presented guidelines, some indifferent and inappropriate built outcomes clearly evidenced inadequacies in the process. This process needs further research and possibly improved methods of exposition. It remains a pressing task for further research.
5.2 Conclusions - Theoretical and Practical

5.2.1 Introduction
The outcomes of the research were stated in Section 1.1.2 as the following:

- documented and co-ordinated previously uncollected material;
- analysed the Program’s objectives and processes developed by the protagonists of the Better Cities Program and also in part of the earlier Department of Urban and Regional Development program (DURD);
- commented, where apparent, on the theoretical and practice positions adopted by the proponents and designers;
- assessed the effectiveness of the Better Cities Program role, objectives, and processes as they relate to urban design, and
- pointed the way as to how future programs of the nature of the BCP, but also smaller programs may benefit from the findings of the research.

It is appropriate, following the research, to return to these objectives and evaluate the outcomes of the research.

5.2.2 Documented and co-ordinated previously uncollected material
Material is defined in this research as, ‘information, ideas, or the like on which a report, thesis, etc. is based’. (The Macquarie Dictionary 1981, p. 1078).

The material gathered throughout the research was extraordinarily diverse and included both existing and new information together with fresh insights and ideas advanced through the field trips, interviews and discussions. The material was found in a variety of forms which included the printed word, transcripts of speeches, photographic records, promotional audiovisual tapes and documentary television programs.

Initially, the approach was one of gathering and reviewing existing documentation, essentially written documents, and regrouping this material, firstly into general commentaries on the Program, next into the respective individual Area Strategies and finally its culling and sorting into the enduring strands.

The diversity of existing written documentation included, but was not limited to the following (refer 1.3.2 Research resources, R1 Literature reviews):

- official Program processes as covered in Section 3.3.2 BCP Processes and Outcomes;
- BCP Newsletters for various Area Strategies;
- agreements between the Commonwealth and the States in which Area Strategies were to be implemented;
- external financial audits;
- Area Strategy performance evaluations;
- monographs with substantial reference to the Program;
- journal articles on the Program;
- individual Area Strategy marketing and sales information; national and community newspapers, including broadsheets from specific interest or pressure groups;
- Area Strategy design guidelines;
transcripts of speeches;
housing design manuals;
consultant reports;
published conference and seminar papers as in the *Occasional Paper Series*;
statutory documents such as the *Sydney Regional Plan No 26*, and
urban design guidelines.

Together with the document review, further information, insights and ideas were gained through over 40 interviews and detailed responses to a wide ranging Questionnaire on the five Category One Area Strategies. Whilst all the interviews were committed to paper records they have not been included on the basis of space and wordage considerations. Nonetheless, the Questionnaire and individual responses to the five Category One Area Strategies are to be found in Appendix C.

Further first hand original material was accumulated from the field trips to 22 of the 26 Area Strategies and two earlier DURD projects. This material included the field trip observations together with extensive photographic records which in turn were evaluated through the enduring strands.

Accordingly, the documentation of material drew from all of the research resources described in Section 1.3.2 Research resources, namely: R1 Literature reviews, R2 Interviews and R3 Case Studies of the Area Strategies. In addition, it drew from the methods as described in Section 1.3.3, namely M2 The Questionnaire, M3 The enduring strands and the Questionnaire and M4 The Matrices, the last mentioned determining the Category of each Area Strategy.

5.2.3 Analysed the Program’s objectives and processes developed by the protagonists of the Better Cities Program and also in part for the earlier Department of Urban and Regional Development program (DURD)

Chapter Three outlined the origins and objectives of both DURD and the BCP. Section 3.3 continued with detailed analyses of the BCP’s objectives, processes and anticipated outcomes. The analyses sought out correspondence between the BCP’s programs and processes with the objectives of this research, through the enduring strands. Correspondence was designated by the symbol (+) which produced only limited agreement indicating that the Program’s formal processes were not preoccupied with matters of urban design. The Program’s processes subjected to this comparative review were:

1. The Better Cities Proposals Selection Process
2. The Measuring and Monitoring of Outcome Process
3. The Demonstration Projects Assessment Process
4. The Audit Process
5. The Head Agreement Process
6. The Monitoring and Accountability Process
7. The Funding Process
8. The Program Management Process
9. The Evaluation Process

Of the preceding, the only two processes that had any significant relevance to the research were The Demonstration Projects Assessment Process and The Audit Process (refer 1.3.3 Reseach methods M5).

The research did not set out to evaluate the Program’s processes in terms of its own criteria; that remains for future research by others. However, the interviews and discussions brought forth a number of informal observations on the processes which included the following, that:
the Program’s reporting requirements were onerous;
auditing was very difficult in terms of auditing ‘outcomes’;
the establishing of what comprised an Area Strategy was at times confusing;
what constituted a demonstration project was the subject of differing interpretations;
the economic outcomes were broadly successful, with enthusiastic comments in support
of private sector involvement and commensurable benefits through the multiplier, and
the generally effective working relationships between the three tiers of Government
received favourable comment.

The responses to the more formal Questionnaire in matters of objectives, processes and outcomes
were:

Q1 What briefing documents, if any, were provided to you on general or specific urban design issues
for your Area Strategy?

The common thrust of the response was that whilst there was specific briefing advice, the project
objectives were self imposed and site specific.

Q2 Did the five BCP objectives form part of the brief? The objectives being:

- economic growth and micro economic reform
- ecologically sustainable development
- an improved urban environment
- improved social justice
- institutional reform

Again, as in Q1 the objectives assumed a background against which the individual Area Strategies
were developed.

Q5 Address social justice issues by improved access to: jobs, health, services, education, public
transport, affordable housing and recreation, particularly for low income and disadvantaged and
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.

The general consensus was a desire that more should have been achieved.

Although DURD and the BCP were separated by some twenty years, a comparison of their objec-
tives was pursued in Chapter One, Section 1.3.3 Method M6 which found a substantial number
of shared objectives as well as some essential differences.

Whilst DURD activities were explored in further detail in Chapter Three, correspondence between
its activities with the objectives of this research, through the enduring strands, was not pursued
as for the BCP, since at that time urban design, although implemented by sensitive and aware
designers, was not commonly part of the built design discourse.

The analyses of the programs and processes developed by the protagonists of the Better Cities
Program and also in part DURD indicated that the participants were not preoccupied with urban
design considerations, but with other objectives.

Where outcomes were positive the research indicates that success can be attributed to a number
of influences, including the proponents involved, both individuals, teams and consultants; a
number of Area Strategy specific urban design advisory committees (UDAC), as was the case in
Ultimo-Pyrmont, and the individual efforts of senior protagonist staff members.
5.2.4 Commented, where apparent, on the theoretical and practice positions adopted by the protagonists and the designers.

The most searching enquiry of the research into the individual proponent’s theoretical positions was pursued in the Questionnaire directed to the principals involved in the five Category One Area Strategies, which were Ultimo-Pyrmont, Honeysuckle and Environs, Inner Melbourne and Rivers (Lynch’s Bridge), Inner North East Suburbs Brisbane and East Perth. The questions most focused on theoretical considerations were Q26, Q27 and Q28 which evoked the following responses.

**Q26** Contemporary design embraces postmodernism, postcolonialism, feminism, deconstructivism, neo-rationalism and the needs of indigenous people. Were you able to give urban design expression to these concerns?

The responses were somewhat guarded and centred on specific and restricted examples. The Women’s Peace Park at Lynch’s Bridge was cited as an acknowledgment of the feminist movement, but might better have been ascribed to the recognition of the women’s movement generally. Whilst vocational employment for indigenous people in the Eveleigh project was not successful, their culture was fully acknowledged in the sensitively conceived and executed memorials and works of art in the waterfront parks of East Perth. The theoretical ‘isms’ of Q26 drew little discussion and were derided by some, who saw the real work of urban design as site and context driven.

**Q27** The urban design approach can be: empirical (trusting the human senses), rational (ie logical steps from first principles), or pragmatic (employing things which are known to work). Which is your preferred approach?

Whilst question Q26 drew circumspect responses Q27 drew a response that all approaches were involved.

**Q28** There are many contemporary theorists/practitioners in urban design, such as: Rossi, the Kriers, Moore, Isoka, Tschumi, Alexander and Plater-Zyberck, and others. Has your work been influenced by these or others?

Question Q28 was directed to determine to what extent contemporary theorists and practitioners may have influenced the design outcomes. The responses ranged from the mention of a favoured theorist, to a select few, to the inclusion of all. There was limited interest and enthusiasm for discussing theories or theorists. Even the continuing debate about what contribution the new urbanists may or may not have made, did not lead into extended discussions.

The responses from the recipients of the Questionnaire do not constitute a large sample. However, the general response from the more broadly-based 40 interviews and discussions was much the same, in terms of limited theoretical discussion.

Notwithstanding an absence of theoretical discourse, the built outcomes did in a number of instances reflect their theoretical origins and certainly their generic origins. Examples of theoretical origins would include the many courtyard house configurations, particularly those of South Melbourne and Church Street housing in the Inner North East suburbs of Brisbane.

These hark back to the earlier workers housing of Bruno Taut and others in the 1930s both in scale and community space and as reinterpreted by Rob Krier in his Berlin courtyard housing schemes, and echoed in the Church Street housing just mentioned. The splendid green spines that exist in East Perth, Subiaco and Lynch’s Bridge with their broad and generously landscaped paths, being safe havens for pedestrians and cyclists and allowing passive and some restricted active recreation might reasonably be assumed to have their origins in Radburn.
Examples of generic origins include large two-storey houses with high site coverage found in some of the Area Strategies. These may have their origins in American housing, particularly in some gated communities. Despite the marketing appellation, the contiguous four-storey housing along Henry Lawson Walk is akin to Dutch canal housing. The 'commons' with their surrounding housing that are to be found in both Kensington Banks and the Horwood Bagshaw housing scheme in South Australia’s Western Area Strategy, may owe some allegiance to the New Urbanism, but their origins lie earlier back in the village common. Examples of terrace housing were plentiful and repeatedly demonstrated their ability to adapt simultaneously to contours and curves, yet maintain their regular rhythmic morphology. The origins of this type are to be found in many European antecedents of the 1800s and 1900s.

Waterfront housing as found in East Perth, Ascot Waters, Honeysuckle, Pyrmont Point and Mawson Lakes with immediacy to water, marinas and recreational boating would owe much to their 'life-style' housing counterparts in America, rich in its abundance of lake, river and ocean-canal waterways. The real estate description of 'New York' type apartments, in which early industrial premises are converted to apartments, must be indulged in the interest of truth, since such conversions do exist in New York and the implied glamour of such accommodation must be borne as enthusiastic marketing hype, since it contains an essence of truth.

In urban design terms the tracing of the origins of the theoretical positions adopted by the proponents and an analysis and comparison of these positions with the actual built outcomes revealed a general reluctance to engage in theoretical discourse, a limited acknowledgment of theorist influence and only a small number of readily perceived examples where such influence was obvious.

On the other hand, the urban design vocabulary encountered in the various Area Strategies drew extensively on generic forms, as outlined above. There were no demonstrations of theoretical explorations venturing into new and exploratory approaches with potentially uncertain outcomes. Very likely the guardians of the public purse would have ensured that did not happen. The outcomes, and the best of them, remained essentially within the familiar vocabulary, which notwithstanding produced in a number of examples meritorious urban design outcomes.

5.2.5 Assessed the effectiveness of the Better Cities Program role, objectives, and processes as they relate to urban design.

