Copyright notice

MONASH
UNIVERSITY

SYDNEY (UN)LTD

Anne-Marie Willis and Tony Fry

The projected rapid expansion of Sydney's population and increased per capita stress on the natural environment means that new thinking is required about Sydney's future. If Sydney is to live in a sustainable manner it will require political changes in the way people live and in the way city planning is managed.

INTRODUCTION

This article is an opening onto debate about the future of Sydney. It seeks to go beyond the dichotomy of fringe development versus consolidation — the plank upon which current planning thinking is built and which continues to inform conflicts over site-specific issues. Major urban regions are being shaped by forces that can no longer be adequately addressed just in spatial terms. Some of these forces of change that urban policy-making and planning have to address include: population changes; the simultaneous fragmentation and globalisation of economies; information technologies creating new configurations of time and space; world political conflicts creating dispersed cultures of dislocation and disadvantage; increasingly unsustainable consumption of resources and energy; and global climate change. New models are needed to make sense of the current situation and to inform decisions about how to sustain the urban environment and all the ecologies upon which it depends. In this context we will argue that other conceptual models are needed for thinking urban futures than the currently dominant spatial ones. We question current ways of thinking about the city because we doubt their adequacy to help us comprehend what is happening or to deal with emergent problems.

Our focus is Sydney, both because there is something to say about this city and because its problems demonstrate the deficiency of current urban perspectives. Comparatively, Sydney is wealthy, relatively unpolluted, its residents are well-housed, and it is free from the scale of inequalities and social conflict found in so many parts of the world. From this position of advantage, well-informed thinking and effective leadership could be mobilised to manage Sydney's population and current patterns of unsustainability and turn the region into a model for the development of urban sustainment.

IMPACTS, SCALE AND THE COMPACT CITY

Sydney does not face the same scale of impacts and dysfunction as those faced by megacities like Tokyo, Mumbai and Sao Paulo, all of which are heading for populations of 25 million plus.[1] But Sydney's current population is four million, and it is expected to remain Australia's largest city, absorbing about 25 per cent of the nation's population growth over the next two decades. So while still a small city in absolute terms, it is comparable, population-wise, to many cities worldwide (Bagdad, Lahore, Singapore, Chicago).[2] Another key factor is that the size of Sydney is still on a scale where it is possible to fix problems. The question of the impacts of its population,

as we shall argue, is more complex, as is the question of whether current urban policies can meet the challenges ahead.

Since the early 1990s the NSW government's policy has been to counter the trajectory that Sydney had been on for more than a century: that of a low-rise sprawling city. The aim now is for a denser, more compact metropolitan region. The stated goals are to conserve bush and rural lands; protect water catchments; reduce car dependence and improve regional air quality. Enhanced 'liveability' and 'urban amenity' are also promoted in public policy documents, and images of a more 'vibrant and cosmopolitan' higher density Sydney are evoked. Significant reduction in urban fringe housing is cited by the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning (DUAP) as a positive outcome of their policies (achieved by using former urban industrial land for housing development rather than greenfield sites, and allowing higher densities around public transport nodes).[3] But pushing in the opposite direction to containment is the growth of Sydney as a centre for new economy development, job generation and hence as a magnet for new settlers.[4] Modest sustainability gains are likely to be overwhelmed by an increasing 'impact population'.[5] There are two aspects to this: growth in actual numbers and growth in per capita impacts.

Currently, urban questions are posed almost exclusively in spatial terms, that is, which is best, denser development of the existing metropolitan area or extension of its boundaries? Land use zoning and urban density are the ground upon which planning policies are built and provide the basis on which interest groups mobilise. Thus resident groups resist increased population in their suburbs, developers complain about land scarcity; and architects and urban designers worry about the quality and visual appearance of more consolidated forms of development, and about questions of 'place' and distinctiveness.

COMPLEX UNSUSTAINABILITY
But current models of planning cannot deal with the crisis of unsustainability. To give an idea of their inadequacy we will briefly consider population and some specific impacts in more detail.