In Section 3.2.5 the role of the Program was summarised in three essential ways. It was a catalyst for innovative change and further development; it was a demonstration Program of how redevelopment could be carried out, and it sought to achieve its objectives in an integrated and socially responsible manner. Whilst the role is not contrary to the nature of urban design neither does it exhibit an explicit awareness of the significance that urban design should have had in the Program. At best the role is passively supportive.

The oft-quoted objectives of the Program were:

- economic growth and micro economic reform;
- ecologically sustainable development;
- an improved urban environment;
- improved social justice, and
- institutional reform.

Whilst it is possible to argue that all of the objectives are supportive of urban design, it is equally valid to argue that they are supportive of an almost countless number of other public goods and benefits, in other words they are worthy, broad and very general objectives. It was not until BCP II, when the Program was well advanced, did urban design receive specific mention as an objective.
The effectiveness of the Better Cities Program’s role, objectives, and processes as they relate to urban design, were less well considered and promoted than they might have been. However, urban design at the Area Strategy implementation stage enjoyed some successes, a number of which might be regarded favourably by contemporary standards.

5.2.6 Pointed the way as to how future programs of the nature of BCP, but also smaller programs may benefit from the findings of the research.

In Section 1.1 it was stated that the research provided an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the BCP’s role, objectives and processes in relation to urban design, and prompted suggestions and modifications which could enhance outcomes in future programs.

The research then makes the following observations, suggestions and modifications which could improve the outcomes of future programs:

1. Make clear and entirely accessible what the objective of urban design is for the particular program. Typically this will take the form of a vision statement or an overarching objective.

   Sources that would be valuable in formulating the vision statement or overarching objective could be drawn from the definitions outlined in Chapter Two, including the definitions of Lang, and Gosling and Maitland (refer Section 2.2 Urban Design as a Formalised Concept and Discipline) and also the Prime Minister’s Urban Design Task Force (refer Section 2.3 The Prime Minister’s Urban Design Task Force and Summary of Responses to the Questionnaire, Appendix C Q24). The East Perth project in particular was one of the most successful outcomes in urban design terms due to the considered integration of all the strand disciplines at the outset of this Area Strategy’s implementation. On the other hand, whilst Bunbury Area Strategy was pursuing its own objectives, it was considerably less successful in urban design terms as this was not a demonstrable objective.

2. Give directions as to the urban design processes to be followed using the model outlined in Section 2.4 The Enduring Strands. Whilst the nine processes adopted by the Better Cities Program referred to in Section 3.3.2 BCP Processes and Outcomes contain some key elements of the enduring strands identified by (+), only two of the nine processes were seen to be germane to the research (refer Section 3.4 Summary; the two processes are to be found in Sections 3.3.5 Demonstration Projects Assessment and 3.3.6 The Audit Process). A more promising indicator of those issues that would form essential objectives and processes in any future program are to be found in Appendix C Summary of Responses to the Questionnaire.

   - **Education program.**
     An education program directed at future participants in programs designed to improve our cities including production and dissemination of information and examples of the enduring strands in BCP projects as models.

   - **Project evaluations.**
     The BCP had a process of inputs, outputs and outcomes for monitoring (continuously evaluating) the projects (refer Section 3.3.4 The measuring and monitoring of outcome process). The Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) experienced difficulties with the accountability expectations of the outcomes process (refer Section 4.1.2 Evaluation Approaches). In addition, there were internal evaluations which were specific to particular projects. There is clearly a need to revisit both internal and external evaluation processes in future programs, in order to establish a consistency of approach.
Chapter Five - Summary and Conclusions

- **Urban design guidelines.**
  From both the field research and the gathering of codes and design guidelines, and also the responses to Q13 (refer Appendix C Summary of Responses to the Questionnaire) it was clear that there was no common basis for written recommendations, codes, controls and design guidelines across all Area Strategies. There is clearly a requirement to develop a uniform basis for guidelines so that outcomes can be evaluated in a consistent manner.

- **Demonstration projects.**
  Whilst guidelines were provided in the Program for demonstration projects (refer Section 3.3.5) the response from those interviewed clearly indicated a wide interpretation of the word ‘demonstration’ (refer Q17 Summary of Responses to the Questionnaire). The concept of demonstration projects is important in future programs, both for demonstration of achieving performance benchmark marks and the potential for the wider application of the demonstration in other sites and programs.

- **Resources.**
  At the time of the BCP there were in excess of one hundred government reports relevant to urban concerns. No audit of these reports was done in the shaping of the Program. (refer Section 3.2.8 Government reports) In addition, such documents as AMCORD which would be perceived as being essential to the Program met with a mixed response and application. It would appear essential that those reports that are valuable to an urban program should be identified as key resource documents, particularly as they affect urban design issues.

- **Management processes.**
  Any future program of the nature of DURD or BCP will doubtless evolve its own particular management processes. The BCP process was examined in Section 3.3.10 The Program management process. If the conclusions herein were to be accepted as the basis of urban design in future programs, this would require trained personnel who could assist, foster and implement such recommendations as referred to in 3 below.

3. **Adopt the ‘strands’ as the basic fabric of the process giving specific guidelines - and where possible performance standards - for desirable outcomes in relation to each. Then as a consequence, there will need to be a government authority responsible for briefing, monitoring and providing feedback on the process at Federal or State level. Hence, the ‘enduring strands’ are an on-going agenda for achieving better environments.**

This research provides support for the conclusion that the absence of specific and succinct urban design guidelines in the terms of reference for the Better Cities Program significantly limited the success of outcomes in a number of cases. With the greater recognition of the critical nature of urban design there is the opportunity for future programs of this nature to be enhanced.
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Appendix B Nature And Role of Urban Design - The Enduring Strands and Their Comparison with the Prime Minister’s Urban Design Task Force Criteria

In November 1994 several years after the commencement of the Better Cities Project, the Commonwealth of Australia published *Urban Design in Australia* Report by the Prime Minister’s Urban Design Task Force. This is regarded as an important document, although it arrived late in terms of the Program’s advancing Area Strategies. The Task Force set down what they believed was good urban design based on the work of William Lyman Porter, namely that good urban design was demonstrated by the following criteria, in that it:

Primary level

(i) ‘demonstrates design excellence in urban development and architecture:

(ii) distributes benefits widely in the population;

(iii) produces environmental benefits;

(iv) responds to local features and needs;

(v) is relevant to the contemporary world;

(vi) leaves open the possibility for continuing adaptation and change, and

(vii) forges connection with the past.’

These criteria are only broad principles, and whilst they indicate a concern for the physical and social world they are not saying much more than the following:

(i) *demonstrates design excellence in urban development and architecture.* This is always commendable, although it is unlikely that there will ever be universal and close knit agreement on what design excellence might constitute. Design competitions bear witness to this. A broad commonality of opinion is the best that might be hoped for.

(ii) *distributes benefits widely in the population.* Again this is a statement of principle, and reinforces the objectives of social justice, equity and access.

(iii) *produces environmental benefits.* This criteria is extremely broad but is assumed to support the implementation of ESD principles in all their many forms.

(iv) *responds to local features and needs.* This seems another way of saying implement sensitive design and siting and respond to social and possibly cultural needs.

(v) *is relevant to the contemporary world.* This criteria is very broad, but assumed to mean the avoidance of a retreat into any sort into historicism, planned, built or socially engineered.

(vi) *leaves open the possibility for continuing adaptation and change.* This has been said by others more concisely as ‘long life loose fit’ and means that, if at all possible, not to close off future options foreseen or otherwise. There is an implication of adaptive re-use of buildings given the ‘locked up’ or embodied energy, particularly in major constructions.
(vii) *forges connections with the past.* This is the principle of continuity and suggests a response to conservation and heritage issues.

Hence, whilst these primary level criteria are sound, they are on closer inspection not extraordinary and at best provide a set of criteria that can - with one or two vague or too generalised exceptions, as noted - be said to establish good urban design. However, alone they are not sufficiently comprehensive, resilient or detailed to provide a set of criteria to evaluate the Program’s initiatives. They only point the way.

However, the Report continues further and enlarges the scope of considerations on the nature of urban design, by outlining what the most urgent urban design needs continue to be today. These I’ve called secondary criteria and are:

(viii) ‘public fora and events to foster informed and open civic discourse and a sense of communal purpose;

(ix) the strengthening of central cores as mixed domains to serve regional, national, even global roles in economic vitality and cultural performance;

(x) a bold commitment to urban design excellence and institutional innovation in reclaiming Australia’s inner-suburban, post-industrial frontier - but without extinguishing our fine industrial heritage;

(xi) the strengthening of inner-city vitality though good mass transit and well managed car access;

(xii) a democratic and open, yet visionary development guidance system that is supported by clear and certain development frameworks;

(xiii) firm and collaborative management of private and public urban capital investment, particularly in times of high economic expectations;

(xiv) unequivocal support for public space that affords generous levels of pedestrian comfort and amenity;

(xv) meaningful preservation and re-use of symbolic and historical buildings and spaces;

(xvi) imaginative articulation of the mutual relations that provide the parts of the city with symbolic meaning and delight, giving a sense of time and place, and securing close relations to water bodies and natural areas;

(xvii) creative management of the quality of signage, general building materials and articulation of facades, and

(xviii) nurturing of strong civic design and development institutions that are capable of innovating design and development control instruments.’

These criteria embody a number of the ‘enduring strands’ to a sufficient degree to establish that the Task Force criteria and ‘strands’ have parallel objectives, but strand dominated.
Secondary level

(viii) public fora and events to foster informed and open civic discourse and a sense of communal purpose. These would seem to embrace the strands of social and management methods such as the various approaches to public participation including charrettes. In a very broad sense the concept of public domain would be included.

(ix) the strengthening of central cores as mixed domains to serve regional, national, even global roles in economical vitality and cultural performance. This has been interpreted as regards central cores as increasing downtown mixed development to serve an increasingly wider audience. It would be reflected in urban form and public domain.

(x) a bold commitment to urban design excellence and institutional innovation in reclaiming Australia’s inner-suburban, post industrial frontier-but without extinguishing our fine industrial heritage. The design excellence is the same as (i) previously and the remainder is a plea for a balanced attention to issues of conservation and heritage.

(xi) the strengthening of inner-city vitality though good mass transit and well-managed car access. This is an aspect of circulation, circulation being an enduring strand.

(xii) a democratic and open, yet visionary development guidance system that is supported by clear and certain development frameworks. This is allied to the enduring strand of management and landscape methods.

(xiii) firm and collaborative management of private and public urban capital investment, particularly in times of high economic expectations. This is part of management method and approaches to project realisation.

(xiv) unequivocal support for public space that affords generous levels of pedestrian comfort and amenity. This is interpreted as including the enduring strands, of public domain and by association that of safety and security.

(xv) meaningful preservation and re-use of symbolic and historical buildings and spaces. This is directly related to the enduring strands of conservation and heritage.

(xvi) imaginative articulation of the mutual relations that provide the parts of the city with symbolic meaning and delight, giving a sense of time and place, and securing close relations to water bodies and natural areas. This need is wide in scope and possible interpretation. Imaginative articulation could mean the spaces between, and connections to the parts of the city - possibly parklands, nodes or public art; it is not easy to interpret. The imparting of a sense of time and place is more abstruse, whilst the proximity to water bodies and natural areas could be either landscaped areas, ponds, parks and reserves or ocean outlook and national parks. On drawing a ‘long bow’ these allusions may be referring to the ‘enduring strands’ of grouping, landscape and works of public art, and possibly other meanings.

(xvii) creative management of the quality of signage, general building materials and articulation of facades. This is certainly linked to some degree with urban form and to the housing of activity.
nurturing of strong civic design and development institutions that are capable of innovating
design and development control instruments. The relationship here is to the strands of urban
form and public domain with a concluding reference to management methods.

Although quite differently described there are many parallels between the urban design principles of the Task Force and those evolved for this research and thesis. In reviewing the enduring strands there are only those of environment and ecological response not accounted for in the above secondary level comparison, and these find a reference, in the primary level as in (iii) in the production of environmental benefits.
Appendix C  The Questionnaire as Sent to Respondents

Q1  What **briefing documents**, if any, were provided to you on general or specific urban design objectives for your Area Strategy?

Q2  Did the **five BCP objectives** form part of the brief? The objectives being:

- economic growth and micro economic reform
- ecologically sustainable development
- an improved urban environment

**Generic outcomes** for the BCP were as follows, Q3-Q11. In your Area Strategy were you able to implement some or all of the following objectives?

Q3  Improve **labour market** outcomes by supporting employment initiatives, and by addressing long journeys to work and poor public transport?

Q4  Respond to **ESD** by: rehabilitating degraded sites; enhancing and protecting heritage, urban and natural environments; reducing traffic congestion; designing energy efficient housing and improving water management and micro climates?

Q5  Address **social justice** issues by improved **access** to: jobs, health, services, education, public transport, affordable housing and recreation, particularly for the low income and disadvantaged and Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders?

Q6  Address **institutional reform** by improved: efficiency of expenditure on health & services; better urban outcomes from land released by the institutional reform process and redevelopment of outmoded institutional service delivery?

Q7  Support the provision of and investment in **infrastructure** particularly efficient transport systems within cities? Make more efficient use of existing, new and upgraded infrastructure and services to support urban renewal?

Q8  Recognise the primary importance of the **public domain** with attention to aesthetics, systems and spatial relationships?

Q9  Respond to **housing** needs in terms of increasing: diversity and hence choice; affordability, innovation, consolidation (more compact forms) particularly for low income and disadvantaged groups, thus addressing issues of social justice?

Q10  Achieve better **integration** of physical and social planning, economic development, infrastructure provisions and environmental management?

Q11  Achieve better **urban management** through improved integration of urban planning and development?

*(End of generic questions)*

Q12  Were there any formal **external evaluations** carried out by the BCP of your urban design in terms of the Area Strategy objectives? Did you institute your own progressive **internal evaluation** processes?
Q13 What was the form of your urban design outcome: written recommendations, codes, controls, design guidelines or some other form?

Q14 In your opinion did the BCP meet the usual tests of merit with the application of cost-benefit analyses?

Q15 Better Cities II 1995-1996 refers to urban design specifically, eg 'better urban design', and 'improved urban design and livable cities'. Whilst BCP II came late, did its urban design focus reach you or was it too little too late?

Q16 What urban design management process did you adopt in the evolution of the design? Did you share your progressive urban design development with a community or reference group?

Q17 Did the urban design aspects of your particular Area Strategy warrant its advancement as a demonstration project with innovative processes? Was it a catalyst for other projects? Could you identify such other projects?

Q18 Urban consolidation was Government policy during the BCP. Do you support urban consolidation, or do you question its contribution to increased efficiency and liveability of cities and to address equity and social justice issues?

Q19 To the extent that your Area Strategy urban design work involved housing, were the AMCORD and Green Streets Program useful to you?

Q20 There were many reports by Federal Government during the BCP, including: A National Housing Strategy, ESD, Social Justice, and the PM’s Task Force on Urban Design. Did any of these reports assist your design outcomes?

Q21 What influences did the following BCP processes have on your urban design development and outcomes: inputs, outputs & outcomes; program management; monitoring & accountability and program evaluation & audit?

Q22 If your Area Strategy was predominantly an infrastructure or corridor project did it lay a foundation for future and successful urban design outcomes?

Q23 If the enduring strands of urban design are: buildings and their grouping, public spaces, circulation, safety, housing, conservation, landscape, public art, environmental response and health, were you able to respond to these strands?

Q24 Good urban design exhibits: design excellence; widely distributed benefits - environmental benefits; a response to local features; a contemporary relevance; provision for change and forges connections with the past. Do you agree?

(PM’s Urban Design Task Force)

Q25 Did your urban design assist in strengthening central areas; in creating safe environments and in fostering public art? As the BCP is essentially silent on these issues. Did it have: flexibility, variety, robustness and legibility?
Contemporary urban design embraces postmodernism, postcolonialism, feminism, deconstructivism, neo-rationalism and the needs of indigenous people. Were you able to give urban design expression to these concerns?

The urban design approach can be: empirical (trusting the human senses); rational (ie, logical steps from first principles), or pragmatic (employing things which are known to work). Which is your preferred approach?

There are many contemporary theorists/practitioners in urban design, such as: Rossi, the Kriers, Moore, Isoka, Tschumi, Alexander, Duany and Plater-Zyberck, and others. Has your work been influenced by these or others?

Urban design was not one of the five BCP objectives, but in some ways urban design issues are found within these objectives. Do you agree that urban design deserved its own objective, or was it in fact the one objective?

What are your personal reflections on urban design in Australia and the BCP? What would you suggest for any further Federal Government urban initiatives? Was urban design improved in Australia as a result of the BCP?
Responses To The Questionnaire

1. East Perth
2. Lynch’s Bridge and Kensington Banks
3. Honeysuckle
4. Ultimo-Pyrmont
5. Brisbane Inner North East Suburbs

Q1 What briefing documents, if any, were provided to you on general or specific urban design objectives for your Area Strategy?

A The generic brief contained the five objectives, but it was as much a coincidence of approach. The project objectives were self imposed and site specific.

Q2 Did the five BCP objectives form part of the brief? The objectives being:

- economic growth and micro economic reform
- ecologically sustainable development
- an improved urban environment.

A As for above, an interactive process really formed the brief.

Generic outcomes for the BCP were as follows, Q3-Q11. In your Area Strategy were you able to implement some or all of the following objectives?

Q3 Improve labour market outcomes by supporting employment initiatives, and by addressing long journeys to work and poor public transport?

A Yes definitely. This occurred at the macro level with shorter journeys to work, but also with retraining long term unemployed youth. There was an arrangement with TAFE with portable classrooms on the site. The courses were designed around specific site activities eg, landscape, horticulture and others. New public transport and changes to existing public transport for efficiency gains were also part of the project.

Q4 Respond to ESD by: rehabilitating degraded sites; enhancing and protecting heritage, urban and natural environments; reducing traffic congestion; designing energy efficient housing and improving water management and micro climates?

A Yes most definitely to all of the above matters. We also ran national competitions on medium density housing. There was a great deal of decontamination of the gasworks site. We cleaned up the river bed and reseeded it with underwater flora. We constructed new parklands, new streetscapes and enhanced built environments. Also we recycled some buildings, protected heritage structures - and more.

Q5 Address social justice issues by improved access to: jobs, health, services, education, public transport, affordable housing and recreation, particularly for the low income and disadvantaged and Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders?

A Yes, but a qualified response as the State was not inclined towards the placing of low cost housing on high value land. However, in the hinterland of the project there was an award for related public housing, but not necessarily under the BCP initiative.

Q6 Address institutional reform by improved efficiency of expenditure on health & services; better urban outcomes from land released by the institutional reform process and redevelopment of outmoded institutional service delivery?
Yes, there was focused activity that brought about the integration of various aspects of urban development under one process. Not everyone would agree to the focused approach. There were some 29 regulatory jurisdictions - an almost impossible situation. The four planning regimes were brought down to two. Some rationalisation was achieved and there were forums for co-ordination.

Support the provision of and investment in infrastructure particularly efficient transport systems within cities? Make more efficient use of existing, new and upgraded infrastructure and services to support urban renewal?

There were huge advances in infrastructure, and net increases in public open space. There were demonstrable increases in infrastructure across the board, and some social structure benefits, particularly upgrading and amplification of obsolete utilities in the area and regional facilities.

Recognise the primary importance of the public domain with attention to aesthetics, systems and spatial relationships?

The recognition of the public domain was a core concept and definitely part of the development. The ‘extroverted’ streets role reinforced the public domain, as did streetscape and landscape.

Respond to housing needs in terms of increasing: diversity and hence choice; affordability, innovation, consolidation (more compact forms) particularly for low income and disadvantaged groups, thus addressing issues of social justice?

Yes to diversity and choice. Innovation definitely and consolidation yes also. Affordability - it depends. As regards accessibility, special packages are needed to advance this issue for lower income groups. Proposals were formulated.

Achieve better integration of physical and social planning, economic development, infrastructure provisions and environmental management?

Yes the outcomes bear witness to that.

Achieve better urban management through improved integration of urban planning and development?

Yes, since planning and development proceeded together. The area will eventually revert to normal municipal arrangements.

Were there any formal external evaluations carried out by the BCP of your urban design in terms of the Area Strategy objectives? Did you institute your own progressive internal evaluation processes?

Yes to both, internal and external evaluations. They were assessed positively.

What was the form of your urban design outcome: written recommendations, codes, controls, design guidelines or some other form?
A Yes, all of the above.

Q14 In your opinion did the BCP meet the usual tests of merit with the application of cost-benefit analyses?
A Yes we used quantified analyses and the usual cost benefit analyses and came out of 1.

Q15 Better Cities II 1995-1996 refers to urban design specifically, eg ‘better urban design’, and ‘improved urban design and livable cities’. Whilst BCP II came late, did its urban design focus reach you or was it too little too late?
A No it was not too late, but by then these objectives were already internalised. Quality in the public realm was part of the project’s own objectives.

Q16 What urban design management process did you adopt in the evolution of the design? Did you share your progressive urban design development with a community or reference group?
A Yes we had community processes and ‘expert’ processes. The community processes were the wider input and the ‘expert’ processes were done in private within the structure of the work and involved QA and internal review processes.

Approach was more complex than can be summarised here, but generally covering:

• strategic planning and setting management frameworks
• commercial packaging
• policy and guideline formulation
• statutory planning.

Q17 Did the urban design aspects of your particular Area Strategy warrant its advancement as a demonstration project with innovative processes? Was it a catalyst for other projects? Could you identify such other projects?
A Uncertain as to demonstration as a whole. Some processes were clearly innovative and in that sense demonstrations, such as in:

• the clean up processes establishing new bench marks;
• innovation being visible in some of the engineering projects;
• public art and urban design, and
• catalytic effect of central area reinvestment and positive spillover were huge.

Q18 Urban consolidation was Government policy during the BCP. Do you support urban consolidation, or do you question its contribution to increased efficiency and liveability of cities and to address equity and social justice issues?
A Mixed views. The project implemented and contributed to this, using land more efficiently and saving land at the fringe. The project is a piece of the urban fabric and not a microcosm of the city as a whole, providing a diversity but also achieving consolidation. (Characteristics of a city within walking distance - an urban village)
Q19 To the extent that your Area Strategy urban design work involved housing, were the AMCORD and Green Streets Program useful to you?

A AMCORD and Green Streets were running in parallel with the project. The documents are useful but mainly concerned with improving suburbs, and East Perth was an urban rather than a suburban project. The densities are higher than those of Green Streets although there is some suburban type housing. AMCORD - an essentially suburban based code - was under way at the time, but there were also local standards and so there was some reluctance to use it. East Perth developed its own standards and in some ways went further than both AMCORD and Green Streets.

Q20 There were many reports by Federal Government during the BCP, including: A National Housing Strategy, ESD, Social Justice, and the PM’s Task Force on Urban Design. Did any of these reports assist your design outcomes?

A Some of these reports were mutually modifying, in that in some matters they quoted back to us our contributions to them. The National Housing Strategy, whilst erudite, was too remote from the project level to contribute much.

Q21 What influences did the following BCP processes have on your urban design development and outcomes: inputs, outputs & outcomes; program management; monitoring & accountability and program evaluation & audit?