THE NUMBERS GAME
Sydney's population is likely to increase from 4.1 million in 2001 to 5.0 million in 2021. This is according to Australian Bureau of Statistics projections based on assumptions of :
- a total fertility rate (TFR) of 1.6;
- net overseas migration to Australia of 90,000 of which 38,300 go to NSW (nearly all to Sydney);
- net annual losses for Sydney of 15,000 from internal migration.[6]

The scenario of close to an extra million people over the next twenty years is one that planners need to take seriously. This is especially so because DUAP's guiding policy document on metropolitan development, *Shaping Our Cities*, is based on projections of a Sydney population of only 4.5 million by around 2016.[7] Within current thinking, an extra million people would be dealt with in two ways: either by higher densities to keep the 'compact Sydney' model or by maintaining current densities and allowing greenfield expansion. It can be argued either way that there will be negative impacts. With option one: more stress on existing urban infrastructure (especially water, power, sewerage services); reduced green open space; increased mass of buildings and hard surfaces leading to higher urban temperatures; more waste to be managed

in more confined space; increasing traffic congestion. With option two: loss of currently protected bushland and productive rural land; biodiversity decline; increased vehicle kilometres travelled thus poorer urban air quality and growing greenhouse emissions from private transport. While DUAP's *Shaping our Cities* looks beyond Sydney to Newcastle, the Central Coast and Wollongong, this does not resolve the population accommodation question as each of these regions has its own vulnerable coastlands, bush and rural hinterlands, and more urban development for them would have the same impacts as for fringe Sydney. Clearly, shifting impacts from one region to another is not a sufficient answer to the problems posed by population growth.

Except for transport (distance and mode), the impacts of urbanised populations are relatively independent of location. Levels of water and energy use and consumption of resources and generation of waste are determined more by household income and cultural habits. The latest estimate is that households are responsible directly or indirectly for the generation of most of Australia's energy-related greenhouse gas emissions — around 56 percent (this is mainly from household electricity use — 17 per cent and motor vehicle use — 12 per cent).[8]

As we have argued previously, per capita impacts of populations are more significant than sheer numbers.[9] According-

ing to a number of indicators these are increasing. Dwelling size is expanding, the number of households is growing, the volume of waste is climbing, car use is growing and traffic congestion is worsening. Now to discuss some of these points in more detail.

LIVING ROOM: A FINAL FRONTIER

Growth in size of new dwellings
The average floor space of new homes in NSW increased from 163.2 square metres in 1985 to 255.9 square metres in 2000. In 1986 13 per cent of people were living in four bedroom homes, ten years later this figure had reached 23 per cent.[10] What are the impact implications of these trends? Larger houses utilise more materials for their construction and fit-out, have higher embodied energy,[11] require more furnishing and, generally, more heating and cooling energy. This is borne out in a review of Victoria's mandatory energy design requirements for new housing that found that energy/greenhouse gas savings achieved (for example, by measures such as insulation) were more than cancelled out by the increase in dwelling sizes.[12] The same pattern seems to be repeating itself in NSW where housing energy rating requirements have only been introduced recently, and dwelling size is expanding.

Increasing numbers of households
The trend towards larger dwellings seems to be contradicted by another trend, the trend towards smaller households, (see Table 1) many of just one or two people. This drives demand for more housing units (a trend all over the Western world).[13]

Clearly there are differences between the people living in expansive family-style single houses in outer

Table 1: Households: Projections for Sydney

Year	Number of households	People per household
1996	1,421,700	2.72
2011	1,761,600	2.55
2021	1,979,700	2.45

Source: Household and family projections, Australia, Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1996-2021[14]

suburbs and those in the one or two person households occupying terrace houses and apartments. What is common to both groups is a drift towards more fractured, individualised, self-contained ways of life. Frequently the rationale for the larger size family home is to create spatial separation ('rumpus room', 'games room', 'parents' retreat' in real estate lingo) for different age groups — so young children, teenagers and adults, each can pursue their own activities without impinging on others. While planners are pre-occupied with questions of density, building form and height, who is assessing the impact implications of the increased goods (fridges, cookers, appliances, TVs, computers, furniture, and so on) and, most likely, the increased energy needed by these micro households and households within households?[15]

In this context it is disingenuous for politicians and bureaucrats to make simple appeals about meeting the need for housing. Individuated desires have been created. Bundled together en masse they are driving the conversion of land into real estate and creating demand for high impact infrastructure and goods to service desired lifestyles. How can planners claim that they are simply responding to 'needs'? This is a clear instance of where reactive planning needs to stop.