A These are good management concepts of value, but the reporting and performance aspects of the project were guided by regimes more endemic to the project.

Q22 If your Area Strategy was predominantly an infrastructure or corridor project did it lay a foundation for future and successful urban design outcomes?

A Not applicable. East Perth was a multifaceted project with elements of a corridor and some of infrastructure but was not essentially either.

Q23 If the enduring strands of urban design are: buildings and their grouping, public spaces, circulation, safety, housing, conservation, landscape, public art, environmental response and health, were you able to respond to these strands?

A Yes these are the drivers. We considered all these elements.

Q24 Good urban design exhibits: design excellence; widely distributed benefits - environmental benefits; a response to local features; a contemporary relevance; provision for change and forges connections with the past. Do you agree?

(PM’s Urban Design Task Force)

A Yes to all, though ‘widely distributed benefits’ is not a clear concept and hard to achieve.

Q25 Did your urban design assist in strengthening central areas; in creating safe environments and in fostering public art? As the BCP is essentially silent on these issues. Did it have: flexibility, variety, robustness and legibility?

A Yes to all.
Q26 Contemporary urban design embraces post modernism, post colonialism, feminism, deconstructivism, neo-rationalism and the needs of indigenous people. Were you able to give urban design expression to these concerns?

A We were not captive to any ‘ism’, but looking at them individually:

post modernism - Yes latitude was given, with coarse parameters and not ‘theming’.

post colonialism and indigenous people - Yes there were many dealings with Aborigines to address historical and current issues.

feminism - This was a more implicit part of the development - some of the community values and issues with which feminism is concerned were present.

deconstructivism - I doubt it, more of a ‘reconstructivism’

neo-rationalism - No, we were more concerned with fitness of purpose and acknowledging the roots of the area.

Q27 The urban design approach can be: empirical (trusting the human senses); rational (i.e., logical steps from first principles), or pragmatic (employing things which are known to work). Which is your preferred approach?

A All of them - science, art and pragmatism; intertwined and / or as appropriate in different circumstances.

Q28 There are many contemporary theorists/practitioners in urban design, such as: Rossi, the Krieger, Moore, Isoka, Tschumi, Alexander, Duany and Plater-Zyberck, and others. Has your work been influenced by these or others?

A I know a number of them, but there was no one hand on East Perth. There was an array of designers, of various persuasions. Yes, they could have been influenced as individuals, but the overall result did not follow a particular work or remote person.

Q29 Urban design was not one of the five BCP objectives, but in some ways urban design issues are found within these objectives. Do you agree that urban design deserved its own objective, or was it in fact the one objective?

A The answer is probably half way between both positions. The five objectives are not of the same weight from the perspectives of urban design.

Q30 What are your personal reflections on urban design in Australia and the BCP? What would you suggest for any further Federal Government urban initiatives? Was urban design improved in Australia as a result of the BCP?

A The BCP was a worthy program and did advance urban design in the broad sense, as discussed. There is a federal role but also layers of responsibility for good urban design through to practitioners and clients. The agenda setting is a higher order to the project level.
Lynch’s Bridge and Kensington Banks
Lynch’s Bridge and Kensington Banks  (Interview responses from Jon Shields  12 June 1998 and 10 May 1999)

Q1  What briefing documents, if any, were provided to you on general or specific urban design objectives for your Area Strategy?

A  The brief was formulated by the group working on the project.

Q2  Did the five BCP objectives form part of the brief? The objectives being:

- economic growth and micro economic reform
- ecologically sustainable development
- an improved urban environment
- improved social justice
- institutional reform

A  Yes Peter McEwan the Victorian BCP Coordinator was well acquainted with the objectives. This applied to the four Victorian Area Strategies, namely:

- South West Corridor (Geelong)
- Inner Melbourne and Rivers (Lynch’s Bridge)
- Plenty Road
- South East Corridor

Generic outcomes for the BCP were as follows, Q3-Q11. In your Area Strategy were you able to implement some or all of the following objectives?

Q3  Improve labour market outcomes by supporting employment initiatives, and by addressing long journeys to work and poor public transport?

A  Improved labour markets were not a preoccupation, as the jobs provided by this Area Strategy were only those of the construction process. The site enjoys good public transport provisions.

Q4  Respond to ESD by: rehabilitating degraded sites; enhancing and protecting heritage, urban and natural environments; reducing traffic congestion; designing energy efficient housing and improving water management and micro climates?

A  Yes, to all of the above with water management focused on site detention using basins and capacity in marsh drain rather than grey water management.

Q5  Address social justice issues by improved access to: jobs, health, services, education, public transport, affordable housing and recreation, particularly for the low income and disadvantaged and Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders?

A  In regard to housing 20% of Kensington Banks stock priced at or below the median price range. At Lynch’s Bridge 30% of housing was either public or public/elderly. Any shortfall in social terms was that Kensington Banks only secured 35 public or assisted units.

Q6  Address institutional reform by improved efficiency of expenditure on health & services; better urban outcomes from land released by the institutional reform process and redevelopment of outmoded institutional service delivery?
Not applicable. The only institutional reform, if it can be regarded as such, was the Army’s rationalisation.

Support the provision of and investment in infrastructure particularly efficient transport systems within cities? Make more efficient use of existing, new and upgraded infrastructure and services to support urban renewal?

The flood mitigation was a major infrastructure initiative that allowed the project to proceed.

Recognise the primary importance of the public domain with attention to aesthetics, systems and spatial relationships?

The objective was to achieve high quality open space. Approximately 25% of the area is given over to open space, particularly linear parks. There is an off centre park known as ‘Central Park’. (At the Maribyrnong River boundary the Riverside Park is currently being formed.)

Respond to housing needs in terms of increasing: diversity and hence choice; affordability, innovation, consolidation (more compact forms) particularly for low income and disadvantaged groups, thus addressing issues of social justice?

There is a wide choice of housing- size and price - ranging from one bedroom studios to four to five bedroom houses.

Achieve better integration of physical and social planning, economic development, infrastructure provisions and environmental management?

Yes, Council surveys were conducted on community needs as well as market surveys on preferences.

Achieve better urban management through improved integration of urban planning and development?

Yes, since the management process embraced both planning and development.

Yes, to both.

What was the form of your urban design outcome: written recommendations, codes, controls, design guidelines or some other form?

Guidelines for each block.

In your opinion did the BCP meet the usual tests of merit with the application of cost-benefit analyses?
A Yes, profits could have been higher, some costs got away. The development aimed at an internal rate of return of 30%, and it is running at about 25%. BCP did not look at our rate of return. I don’t know what measure they used to determine their level of cost benefit. We, the Government did not get 25% - 30% although the Vic Govt. could claim a much higher IRR since BCP paid for basic flood works.

Q15 Better Cities II 1995-1996 refers to urban design specifically, eg 'better urban design', and 'improved urban design and livable cities'. Whilst BCP II came late, did its urban design focus reach you or was it too little too late?

A No impact, 'better urban design' could have been an intentional ploy to relate to a change of government, and away from the social goals of the previous government. Urban design is more apolitical than the social concerns.

Q16 What urban design management process did you adopt in the evolution of the design? Did you share your progressive urban design development with a community or reference group?

A Yes, a community committee meets monthly, and has been in existence for 12-13 years.

Q17 Did the urban design aspects of your particular Area Strategy warrant its advancement as a demonstration project with innovative processes? Was it a catalyst for other projects? Could you identify such other projects?

A The whole site is a demonstration project, and in a general sense it would have been a catalyst for other initiatives.

Q18 Urban consolidation was Government policy during the BCP. Do you support urban consolidation, or do you question its contribution to increased efficiency and liveability of cities and to address equity and social justice issues?

A Yes, there was a return to older inner city densities, dwelling numbers but not population.

Q19 To the extent that your Area Strategy urban design work involved housing, were the AMCORD and Green Streets Program useful to you?

A This links to question Q17, the relationship with the above was circular; we influenced the above and were in turn influenced by them.

Q20 There were many reports by Federal Government during the BCP, including: A National Housing Strategy, ESD, Social Justice, and the PM's Task Force on Urban Design. Did any of these reports assist your design outcomes?

A No

Q21 What influences did the following BCP processes have on your urban design development and outcomes: inputs, outputs & outcomes; program management; monitoring & accountability and program evaluation & audit?

A None
Q22 If your Area Strategy was predominantly an **infrastructure** or **corridor** project did it lay a foundation for future and successful urban design outcomes?

A Lynch’s Bridge and Kensington Banks were neither a corridor nor an infrastructure project.

Q23 If the **enduring strands** of urban design are: buildings and their grouping, public spaces, circulation, safety, housing, conservation, landscape, public art, environmental response and health, were you able to respond to these strands?

A Yes, to all.

Q24 **Good urban design** exhibits: design excellence; widely distributed benefits - environmental benefits; a response to local features; a contemporary relevance; provision for change and forges connections with the past. Do you agree?

_A_ Yes. We won a commendation in the Australia Award for Urban Design

Q25 Did your urban design assist in **strengthening central areas**; in creating **safe environments** and in **fostering public art**? As the BCP is essentially silent on these issues. Did it have: flexibility, variety, robustness and legibility?

A Safer environments - yes. Public art - yes but limited.

Q26 **Contemporary urban design** embraces post modernism, post colonialism, feminism, deconstructivism, neo-rationalism and the needs of indigenous people. Were you able give urban design expression to these concerns?

A There is the Women’s Peace Park.

Q27 The **urban design** approach can be: empirical (trusting the human senses); rational (ie, logical steps from first principles), or pragmatic (employing things which are known to work). Which is your preferred approach?

A Urban design is a combination of all three, but at a personal level the approach would be towards the empirical.

Q28 There are many **contemporary theorists/practitioners** in urban design, such as: Rossi, the Kriers, Moore, Isoka, Tschumi, Alexander, Duany and Plater-Zyberck, and others. Has your work been influenced by these or others?

A I am familiar with the new urbanism. It has an evangelical sentiment reminiscent of Garden City utopianism. It is a form of ‘packaging’ like Amway.

Q29 **Urban design** was not one of the five BCP objectives, but in some ways urban design issues are found within these objectives. Do you agree that urban design deserved its own objective, or was it in fact the one objective?
People interested in cities at the Federal level are impotent, other than perhaps the NCA. Urban design is seen as a tack on. It is apolitical. (The likes of Howe and Uren and like minded public servants then are the exception)

What are your personal reflections on urban design in Australia and the BCP? What would you suggest for any further Federal Government urban initiatives? Was urban design improved in Australia as a result of the BCP?

To the extent that many good case studies emerged, but in the longer term the messages taken away by visiting sites like Kensington Banks are to do with:

(i) revisiting subdivision and sale of land legislation to achieve flexibility, and
(ii) change building codes to accommodate new practice, ie, multi-unit timber framed construction.
Honeysuckle

Honeysuckle (Interview response from Brian Murphy, 28 January 2000)

Q1 What **briefing documents**, if any, were provided to you on general or specific urban design objectives for your Area Strategy?

A The Better Cities Honeysuckle and Environs Area strategy (copy attached).

Q2 Did the **five BCP objectives** form part of the brief? The objectives being:

- economic growth and micro economic reform
- improved social justice
- ecologically sustainable development
- institutional reform
- an improved urban environment.

A Yes. The five overarching program wide objectives underpinned the specific objectives for Honeysuckle and environs Area strategy (see attached)

**Generic outcomes** for the BCP were as follows, Q3-Q11. In your Area Strategy were you able to implement some or all of the following objectives?

Q3 Improve **labour market** outcomes by supporting employment initiatives, and by addressing long journeys to work and poor public transport?

A The first three years of the Area Strategy generated direct investment and flow-on impact on the regional economy totalling $164m and 1,530 direct and indirect (one year) jobs. Predictions that the following five years would produce an impact four times greater have been overly optimistic, partly due I believe to the Olympics, and the consequent focus of capital on Sydney infrastructure and facilities. As discussed with you previously, I believe that the BCP Program did help stimulate a surge in off-site (ie, excluding Honeysuckle) inner city housing developments.

Recent census data indicates that the decline in the inner city population has been arrested, with an increase in inner city population and dwelling numbers from the previous census period. The development of the Honeysuckle site will over time provide housing opportunities for approximately 4,000 people with consequent implications for improvements in journey to work and public transport outcomes. The BC Program brought forward the time frame for the development of the Honeysuckle site with direct funding made available for various physical infrastructure works.

The BC Program also directly funded the construction of a transport interchange at Newcastle.

Q4 Respond to **ESD** by: rehabilitating degraded sites; enhancing and protecting heritage, urban and natural environments; reducing traffic congestion; designing energy efficient housing and improving water management and micro climates?

A Yes. As previously discussed the Honeysuckle site was made up of degraded and redundant railway and port land which has been transformed into a new harbour side residential, commercial and leisure development site. A number of significant heritage buildings were restored, including the Civic Railway Workshops, Lee Wharf Buildings and Wickham School. All BC housing projects had to conform with the
Better Cities Housing Design Manual. The Manual won a RAPI award for planning excellence, and to my knowledge at the time, was the first building code type document in Australia to include ESD design performance criteria as mainstream urban housing design considerations.

The BC Program also initiated and funded the development and implementation of a very innovated water-recycling project on part of the old Hamilton bus depot site. As advised you should liaise with Professor John Argue of the University of SA to get more detailed information on this project.

Q5 Address social justice issues by improved access to: jobs, health, services, education, public transport, affordable housing and recreation, particularly for the low income and disadvantaged and Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders?

A Yes. The program directly funded the development of an inner Newcastle Housing Strategy which allocated significant funds to the Better Cities Affordable Rental (ARHP) and Community and Special Needs Housing Programs. See better Cities Housing Strategy brochure previously provided to you.

Also, by the Better Cities Program funding the development of housing, park and roadway improvements at the edges of the core Honeysuckle site, notably in Carrington and Wickham, a significant subsidy and revitalisation stimulus was provided to the less advantaged areas of inner Newcastle. An alternative strategy would have been to concentrate funding exclusively on the central Civic area. The Program also funded a community art and landscape strategy in the inner city suburbs of Carrington, Islington and Wickham. This community based strategy was significantly enhanced by contributions from local businesses and other Government agencies. See Community, Art & Urban Revitalisation brochure previously provided.

The Program also part funded with the Newcastle City Council and Honeysuckle Development Corporation, the preparation of a Honeysuckle and Environs Social Impact Assessment and Infrastructure Strategy. However, specific Better Cities milestone funding was not provided for social service infrastructure, and the provisions of many of the facilities identified by the Strategy is tied to the future development of the Honeysuckle site.

Q6 Address institutional reform by improved: efficiency of expenditure on health & services; better urban outcomes from land released by the institutional reform process and redevelopment of outmoded institutional service delivery?

A No.

Q7 Support the provision of and investment in infrastructure particularly efficient transport systems within cities? Make more efficient use of existing, new and upgraded infrastructure and services to support urban renewal?

A Yes. See 3 above.

Q8 Recognise the primary importance of the public domain with attention to aesthetics, systems and spatial relationships?
A Yes. See the Civic Urban Design Plan, Design Guidelines for the Carrington and Linwood Residential Precincts. (available from HDC) and the Better Cities initiated and funded Wickam Urban Village Strategy, West End Strategic Development Plan, Housing Design Manual and the Mixed Use Compatibility Strategy. Subsequent to the BC Program a Central Honeswick REP has been prepared and a DCP for the whole City West area which essentially promotes the strengthening of connections between the existing Newcastle CBD and Honeswick.

Q9 Respond to housing needs in terms of increasing: diversity and hence choice; affordability, innovation, consolidation (more compact forms) particularly for low income and disadvantaged groups, thus addressing issues of social justice?

A Yes. See the Better Cities Inner Newcastle Residential Intensification Strategy and the summary Housing Strategy previously provided.

Q10 Achieve better integration of physical and social planning, economic development, infrastructure provisions and environmental management?

A Yes.

Q11 Achieve better urban management through improved integration of urban planning and development?

(End of generic questions)

A Yes

Q12 Were there any formal external evaluations carried out by the BCP of your urban design in terms of the Area Strategy objectives? Did you institute your own progressive internal evaluation processes?

A A) Yes. All Better Cities housing project DAs were assessed by Newcastle City Planners against performance standards contained in the Better Cities Housing Design Manual. Independently facilitated pre-DA community consultations were also held for all better Cities ARHP projects.

B) Yes. A Built Environment Advisory Team (BEAT) convened by DUAP and with representatives from Council, Newmacq Community Housing Company, Dept. of Housing, University of Newcastle School of Architecture and Honeswick Development Corporation was established. This group prepared briefs for housing projects and considered the strategic and demonstration aspects of proposed projects and reviewed design concepts prior to full DA documentation being prepared.

Q13 What was the form of your urban design outcome: written recommendations, codes, controls, design guidelines or some other form?

A The Better Cities Program initiated and funded a number of urban design strategy documents that have and will continue to inform the redevelopment/revitalisation of inner Newcastle (see question 8).
Q14 In your opinion did the BCP meet the usual **tests of merit** with the application of cost-benefit analyses?

A The Hunter Valley Research Foundation produced an assessment of the economic impact of the Honeysuckle and Environs Area Strategy upon the Hunter Region for the first three years 1992/93 to 1994/95. The Study assessed both output and employment impacts. The Foundation also estimated the likely economic impact for the five years 1995/96 to 1999/00 that unfortunately will not be achieved. The potential positive and negative social impacts of the implementation of the Honeysuckle and Environs Area Strategy were also assessed as part of the development of the Better Cities Social Impact Assessment and Social Infrastructure Strategy.

Q15 **Better Cities II** 1995-1996 refers to urban design specifically, eg ‘better urban design’, and ‘improved urban design and livable cities’. Whilst BCP II came late, did its urban design focus reach you or was it too little too late?

A Whilst ‘urban design’ was not specifically stated as an objective of the Honeysuckle and Environs Area Strategy, it was implied and much of the planning effort was about achieving better urban design outcomes and more livable cities through both strategic and project specific actions. Also, see attached copy of the Honeysuckle and Environs Area Strategy.

Q16 What urban design **management process** did you adopt in the evolution of the design? Did you share your progressive urban design development with a community or reference group?

A See 12B. The BEAT included community representatives. It was set up by the Housing Implementation Committee (HIC) and reported to the overarching Honeysuckle and Environs area Committee. Regular briefings were provided to local, state, and federal politicians on a range of Better Cities Program matters, including urban design initiatives. The Newmacq Community Housing Company which is responsible for the day to day management of the ARHP, was a member of the BEAT and the HIC. The Newmacq Board has wide community representation and brought to the BEAT a community perspective on a range of urban housing design issues. The Honeysuckle Development Corporation also commissioned the development of a number of urban design guideline documents, including the Honeysuckle Concept Masterplan, Civic Urban Design Plan and more recently, The Linwood Housing Design Guidelines and Honeysuckle Public Domain Strategy. The community was extensively consulted in the preparation of these documents.

Q17 Did the urban design aspects of your particular Area Strategy warrant its advancement as a **demonstration project** with innovative processes? Was it a **catalyst** for other projects? Could you identify such other projects?

A The full demonstration impact of the Better Cities Program will not be fully realised until the development of the Honeysuckle really kicks in. However, the Program has set the strategic planning framework for the revitalisation of inner Newcastle. It has provided key demonstration housing projects in well located, but somewhat run down inner city suburbs of Carrington and Wickham. The Program was also an important catalyst to the surge in private sector apartment development, particularly in the East.
End of Newcastle.

Of note, the ARHP provides a key demonstration component of the BC Program in Newcastle. The primary objective which underpinned the development of this Program was to address the issue of inner city gentrification, and the consequent forcing out of low to middle income people from once traditional working class suburbs. The Program has been set up to generate an annual surplus that will be channelled into new inner city housing projects. It is also hoped that the Program acts to provide a stepping stone to home ownership, and the possibility of selling houses to tenants is being explored.

However, the ARHP was not just about housing affordability and providing a positive social housing outcome. There was a holistic strategic approach in the delivery of this program. Housing was targeted at low to middle income people in the private rental market experiencing housing stress. Projects were located to act as catalysts for future private sector developments in inner city areas where there is considerable potential for urban renewal (eg, Wickham / Maryville). Housing was well designed responding to likely future client needs. A portion of units incorporated adaptable housing elements. ESD design principles helped drive the design process and many passive, and where funding permitted, active ESD design principles were included in housing projects.

Also, a very innovative stormwater management and water recycling system was included as a key ESD demonstration component of the ARHP project at Hamilton (see attached brochure).

Q 18 Urban consolidation was Government policy during the BCP. Do you support urban consolidation, or do you question its contribution to increased efficiency and liveability of cities and to address equity and social justice issues?

A Yes.

Q 19 To the extent that your Area Strategy urban design work involved housing, were the AMCORD and Green Streets Program useful to you?

A Yes. These documents provided a resource together with a number of others for the preparation of the Better Cities Newcastle Housing Design Manual.

Q 20 There were many reports by Federal Government during the BCP, including: A National Housing Strategy, ESD, Social Justice, and the PM’s Task Force on Urban Design. Did any of these reports assist your design outcomes?

A Yes, to the extent that they provided more definition to the overarching BC Program objectives. It would be fair to say these documents influenced, supported and/or helped to guide and enhance the implementation of the Honeysuckle and Environ Area Strategy. Whilst the initial focus of the Honeysuckle Strategy was that of infrastructure provision on Honeysuckle, it evolved overtime to become much more taking into consideration social equity, affordable housing, cultural and community/social issues.

Q 21 What influences did the following BCP processes have on your urban design development and outcomes: inputs, outputs & outcomes; program management; monitoring & accountability and program evaluation & audit?
Appendices

A  See previous answers.

Q22 If your Area Strategy was predominantly an infrastructure or corridor project did it lay a foundation for future and successful urban design outcomes?

A  Yes, see 3, 4, 5 and 17

Q23 If the enduring strands of urban design are: buildings and their grouping, public spaces, circulation, safety, housing, conservation, landscape, public art, environmental response and health, were you able to respond to these strands?

A  Yes, see previous answers.

Q24 Good urban design exhibits: design excellence; widely distributed benefits - environmental benefits; a response to local features; a contemporary relevance; provision for change and forges connections with the past. Do you agree?

(PM's Urban Design Task Force)

A  Yes, but also see answer 29.

Q25 Did your urban design assist in strengthening central areas; in creating safe environments and in fostering public art? As the BCP is essentially silent on these issues. Did it have: flexibility, variety, robustness and legibility?

A  Yes, see previous answers.

Q26 Contemporary urban design embraces postmodernism, postcolonialism, feminism, deconstructivism, neo-rationalism and the needs of indigenous people. Were you able give urban design expression to these concerns?

A  Apart from issues relating to equity which resulted in the consideration of the needs of Aboriginal people and women, and the need to have careful regard to the existing architectural character of a locality and the contextual relationship of new contemporary buildings with existing, I cannot say that there was a conscious effort to address [these concerns].