ALWAYS ON THE MOVE

Some progress has been made in recognising the relation between transport, air quality and the nature of urban development. The NSW government's *Air Quaity Action Plan* includes strategies to: encourage cleaner fuel burning and less congested roads and to provide more public transport and forms of urban development to encourage its use (such as high residential densities close to public transport routes). This is in

response to a troubling trend in which vehicle usage (measured in vehicle kilometres travelled — VKT) is growing faster than population. Total VKT for the Sydney region grew by 23.5 per cent between 1991 and 1997 while the population increased by 7.1 per cent.[16] The government's ambition is to reverse this trend. The target of halting *per capita* growth of VKT by 2011 and stopping growth of *total* VKT by 2021.[17] There are now two practical reasons why they are less likely to meet these targets: first is the higher than previously estimated population increase, second is the recently announced delay in public transport roll-out. The Chatswood to Parramatta rail link originally to have been completed in 2006 will now only go to Epping by 2008, with completion to Parramatta yet to be announced.[18]

Even if the targets were achieved, stabilising VKT does not guarantee reduced per capita *transport* impacts. Inner city dwellers may relinquish private cars but may well increase their air travel. The most wealthy would have enormous air travel impacts and minute VKT (they're not the ones in daily commuter traffic jams). Transport impacts are complex because of the way that the infrastructures of mobility have inscribed urban form and urban life over several centuries (road, then railway, then many roads and motorways). Cities were born out of the crossing of roads creating new opportunities for exchange. However, by the late twentieth century, roads had become dividers of community and destroyers of urban life.[19]

Movement is at the very heart of the urban condition.[20] Travel has become elemental to urban culture and the social functioning of peoples' lives and is not amenable to rationalist planning. Cities are aggregations of opportunities and the

more differentiated an urban region, the more incentives to travel. There is a disjuncture between technocractic solutions (transport planning, fuel improvements, vehicle technologies, and so on) and the socio cultural complexity of a mobile population. People are becoming more car dependent and travel patterns more complex and individuated, making it increasingly difficult to plan for public transport as a substitute for car travel.[21] Attempts to change travel behaviour have to be able to engage problems at this level.

Sustainable transport planning for Sydney directly collides with the bolstering of the cultural economy and tourism: places and events are constantly being created and promoted as attractions while sub regions and centres compete to attract customers and audiences. All of this is but one instance of 'disjunctural planning', whereby government departments plan as much against each other as they plan with each other.

The flip side of this is that as cities grow, diversify and fracture along fault lines of inequality and difference, the car increasingly becomes a mobile protection zone, shielding those perceived as vulnerable from the real and imagined threats of urban life.[22] People create their own cities from habits of movement across urban territory, creating pathways differentially out of necessity and choice. 'Your Sydney' of familiarity, and thus your reference points, might be the CBD and inner west with maybe a line or two of connection beyond to places from your past. Another person's Sydney may be triangulated in a pattern of work/family nodal points from Camden to Campbelltown to Liverpool. Other experiential Sydneys may be more localised, say entirely around the Sutherland shire or the northern beach suburbs. Then there are lines which link nodes of privilege across vast spaces: say from the Eastern suburbs to the CBD to a 'weekender' on the south coast.

FRACTURE-ZONES
For some time urban theorists have been saying that 'the city' is an outmoded idea, no longer capable of describing the complexity of what has become the condition of amorphous, unbounded and portable urbanity. 'Polynucleated metropolitan region' is Gottdiener's term for what he claims 'is not just the city grown large but a qualitatively new form of settlement space'.[23] Over and above extended metropolitan regions, the iconic form of the city as singularity is constantly re-inscribed, especially to create an identity that can function within the cultural economy of tourism (thus Sydney equals harbour, bridge, opera house, beaches, shops, hotels).

It is not just that there is no single point from which to view the city as space or process but rather the notion of the city as 'one' entity is illusory. Of course, historically no city can claim to have been a social, economic or cultural unity. City spaces are not, and have never been, classless; they always manifest economic difference, and from the ancient world onwards cities have been places where different cultures and races mix, meet and interact. Such trends, often on a much vaster scale, are destined to continue but equally some new trends have arrived. In these circumstances, the old model of inner-city bohemian culture, outer-city suburbs and a few racial enclaves has been overlaid with a much more complex and fractured structure. Sydney, as a place that is a major attractor of immigrants to Australia, significantly fuses both the old and new trends. It is in fact moving from being a

collection of fragments where every local authority claims its cluster of suburbs as a city, to a mix of fracture zones which are socially, economically and culturally disjunctural. Many newcomers will arrive in these zones in the coming years, thus they are worth reviewing.

Big capital in Sydney has set out to make it a regional centre of financial services and investment. This is effectively creating greater spatial divisions between the rich, the poor and the rest. At the same time it creates: a disproportionate take-up of resources, demographic change (as the rich move in, gentrify, or increasingly demolish and rebuild, and the poorer move out) plus significant restructuring between the public and private sectors especially in areas like education (so rather than a population influx revitalising an inner city public school it can be the cause if its demise as wealthy parents choose private schools).[24] A significant number of the old and new privileged are 'located' in global network structures as much as they are in local geography - effectively they have multiple identities, senses of belonging and allegiances. They function in a 24 hour economy in the global immateriality of 'strong' information links while living in a specific space. Their existence is a bridge across a time/space divide. As Manuel Castells recognises, information technologies are transforming the regime of time, and so of space. The 24 hour information economy, at its simplest, means planning is increasingly a question of time as much as space.[25] Few planners have even started to deal with this issue conceptually let alone practically. While much work activity now occurs literally in no place, the globally mobile upper echelon knowledge worker may feel as much at home in central London or Milan

as in downtown Sydney, while Canterbury, Bankstown, Granville and beyond are foreign territory.

The nature of ethnic diversity in zones of transposed culture raises serious questions about the cosy inclusive agenda of multiculturalism and certainly makes the official images of the 'multicultural city' seem a liberal delusion. Effectively, and increasingly, displaced communities from other parts of the world wish to reconstruct their own space elsewhere. Political refugees, and what will be growing ranks of environmental refugees, are not abandoning their cultures or being attracted to another's culture, but rather relocating their culture. In contrast to the often dysfunctional model of the modern ghetto, these formative cultural isolates are far more self-sustaining. The geography of a city like Sydney increasingly accommodates the different cultures and economies of the polarities of the rich and poor. Canterbury, Fairfield and Auburn in recent years have seen concentrations of non-English-speaking-background (NESB) people with very low incomes. The largest proportion of some language groups are located in these local government areas (Vietnamese, Cambodia and Laos-born in Fairfield, Lebanese-born in Canterbury and Turkish-born in Auburn).[26]

The labour pool of the abandoned, dispossessed and young (currently youth unemployment runs at 23 per cent in contrast to 6.8 per cent for adults) make up other fracture zones that tragically fuse with a counter economy of drugs and other crimes. These other fracture zones also link to just-in-time production and hire and fire labour practices.

WHAT IS NEEDED NOW?
Fundamental to the kind of thinking advocated here, is, as said, a shift from a

spatial model of seeing to an impact model that views the city as a process — in terms of economies, cultures, materiality, immateriality, space and time. This is no mere shift from one functionalist mode to another. In essence, the city has to be turned from a location of impact expansion to one of impact containment and resource conservation. The conceptual move has to be from 'city' to 'region of sustainment'. This is not a utopian project of containing the ability to produce wealth and expand, neither is it 1960s idealistic 'limits to growth' project but rather a delimitation of the conditions in which these activities are possible.

Our proposal is completely predicated upon the imposition of limits in such a way as to inscribe equity and advance sustainability. Such an approach would shift the emphasis of planning from the spatial to the temporal. The performance of the built environment in process and over time would come to override the pre-occupation with appearance and built forms as final products. The urban environment is one of dependence. Most people cannot survive outside it. It is a care structure but not recognised and treated as such. Care is a concept that begs to be developed — the way we are using it here is not in emotive terms but rather, analogous to craft work or to the way safety is inscribed by design into the functioning of products and built form, or how we treat all that we value. Urban environments and their biophysical and social ecologies are yet to be grasped as care structures that need to be managed in terms of how they support communities but also how they use resources, generate waste, endanger or protect other living things. Importantly this does not necessarily mean caring for things as they are currently perceived: there is work to be done in building up the picture of what

there is to care for and what cares.