Q27 The urban design approach can be: empirical (trusting the human senses); rational (ie, logical steps from first principles), or pragmatic (employing things which are known to work). Which is your preferred approach?

A  I don’t have a preferred approach. I think the best urban design probably comes from a measure of all of these depending on the circumstances and the players involved one may dominate.

Q28 There are many contemporary theorists/practitioners in urban design, such as: Rossi, the Kriers, Moore, Isoka, Tschumi, Alexander, Duany and Plater-Zyberck, and others. Has your work been influenced by these or others?

A  Yes.
Q29 Urban design was not one of the five BCP objectives, but in some ways urban design issues are found within these objectives. Do you agree that urban design deserved its own objective, or was it in fact the one objective?

A No, I agree with the proposition that urban design in the fullest sense should take into account the complex of environmental, economic, social and cultural issues and therefore should not be regarded as an objective in isolation. Too often I think urban design is perceived as a solely physical discipline concerned essentially with the relationships between buildings, spaces and movement corridors. Perhaps what I am trying to say is that a symbiotic relationship exists between urban and social planning and urban design and that making artificial divisions between them is counter productive to achieving better more livable environments and efficient, equitable cities.

Q30 What are your personal reflections on urban design in Australia and the BCP? What would you suggest for any further Federal Government urban initiatives? Was urban design improved in Australia as a result of the BCP?

A The Better Cities Program in my view was initially conceived as an infrastructure program, born during the recession we had to have but evolved to be much more. For the first time since the Whitlam era and the demise of DURD, attention and debate was focused on the structure and design of our cities. The Program, perhaps by default, recognised that the achievement of positive urban design outcomes was linked not only to policy development, but also implementation plans and catalyst funding, and the forging of strong partnerships between the three levels of government and individual agencies.

The improvement of the structure and efficiency of our cities has important implications for micro economic reform and cannot be solved by governments and agencies acting in isolation. I believe there are strong arguments for the Federal Government to participate and part fund an ongoing urban renewal / improvement program.

Finally, I feel that the Better Cities Program whilst having some positive impacts and providing some laudable demonstration projects, only scratched the surface in relation to improving urban design outcomes in Australia. The process is ongoing and would be greatly assisted by a co-ordinated national strategy and implementation plan involving state and local government agencies, and also private sector organisations. Catalyst funding could then be strategically targeted to projects that aid the achievement of more compact / livable, efficient, equitable and environmentally responsible cities.
Ultimo-Pyrmont

Ultimo-Pyrmont (Interview response from Alan Davidson 14 February 2001)

Q1 What briefing documents, if any, were provided to you on general or specific urban design objectives for your Area Strategy?

A a) Ultimo-Pyrmont Area strategy as part of Better Cities Agreement between NSW and Commonwealth Governments.

b) planning documents were in preparation and finalised as part of the Program and all included urban design principles and controls, etc., eg, Ultimo-Pyrmont Precinct Study, draft REP (then adopted REP), Ultimo-Pyrmont Urban Development Plan, Public Domain Strategy & Technical Manual, numerous Master Plans for various precinct sites.

Q2 Did the five BCP objectives form part of the brief? The objectives being:

- economic growth and micro economic reform
- ecologically sustainable development
- an improved urban environment.

A Yes, to all but ‘institutional reform’.

Improved urban environment, improved social justice and ecologically sustainable development were all seen to have urban design dimensions and vice versa.

Generic outcomes for the BCP were as follows, Q3-Q11. In your Area Strategy were you able to implement some or all of the following objectives?

Q3 Improve labour market outcomes by supporting employment initiatives, and by addressing long journeys to work and poor public transport?

A Yes: new employment opportunities in Ultimo-Pyrmont and new residential were seen as addressing journey to work issues, assisting economic restructuring from previous infrastructure / industrial / past employment to new employment such as tourism, media, communications. Money for light rail and bike initiatives also assisted.

Q4 Respond to ESD by: rehabilitating degraded sites; enhancing and protecting heritage, urban and natural environments; reducing traffic congestion; designing energy efficient housing and improving water management and micro climates?

A Yes. Ultimo-Pyrmont did all these in various ways from broad strategic planning to detailed site implementation in capital works and development control.

Q5 Address social justice issues by improved access to: jobs, health, services, education, public transport, affordable housing and recreation, particularly for the low income and disadvantaged and Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders?

A Mixed use meant in Ultimo-Pyrmont to help all these, particularly the Affordable Housing Program.
Q6 Address institutional reform by improved: efficiency of expenditure on health & services; better urban outcomes from land released by the institutional reform process and redevelopment of outmoded institutional service delivery?

A Not focus of objectives in Ultimo-Pyrmont Strategy.

Q7 Support the provision of and investment in infrastructure particularly efficient transport systems within cities? Make more efficient use of existing, new and upgraded infrastructure and services to support urban renewal?

A Much of Better Cities funding was for infrastructure: roads, parks, bicycle routes, social facilities, light rail. To help make use of under-utilised/surplus land. All ahead of demand: to encourage redevelopment if a form which we wanted, eg, low private vehicle usage, work/live/recreate in one precinct.

Better Cities money as seed funding for ongoing program of revitalisation - reached threshold and then ongoing.

Q8 Recognise the primary importance of the public domain with attention to aesthetics, systems and spatial relationships?

A Yes. A major emphasis of strategic planning, regulatory instruments and implementation; both development control and capital works, all guided by a Public Domain Strategy & Technical Manual; Street Tree Master Plan, etc.

Q9 Respond to housing needs in terms of increasing: diversity and hence choice; affordability, innovation, consolidation (more compact forms) particularly for low income and disadvantaged groups, thus addressing issues of social justice?

A Yes. A major emphasis of Ultimo-Pyrmont strategic planning, statutory instruments and implementation. City West Affordable Housing Program: a major initiative. Also provisions re housing mix in terms of size, typology to suit socio-eco-demographic mix. Tried to emphasise flexibility.

Q10 Achieve better integration of physical and social planning, economic development, infrastructure provisions and environmental management?

A Yes, a major theme with City West Development Corporation, Dept. Urban Affairs & Planning, Council, Dept. Transport, etc, working together on strategic planning and implementation - to deliver outcomes which related to objective of regional plan and Better Cities Program integrated package of policy and budgets, capital works and actions, by agencies and partnerships with private sector to also deliver.

Q11 Achieve better urban management through improved integration of urban planning and development?

(End of generic questions)

A Yes. As above. Policy and planning regulations, agencies actions and private sector partnerships. Significantly aided by partnership of City West Development Corporation, DUAP and Better Cities funds and Agreement.
Q12 Were there any formal external evaluations carried out by the BCP of your urban design in terms of the Area Strategy objectives? Did you institute your own progressive internal evaluation processes?

A No formal external evaluations. Used external consultants to prepare many of the Master Plans. Had independent and advisory committee to review and comment on preparation of new Master Plan, Urban Development Plan, REP revisions and Development Applications. Also public consultation forums / workshops during preparation of documents often involved external designers. Review of REP and UDP on several occasions enabled refinement of policies and controls.

Q13 What was the form of your urban design outcome: written recommendations, codes, controls, design guidelines or some other form?

A Broad principles in REP; more specific principles and controls and guidelines in Urban Development Plan and master Plans and Public Domain Manual. Differing degrees of specificity depending on issues and site.

Q14 In your opinion did the BCP meet the usual tests of merit with the application of cost-benefit analyses?

A There was little cost-benefit analysis of the better Cities Program itself (if any). Individual projects had some cost-benefit analysis, eg, light rail.

Q15 Better Cities II 1995-1996 refers to urban design specifically, eg, ‘better urban design’, and ‘improved urban design and livable cities’. Whilst BCP II came late, did its urban design focus reach you or was it too little too late?

A BCP II had no impact on Ultimo-Pyrmont or any other BCP I Area Strategies. NSW took the attitude that BCP II was to do new precincts to affect strategic change in those locations. The BCP II scoping report that was submitted was mainly strategic but urban design would have been a key element in the Area Strategies which were proposed.

Q16 What urban design management process did you adopt in the evolution of the design? Did you share your progressive urban design development with a community or reference group?

A As noted above. Urban design principles and controls in REP, UDP and Master Plans. All had community consultation and review by independent Advisory Committee. REP and UDP and Public Domain strategy produced by public authorities (DUAP and City West DC and Council). Master Plans for sites prepared by developer or owner of sites in consultation with DUAP, an adopted by Minister (involves exhibition of draft for public comment).

Q17 Did the urban design aspects of your particular Area Strategy warrant its advancement as a demonstration project with innovative processes? Was it a catalyst for other projects? Could you identify such other projects?
A Yes. Demonstration project on mechanisms such as Master Plan plus Public Domain Manual and urban design controls for high density housing (few existed in Australia till Ultimo-Pyrmont happened) also demonstration of delivery on public domain, light rail, high density houses, affordable houses. Catalyst for use of mechanism and approach in various other places.

Catalyst / Demonstration - Examples.
Ultimo/Pyrmont mechanisms, such as Master Plan and Public Domain Manuals now used extensively in NSW by:

• Council and state agencies, eg, South Sydney, Master Plan and Public Domain;
• Master Plans - State Environmental Planning Policy 56 - Sydney Harbour;
• Master Plans - State Environmental Planning Policy 59 - Central Western Sydney Employment Zone;
• Walsh Bay Precinct;
• City of Sydney uses Master Plan concept and manual;
• use of Development Corporation for area focus has continued, eg, South Sydney D.C.; Festival D.C. (Gosford);
• Affordable Housing Program led to major state government initiative, funding program, a Unit in DUAP to advance ideas and generate new projects. Funding approach incorporated into Green Square redevelopment initiative in South Sydney Council;
• high density medium rise housing precincts now emerging in various parts of Sydney. Planning controls often use Ultimo/Pyrmont policies;
• State government’s policy document on high density housing ‘Better Urban Living’ by DUAP and Government architect utilises many controls / examples from Ultimo/Pyrmont;
• DUAP initiatives - eg, Rhodes Peninsula redevelopment, establishment of Urban Design Advisory Service and Living Controls Program and Urban Improvement Program ALL OWE their approach to Ultimo/Pyrmont and Better Cities approaches and lessons.

Q18 Urban consolidation was Government policy during the BCP. Do you support urban consolidation, or do you question its contribution to increased efficiency and liveability of cities and to address equity and social justice issues?

A Yes, support. Don’t question it, but support it as key in delivering efficiency and variety of precincts / housing / lifestyles, etc, in metropolitan area. Is not the only policy but a key one in providing a full range of housing, transport, social infrastructure, recreational policies and outcomes for a diverse city.

Q19 To the extent that your Area Strategy urban design work involved housing, were the AMCORD and Green Streets Program useful to you?
A Not very useful as Ultimo/Pyrmont is higher density than these two Programs had focused on. Ultimo/Pyrmont needed to produce policies and controls from scratch as little existed in Australia for houses predominantly at 6 - 10 stories. There were lessons from AMCORD / Green street which informed our work.

Q20 There were many reports by Federal Government during the BCP, including: A National Housing Strategy, ESD, Social Justice, and the PM’s Task Force on Urban Design. Did any of these reports assist your design outcomes?

A Most came after the urban design policies and controls in Ultimo/Pyrmont were formulated but the Federal government interest and initiatives and commitment helped in improving our work and kept up the interest and commitment to the Program.

Q21 What influences did the following BCP processes have on your urban design development and outcomes: inputs, outputs & outcomes; program management; monitoring & accountability and program evaluation & audit?

A Better Cities monitoring and accountability led to lots of project delivery and co-ordination committees. These helped achieve the projects and Program outcomes and partnership approach but at times design may have suffered from the ‘committee’ approach.