Conceptualising planning as the identification, enhancement and management of the artificial structures of care involves a number of shifts in thinking, which goes to the need for a new discourse to be created to inform planning, and more fundamentally, the nature of the social contract. Property rights for example would become reconfigured, in the recognition that the boundaries of ownership bear little relation to the network of impacts. Activities of living and working may be spatially contained, but their effects are local, regional and global, impacting upon the condition of air, water, land and atmosphere. Property rights are already not unfettered: one can build and develop only to the extent that this does not threaten public health and safety or cause gross environmental damage. In the context of global warming and climate change, these limits will have to be extended. Persuasion and price mechanisms will not be enough. The idea of sumptuary legislation needs serious consideration. What we are talking about is the possibility of mandated quantitative limits such as fixed household allocations of water and energy or fixed individual allocations for vehicle kilometres travelled.

Care has been briefly presented as a concept to rehabilitate, elaborate and give material substance to. A more immediate manifestation of care would be to develop a program of urban retrofitting (infrastructure, commercial and industrial development or housing) that proceeds on the basis of assessing the sustain-ability of existing material structures. Just as much wealth can be generated from the remaking of what exists as from the growth of the new. Taking this further: the current practice is that any building can be

demolished, except when it is designated as having heritage value. This could be reversed, with the assumption that all substantial structurally sound buildings remain standing, though their use will change. Retrofitting, upgrading and remodelling will occur, but always on the basis of improving the building's environmental performance and its ability to sustain that which sustains.

Applied to new developments on green field sites, the 'care structure' could be extended beyond the current limits of environmental protection (most often predicated upon putting boundaries around harmful activities rather than remaking them). New land (or any large parcel) must be cared for as it is built upon (the tabula rasa mentality must itself be erased) and be designed to develop as a care structure in process. For example, for the privilege of building a single dwelling on a large block of land, impact offset measures to ease the pressure on collective infrastructure could be required. These might be food cultivation, composting, rainwater harvesting or on-site sewage treatment. The larger the block, the more the offset, e.g., 100% on-site renewable energy generation or 100 percent contribution to a 'green power scheme'. The logic here is to allow for 'housing choice' but with equity and sustainment.[27]

CONCLUSION

Meeting the growth of Sydney while reducing impacts cannot be done by tinkering with the status quo. A far more adequate forum of metropolitan decision-making is needed, as is a better-informed political leadership. Despite its fracture zones, and growing inequalities, Sydney, as said in our opening, is still in a privileged position — problems have not reached the scale of total unmanageability that they have in other cities. Projecting Sydney into a viable future might be hard but it can be done. Yes, there will be costs but the benefits locally and globally would be extraordinary.

There is an urgent need to redesign the planning process (who plans, what is planned and how) so that is not over-determined by short-term economic interests or the politics of vested interests. More capabilities have to be drawn into this process and more ideas need to be explored and tested by public comment. Planners need to drop the promotional rhetoric and engage constituencies in far more serious and substantial ways. 'Dumbing down' for the public 'dumbs down' planners too (this could be said of policy making more generally).

What we're endeavouring to do is to open up the agenda that needs to be discussed in relation to Sydney, and more generally to the planning process itself. These issues should not be subordinate to the existing political structure and whims of politicians. They are the means by which the agenda of sustainability can be brought to the things that most immediately affect peoples lives.

References

1 M. Castells, *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Volume 1 The Rise of the Network Society*, Oxford: Blackwell, p. 405, 1996

2 Bagdad 4.8m, Lahore 5.4, Singapore 3.6m, Chicago 3m

3 According to DUAP's, *Shaping Our Cities*, 'reliance on the urban fringe for new housing has been reduced from 42 per cent in 1993-94 to around 30 per cent in recent years and touching a low of 27 per cent', p. 16

4 The dynamic growth sectors since the late 1990s have been telecommunications (12 per cent per annum growth); property and business services (11 per cent per annum growth); followed by health, finance and insurance, retail trade and construction sectors (4.5-5.5 percent).

[5] The concept of 'impact population' is outlined in our previous article, A. Willis, 'Design in the shadow of impact population', *People and Place*, vol. 8, no. 3, 2000

[6] These are Australian Bureau of Statistics 'series 2' assumptions which are probably cautious. For example net overseas migration between 1995-96 and 1999-2000 was 92,200 per annum and the 15,000 per annum Sydney loss is higher than for recent years. ABS, *Population Projections - 3220.0 - 1999 to 2101.*

[7] 4,578,500 by 2016 is the figure in the latest DUAP publication, *Population Projections for NSW - Preliminary*, 1999. By 2021 its estimate is 4,737,700.