However, it also had the advantage that design was realistic in terms of meeting diverse needs of community and aspects such as asset management which DESIGNERS often ignore. I COULD GIVE EXAMPLES IN ULTIMO/PYRMONT!!!

Q22 If your Area Strategy was predominantly an infrastructure or corridor project did it lay a foundation for future and successful urban design outcomes?

A Ultimo/Pyrmont was a precinct / multifunctional project but yes, it laid a foundation for good urban design outcomes.

Q23 If the enduring strands of urban design are: buildings and their grouping, public spaces, circulation, safety, housing, conservation, landscape, public art, environmental response and health, were you able to respond to these strands?

A Yes, all strands pursued in Ultimo/Pyrmont with varying degrees of success.

Q24 Good urban design exhibits: design excellence; widely distributed benefits - environmental benefits; a response to local features; a contemporary relevance; provision for change and forges connections with the past. Do you agree? (PM’s Urban Design Task Force)

A Yes, plus public and private benefits!!

Q25 Did your urban design assist in strengthening central areas; in creating safe environments and in fostering public art? As the BCP is essentially silent on these issues. Did it have: flexibility, variety, robustness and legibility?

A Yes - safe environments was an aspect of our policies and controls.

Public art needed a specific program which came after Better Cities, although
in some parks in Better Cities Program community involvement in design workshops led to public art.

Q26 Contemporary urban design embraces postmodernism, postcolonialism, feminism, deconstructivism, neo-rationalism and the needs of indigenous people. Were you able give urban design expression to these concerns?

A This question is too hard!! The urban design approach / policy development had a healthy amount of debate but mainly about the role of traditional Ultimo/Pyrmont building typologies in influencing new forms and design details versus new forms to suit new uses and new investors.

Design in Ultimo/Pyrmont was not debated in these terms. It was about more basic issues: heights, building forms, quantum of open spaces, bulk of buildings, materials, etc.!!

Q27 The urban design approach can be: empirical (trusting the human senses); rational (ie, logical steps from first principles), or pragmatic (employing things which are known to work). Which is your preferred approach?

A A mix of all!! Urban design must respond appropriately to place-specific context and contemporary needs and desires of current and future users and investors. Need to balance / trade off / deliver on inspiration and creativity / and financial feasibility. Therefore, need three approaches!

Q28 There are many contemporary theorists/practitioners in urban design, such as: Rossi, the Kriers, Moore, Isoka, Tschumi, Alexander, Duany and Plater-Zyberck, and others. Has your work been influenced by these or others?

A Yes to the Kriers, Alexander, Duany and Plater-Zyberck.

Q29 Urban design was not one of the five BCP objectives, but in some ways urban design issues are found within these objectives. Do you agree that urban design deserved its own objective, or was it in fact the one objective?

A Urban design was an element of the planning and implementation approaches in Ultimo/Pyrmont which helped deliver the outcomes. A specific objective would have helped the commitment and forms, but it was not the ‘one objective’ of the Program.

Remember that in 1991 when the Program was initiated, the ‘URBAN DESIGN’ discipline was not huge in Australia. It has become identified and self-promoting in the 1990s.

Many of the states would have had few urban designers or governments interested in or committed to urban design in 1991/92.

Remember, even NSW abandoned its Urban Design Unit in 1992/93. Only to recreate one in 1996 or 97.

I am of the view that urban design is only a new name for ‘physical planning’. Lots of planners and architects were doing ‘urban design’ without calling it that. All the formulation of strategic planning and first generation of controls
for Ultimo/Pyrmont were done by planners and architects. (Only one officer involved in the early stages called himself an urban designer). It has only been since the mid 1990s that urban design(ers) has been promoting itself as something different.

Q30 What are your personal reflections on urban design in Australia and the BCP? What would you suggest for any further Federal Government urban initiatives? Was urban design improved in Australia as a result of the BCP?

A Yes. See above. More place-based, multi-objective, funding and physical / social / environmental outcome oriented Program.
Brisbane Inner North East Suburbs
Brisbane Inner North East Suburbs (Interview response from John Byrne, 17 May 2001)

Q1 What briefing documents, if any, were provided to you on general or specific urban design objectives for your Area Strategy?

A Inner NE Suburbs had already begun as an initiative of the Brisbane City Council. Both Trevor Raddacliff and Jim Sorley, the Mayor, were involved. The State was talking to Council about a joint initiative when BBC raised the matter of the north east suburbs. It was ready to go. However, three of the other five Area Strategies were created for the Program, namely Mackay, Inala-Ipswich, and Townsville. The Gold Coast railway line failure was brought forward too early. There were no briefing documents created for the BCP. John Byrne’s concern was with public housing.

Q2 Did the five BCP objectives form part of the brief? The objectives being:

- economic growth and micro economic reform
- ecologically sustainable development
- an improved urban environment
- improved social justice
- institutional reform

A Of the five objectives ESD was the least likely, but the order of response was:

- Economic growth and micro economic reform - yes;
- ecologically sustainable development - not really;
- an improved urban environment - central;
- improved social justice - implied, no real delivery, and
- institutional reform - not featured in the Inner NE Project.

Generic outcomes for the BCP were as follows, Q3-Q11. In your Area Strategy were you able to implement some or all of the following objectives?

Q3 Improve labour market outcomes by supporting employment initiatives, and by addressing long journeys to work and poor public transport?

A Inner urban renewal was going to deliver outcomes with inner gentrification working against public issues, but public issues were taken as given.

Q4 Respond to ESD by: rehabilitating degraded sites; enhancing and protecting heritage, urban and natural environments; reducing traffic congestion; designing energy efficient housing and improving water management and micro climates?

A Response to ESD was that:

- Degraded sites were responded to by developers;
- heritage issues were responded to;
- the natural environment did not receive any particularly special treatment;
- the urban environment was improved;
- traffic congestion was eased;
- energy issues received attention in public housing, but not much in private housing;
- water management - no, and
- micro-climate - no.
Address social justice issues by improved access to: jobs, health, services, education, public transport, affordable housing and recreation, particularly for the low income and disadvantaged and Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders?

Social justice was a big issue, particularly in view of gentrification. Issues of loss of affordable housing in percentage terms, and therefore, not especially successful. The activity of affordable housing would have been attempted in any case. Support was received from the ‘Task Force’ (not the PM’s Task Force), but not from the BCP, as money from BCP went into infrastructure.

Address institutional reform by improved: efficiency of expenditure on health & services; better urban outcomes from land released by the institutional reform process and redevelopment of outmoded institutional service delivery?

Not applicable.

Support the provision of and investment in infrastructure particularly efficient transport systems within cities? Make more efficient use of existing, new and upgraded infrastructure and services to support urban renewal?

Improvement in sewers, cabling and public transport.

Recognise the primary importance of the public domain with attention to aesthetics, systems and spatial relationships?

The River Edge was a major problem with the privatisation of access and visual enjoyment of the river corridor, excluding the involvement of the public behind. The public realm works in some way; New Farm Village (Merthyr Street Village) is a much more attractive area in its public realm because of Council initiatives.

Respond to housing needs in terms of increasing: diversity and hence choice; affordability, innovation, consolidation (more compact forms) particularly for low income and disadvantaged groups, thus addressing issues of social justice?

Yes, we attempted to address these and succeeded in terms of the budget. Increase in publicly owned low-income housing is important, but dwarfed by the loss of privately owned low-income housing.

Achieve better integration of physical and social planning, economic development, infrastructure provisions and environmental management?

We did achieve better integration with the full-time staff of the ‘Task Force’ and the status afforded to it by state and local government allowed greater integration to be pursued, and in part delivered. The ‘Task Force’ included Council, State and Federal representatives supported by full-time staff working within the existing statutory system and was a very effective model.

Achieve better urban management through improved integration of urban planning and development?

Yes.
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(End of generic questions)

Q12 Were there any formal external evaluations carried out by the BCP of your urban design in terms of the Area Strategy objectives? Did you institute your own progressive internal evaluation processes?

A In housing, no, but in the Program, yes, there were many evaluations carried out by the ‘Task Force’ and State.

Q13 What was the form of your urban design outcome: written recommendations, codes, controls, design guidelines or some other form?

A Yes, to all plus active participation in the projects. The ‘Task Force’ was characterised by bargaining within loose frameworks.

Q14 In your opinion did the BCP meet the usual tests of merit with the application of cost-benefit analyses?

A No comment.

Q15 Better Cities II 1995-1996 refers to urban design specifically, eg ‘better urban design’, and ‘improved urban design and livable cities’. Whilst BCP II came late, did its urban design focus reach you or was it too little too late?

A There was an urban design awareness in the inner north east suburbs from the beginning, driven by individuals.

Q16 What urban design management process did you adopt in the evolution of the design? Did you share your progressive urban design development with a community or reference group?

A The ‘Task Force’ was involved in a lot of community referencing.

Q17 Did the urban design aspects of your particular Area Strategy warrant its advancement as a demonstration project with innovative processes. Was it a catalyst for other projects? Could you identify such other projects?

A Demonstration projects include Church Street, but other housing projects have won awards, including the River Edge and MacTaggarts.

Q18 Urban consolidation was Government policy during the BCP. Do you support urban consolidation, or do you question its contribution to increased efficiency and liveability of cities and to address equity and social justice issues?

A Yes, it was supported. Its contribution depends on its outcome with increases in efficiency and improved social outcomes.

Q19 To the extent that your Area Strategy urban design work involved housing, were the AMCORD and Green Streets Program useful to you?

A AMCORD no, but AMCORD URBAN yes. We were doing it before AMCORD URBAN. AMCORD URBAN legitimised the process.
There were many reports by Federal Government during the BCP, including: A National Housing Strategy, ESD, Social Justice, and the PM’s Task Force on Urban Design. Did any of these reports assist your design outcomes?

A The National Housing Strategy was important to the Department, work in the field in the inner north east suburbs was going down that route in any case.

What influences did the following BCP processes have on your urban design development and outcomes: inputs, outputs & outcomes; program management; monitoring & accountability and program evaluation & audit?

A Little.

If your Area Strategy was predominantly an infrastructure or corridor project did it lay a foundation for future and successful urban design outcomes?

A It was not in infrastructure projects.

If the enduring strands of urban design are: buildings and their grouping, public spaces, circulation, safety, housing, conservation, landscape, public art, environmental response and health, were you able to respond to these strands?

A Yes.

Good urban design exhibits: design excellence; widely distributed benefits - environmental benefits; a response to local features; a contemporary relevance; provision for change and forges connections with the past. Do you agree?

A Yes.

Did your urban design assist in strengthening central areas; in creating safe environments and in fostering public art? As the BCP is essentially silent on these issues. Did it have: flexibility, variety, robustness and legibility?

A Yes, but for public art, no.

Contemporary urban design embraces postmodernism, postcolonialism, feminism, deconstructivism, neo-rationalism and the needs of indigenous people. Were you able give urban design expression to these concerns?

A These words are not in the lexicon of discussion, apart from ‘indigenous’.

The urban design approach can be: empirical (trusting the human senses); rational (ie, logical steps from first principles), or pragmatic (employing things which are known to work). Which is your preferred approach?

A All of the above.
There are many contemporary theorists/practitioners in urban design, such as: Rossi, the Kriers, Moore, Isoka, Tschumi, Alexander, Duany and Plater-Zyberck, and others. Has your work been influenced by these or others?

A 
At a personal level the work of Francis Tibbauds, with support for much of the work of the new-urbanists.

Urban design was not one of the five BCP objectives, but in some ways urban design issues are found within these objectives. Do you agree that urban design deserved its own objective, or was it in fact the one objective?