[8] ABS, *Energy and Greenhouse Gas Emission Accounts, Australia 1992-93 to 1997-98*, Cat. No. 4604.0, May 2001.

[9] Willis, op. cit.

[10] BIS Schrapnel study and ABS cited in L. Morris, 'Nothing modest in modern McMansion' *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3 April, 2001.

[11] Embodied energy refers to all the energy required to manufacture a material or a product: extraction of raw materials, processing, assembly, etc.

[12] The study found that average floor areas of detached houses rose by 43 m^2 or 25 percent between 1990 and 1999 and attached houses rose by 35 m^2 or 31 per cent over the same period. This wiped out the modest 6 per cent reduction in energy per unit of floor area. *Australian Greenhouse Office Impact of Minimum Energy performance Requirements for Class 1 Buildings in Victoria — Executive Summary*, Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, 2000.

[13] From the mid 1990s there was 'a startling increase across Europe in the projected number of new household — a result not of population growth, as in the 1950s and 1960s, but rather of the splitting up of a population into more and more, smaller and smaller, households'. P. Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1996 (updated edition), p. 415

[14] P. Mc Donald, 'Scenarios for the future population of Sydney', paper for *Sydney's Population Future*, forum, Sutherland, 3 March, 2001 (organised by Australians for an Ecologically Sustainable Population and Save our Sydney Suburbs).

[15] A recent newspaper article reported on people queuing up for a week to buy Landcom housing blocks in southwestern Sydney, featuring a (very) young couple who were pleased to have secured the largest lot because they wanted 'room enough for a two storey house with four bedrooms, a study, rumpus room and a big games room and room enough for a pool'. L. Morris, 'Smile you've scored a rare chunk of Sydney' *Sydney Morning Herald*,, 9 April, 2001, p. 1

[16] S. Holiday, Director General DUAP, Address to *Sustainable Sydney* conference organised by DUAP November 2000

[17] *Action for Air: The NSW Government's 25 Year Air Quality Management Plan*, Environment Protection Authority NSW, February 1998, p. 22

[18] L. Doherty, 'Labor MP rails at Scully over Parramatta Link', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 April, 2001

[19] The impacts of motor vehicles and roads are now incalculable: destroyed communities (literally, in many third world modernising cities), noise, stress, accidents, injuries, air pollution, altered hydrologies, contamination of soil and waterways from run-off, higher urban temperatures, to say nothing of the car industry as the motor force of economic and cultural modernisation in the twentieth century and the economic centrality of the oil industry.

[20] Even when new towns centres were planned for the Stockholm region in the 1950s this was done on the basis of a 50/50 split, that is, the assumption that half the dwellers would travel out of the centres to other workplaces and half the jobs in the new town centres would be occupied by those who lived outside the town. Hall op. cit., p. 308.

[21] Studies are revealing that people are using cars for many reasons — travel to work, leisure activities, taxi-ing their children to and from school, childcare, sport, and so on, according to a forthcoming study on gender, parenting and travel behaviour by A. Gollner and others, Macquarie University, June 2001.

[22] The resemblance between military vehicles and the large recreational vehicles popular with affluent mothers of school age children is neither a co-incidence nor merely a style-fad: both are designed for a safe passage through hostile territory. While Australian cities may hardly be war zones, the imaginary of danger clearly plays a part in the lifestyle and purchasing decisions of many, which in turn acts back on the nature of the urban environment itself.

[23] M. Gottddiener, *The Social Production of Urban Space*, Austin: University of Texas Press, p. 4-8, 1985

[24] The closure or merging of at least half a dozen inner Sydney schools has recently been announced by the NSW Education Minister, declining numbers of pupils being given as the main reason. Several choice sites (such as Hunters Hill waterfront) are slated for sell-off.

[25] Castells op. cit., pp. 429-468.

[26] Roughly one third of overseas-born men aged 25-44 in these LGAs were earning less than $300 per week in 1996. B. Birrell and B. Seol, 'Sydney's ethnic underclass', *People and Place*, vol. 6, no. 3, 1998

27 DUAP claims that its urban consolidation policy is about offering housing choice, especially smaller dwellings for one and two person households. Its critics counter this by claiming that the traditional single dwelling on a large block is one of the 'choices' being squeezed out. But it could be possible to reinvent this typeform as a low impact model, linked of course to public transport and services planning.