A 
To me, improved urban environments as one of the five objectives covered this. To have isolated urban design as an objective would have been unhelpful politically at the time.

What are your personal reflections on urban design in Australia and the BCP? What would you suggest for any further Federal Government urban initiatives? Was urban design improved in Australia as a result of the BCP?

A 
Yes.
Summary of Responses to The Questionnaire

Q1 What briefing documents, if any, were provided to you on general or specific urban design objectives for your Area Strategy?

Response. The project objectives were frequently self-imposed and site-specific, and formulated by the group working on the project, together with the requirements to meet the objectives of the BCP Agreement on the particular Area Strategy. (refer Section 5.2.3 Q1)

Q2 Did the five BCP objectives form part of the brief? The objectives being:

- economic growth and micro economic reform
- ecologically sustainable development
- an improved urban environment.

Generic outcomes for the BCP were as follows, Q3-Q11. In your Area Strategy were you able to implement some or all of the following objectives?

Response. Yes, but with specific comment as to whether ecologically sustainable development and institutional reform received the attention they should have. (refer Section 5.2.3 Q2)

Q3 Improve labour market outcomes by supporting employment initiatives, and by addressing long journeys to work and poor public transport?

Response. Yes, but this was perceived in different ways, these being specific on-site training schemes, the increase in construction employment created by the Area Strategies and as the initiatives generally influenced the wider economy.

Q4 Respond to ESD by: rehabilitating degraded sites; enhancing and protecting heritage urban and natural environments; reducing traffic congestion; designing energy efficient housing and improving water management and micro climates?

Response. A generally positive response to this question, but with some specific exclusions as in the case of Brisbane Inner North East Suburbs with matters of water management and micro-climate receiving limited attention.

Q5 Address social justice issues by improved access to: jobs, health, services, education, public transport, affordable housing and recreation, particularly for the low income and disadvantaged and Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders? (refer Section 5.2.3 Q5)

Response. Several of the respondents referred to difficulties in the provision of affordable housing for a variety of reasons, but in particular, the high cost of the land component as well as other competing demands.

Q6 Address institutional reform by improved: efficiency of expenditure on health & services; better urban outcomes from land released by the institutional reform process and redevelopment of outmoded institutional service delivery?
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Response. Almost without exception the response to this question was a negative, or it was not seen as applicable to the initiative(s).

Q7 Support the provision of and investment in infrastructure particularly efficient transport systems within cities? Make more efficient use of existing, new and upgraded infrastructure and services to support urban renewal?

Response. This question received virtually a positive response.

Q8 Recognise the primary importance of the public domain with attention to aesthetics, systems and spatial relationships?

Response. The response to this question was uniformly positive.

Q9 Respond to housing needs in terms of increasing: diversity and hence choice; affordability, innovation, consolidation (more compact forms) particularly for low income and disadvantaged groups, thus addressing issues of social justice?

Response. Generally a positive response to issues of diversity, choice and consolidation, but with qualified responses to the issues of affordability in the cases of East Perth and Brisbane Inner North East Suburbs.

Q10 Achieve better integration of physical and social planning, economic development, infrastructure provisions and environmental management?

Response. This question received a uniformly positive response.

Q11 Achieve better urban management through improved integration of urban planning and development?

(End of generic questions)

Response. A uniformly positive response was received to this question.

Q12 Were there any formal external evaluations carried out by the BCP of your urban design in terms of the Area Strategy objectives? Did you institute your own progressive internal evaluation processes?

Response. Both internal and external evaluations were carried out in most cases with the exceptions being that there were no formal external evaluations and no housing evaluations carried out in the case of the Brisbane Inner North East Suburbs.

Q13 What was the form of your urban design outcome: written recommendations, codes, controls, design guidelines or some other form?

Response. All respondents had produced urban design recommendations, codes, controls and design guidelines but the range and focus was often different in each case.

Q14 In your opinion did the BCP meet the usual tests of merit with the application of cost-benefit analyses?
Response. A diversity of responses was received to this question, ranging from yes, no comment and a detailed qualified response in the case of the Honeysuckle Area Strategy.

Q15 Better Cities II 1995-1996 refers to urban design specifically, e.g. 'better urban design', and 'improved urban design and livable cities'. Whilst BCP II came late, did its urban design focus reach you or was it too little too late?

Response. The question produced wide-ranging responses, including: an urban design approach was already internalised; BCP II and urban design was a ploy to steer a change of Government away from the Program’s social goals and BCP II had no impact on any of the BCP II Area Strategies. The conclusion drawn is that whichever response is accepted, BCP II had little effect on the overall Program.

Q16 What urban design management process did you adopt in the evolution of the design? Did you share your progressive urban design development with a community or reference group?

Response. All responses demonstrated community participation and also specialist input and advice.

Q17 Did the urban design aspects of your particular Area Strategy warrant its advancement as a demonstration project with innovative processes? Was it a catalyst for other projects? Could you identify such other projects?

Response. All respondents laid claim to demonstration projects, portions of projects or processes. ‘Demonstration’ was widely interpreted.

Q18 Urban consolidation was Government policy during the BCP. Do you support urban consolidation, or do you question its contribution to increased efficiency and liveability of cities and to address equity and social justice issues?

Response. With one exception, where the respondent had mixed views on the issue of urban consolidation, all other respondents supported it.

Q19 To the extent that your Area Strategy urban design work involved housing, were the AMCORD and Green Streets Program useful to you?

Response. Whilst the above documents had some relevance, the responses referred to other prevailing housing codes and the fact that the above documents were running in parallel with the projects to views of their limited use.

Q20 There were many reports by Federal Government during the BCP, including: A National Housing Strategy, ESD, Social Justice, and the PM’s Task Force on Urban Design. Did any of these reports assist your design outcomes?

Response. The general response was that there was an awareness of the many Government reports, but that their influence on the projects was one of background support, to limited value to no use at all.
What influences did the following BCP processes have on your urban design development and outcomes: inputs, outputs & outcomes; program management; monitoring & accountability and program evaluation & audit?

Response. The BCP management processes including the inputs, outputs and outcomes model did not emerge as key management approaches in the various Area Strategies.

If your Area Strategy was predominantly an infrastructure or corridor project did it lay a foundation for future and successful urban design outcomes?

Response. With the exception of the Honeysuckle project which produced an affirmative response, the question was not applicable to the other Area Strategies.

If the enduring strands of urban design are: buildings and their grouping, public spaces, circulation, safety, housing, conservation, landscape, public art, environmental response and health, were you able to respond to these strands?

Response. A unanimous affirmative response from all respondents.

Good urban design exhibits: design excellence; widely distributed benefits - environmental benefits; a response to local features; a contemporary relevance; provision for change and forges connections with the past. Do you agree?

(PM’s Urban Design Task Force)

Response. A unanimous affirmative response from all respondents.

Did your urban design assist in strengthening central areas; in creating safe environments and in fostering public art? As the BCP is essentially silent on these issues. Did it have: flexibility, variety, robustness and legibility?

Response. A positive response from all respondents, but with a qualified response in terms of some of the issues, in particular, public art.

Contemporary urban design embraces postmodernism, postcolonialism, feminism, deconstructivism, neo-rationalism and the needs of indigenous people. Were you able give urban design expression to these concerns?

Response. Whilst indigenous people’s needs and wants and the concerns of women were acknowledged, the other ‘isms’ did not assume prominence. (refer Section 5.2.4 Q26)

The urban design approach can be: empirical (trusting the human senses); rational (i.e., logical steps from first principles), or pragmatic (employing things which are known to work). Which is your preferred approach?

Response. All respondents confirmed all approaches are involved. (refer Section 5.2.4 Q27)
Q28  There are many contemporary theorists/practitioners in urban design, such as: Rossi, the Kriers, Moore, Isoka, Tschumi, Alexander, Duany and Plater-Zyberck, and others. Has your work been influenced by these or others?

Response. There are any contemporary theorists. The responses ranged from the mention of a favoured theorist, to a select few, to the inclusion of all. (refer Section 5.2.4 Q28)

Q29  Urban design was not one of the five BCP objectives, but in some ways urban design issues are found within these objectives. Do you agree that urban design deserved its own objective, or was it in fact the one objective?

Response. The cautious responses appear curiously at odds with the strong affirmation responses to Questions Q23 and Q24 which are about the wide-ranging nature and benefits of good urban design, and would not unreasonably lead to a conclusion that urban design deserved its own objective.

Q30  What are your personal reflections on urban design in Australia and the BCP? What would you suggest for any further Federal Government urban initiatives? Was urban design improved in Australia as a result of the BCP?

Response. The overall consensus was that urban design was improved by the Program, but there was much work yet to be done.
Appendix D1 The Matrix derived from Project Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building grouping</th>
<th>Royal Hospital for Women</th>
<th>Abercrombie Precinct, USyD</th>
<th>Circular Quay</th>
<th>Liverpool Gateway</th>
<th>Miranda Town Centre</th>
<th>Redfern Station</th>
<th>Parramatta Road</th>
<th>Padstow Haven</th>
<th>Macarthur Master Plan</th>
<th>Bankstown Interchange</th>
<th>SA Gas Co., Site</th>
<th>Baldessin Square, ANU</th>
<th>Precinct Guidelines, ANU</th>
<th>Acton Housing, ANU</th>
<th>Annandale Housing</th>
<th>Section 56, Civic</th>
<th>Newmarket Housing</th>
<th>Bandar Amanjaya Master Plan</th>
<th>Tanjung Toloong Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public domain</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological response</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public art</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management processes</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NZ</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Notes:
- √ = partial or complete response
- - = insignificant or no response

Areas:
- Royal Hospital for Women
- Abercrombie Precinct, USyD
- Circular Quay
- Liverpool Gateway
- Miranda Town Centre
- Redfern Station
- Parramatta Road
- Padstow Haven
- Macarthur Master Plan
- Bankstown Interchange
- SA Gas Co., Site
- Baldessin Square, ANU
- Precinct Guidelines, ANU
- Acton Housing, ANU
- Annandale Housing
- Section 56, Civic
- Newmarket Housing
- Bandar Amanjaya Master Plan
- Tanjung Toloong Master Plan
## Appendix D2 The Matrix applied to the BCP Area Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Building grouping</th>
<th>Public domain</th>
<th>Safety &amp; Security</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Conservation &amp; Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Ecological response</th>
<th>Conservation &amp; Heritage</th>
<th>Management processes</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Appendix E The Objectives Of DURD


- The Department is a major policy arm of the Australian Government, responsible for developing and implementing a national urban and regional development strategy.

- The strategy requires the development and monitoring of an urban and regional budget program as a coordinating machinery for the resources allocated for investment by federal departments, State and local governing bodies in urban and regional services but responsibility for coordination between urban and non-urban programs would remain with Treasury. The urban and regional budget program in preliminary form would be submitted to the Government as part of the budget papers for the next budget discussions.

- The Department would be required to develop an urban economic and long-term resource planning group.

- The Department would have an initiating and coordinating role in relation to the activities of federal departments in urban and regional development and would be responsible for ensuring that coordinated advice is available to ministers.

- The Department would be responsible for advising and assisting the states, semi-government and local government authorities in preparing and implementing plans for cities and regions.

- The Department would be required to assess the needs for urban transport, including improved public transport facilities, as a guideline to the states and to Department of Transport in developing programs.

- Research into urban and regional development would be initiated and coordinated by the Department.

- The Department would establish and supervise the Australian and state land commissions.

- The Department would be administratively responsible for the success of the new cities program, eg. Albury-Wodonga, Holsworthy-Menai.

- The Department would develop, and advise the Australian Government on a national estate program to protect and enhance land and buildings of national importance.