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THE CHARACTER/INTENSIFICATION CONUNDRUM

Melbourne has long figured near the top of two globally significant league tables: world's most livable cities and highest CO2 emissions per capita. Both this highly valued livability and the unsustainably high emissions are linked in large part to lifestyles of low-density car-based suburbs. Such low-density suburbs are often strongly defended against change on the basis of a threat to their ‘character’; yet any serious move towards a low-carbon city must reduce both car-dependency and the distances we need to travel.

Claims about threats to place-identity or character are often used to defend cities against what is seen as inappropriate development, while claims about a future sense of place and community are often used to promote new development. Urban or neighbourhood character has come to play a key role in public discourse and planning decisions, yet it has done so without being grounded in rigorous research. How can valued place-identities be protected as part of the transformation of Australian cities to a more sustainable, resilient future?

While supporters of suburbia live in hope for green cars and public transport to save the suburbs, low-density/low-carbon suburbs are not a viable option for the near future. The best prospect to save the suburbs is to service them with an intensified network of transit-oriented development that brings high frequency public transport within walking distance of everyone. While there is substantial scope for such intensification within existing activity centres and along transit routes, the political reality is that local resident groups are well-organized to prevent what they see as overdevelopment in their neighbourhoods and governments are fearful of losing power in a suburban backlash. With a development industry lobbying for more cheap profits on the urban fringe the response to date has been market-led suburban sprawl at densities too low and layouts too awkward for even minimal public transport. The public debate becomes polarized into those who think intensification is a threat to ‘character’ and those who think that resident democracy is a threat to sustainability.
This research report is focused on how to resolve this livability/low-carbon conundrum—the character/intensification conundrum. How can we better understand this phenomenon of urban or neighbourhood character? Since whatever character the city currently possesses was created by intensification, why is it that further intensification is so often seen as a threat? How can we manage sustainable urban development in a manner that enhances rather than damages urban character? What are the urban design options for transit-oriented development and what are the prospects for a more resilient future for Melbourne, and for all Australian cities?

We begin from the view that urban place identity is not static, fixed or pre-formed; since it is an urban or suburban phenomenon it has emerged from the very process of intensification—it can be damaged or enhanced by further intensification. High quality ‘transit-oriented development’ (TOD) can create greater levels of urban amenity, access and equity along with reduced car dependency, by raising residential densities and intensifying land-uses within walking distance of public transport services.

The urban design and planning research projects summarized herein were funded by the Australian Research Council and a range of Linkage partners. The research was conducted primarily in Melbourne from 2002-10 and incorporates two major funded projects that have led into a third that commenced in late 2010. The initial project (2002-6) entitled ‘What is Urban Character?’ is summarized in part 1 followed by ‘The Character of Urban Intensification’ (2006-10) in part 2. The final section briefly outlines the new project ‘Intensifying Places’, and then outlines the links between this research program and other research and teaching activities within the Melbourne School of Design and the Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning.
PLACE IDENTITY & RESILIENT ASSEMBLAGES

The task of transforming cities to create better urban places and more sustainable urban futures needs to be geared to the development of new concepts for analysing the city—new tools for thought. The research projects outlined in this report have proceeded in parallel with the development of a range of theoretical frameworks.

Place & Identity

Phenomenology is the study of lived experience, the taken-for-granted world of everyday life—the experience of place and home, where conceptions of urban character, place identity and social identity are grounded and constructed. The question of urban character is difficult to define because it is so deep seated—it is a site where habit fuses with habitat and social ideology takes hold. To understand resident resistance to urban change requires that we penetrate beneath NIMBY stereotypes and engage with social processes and the politics of identity formation. Place and identity are dynamic social constructions that we often come to see as fixed and natural, but both are dynamic, changing with each other reflexively. Better understandings of place and identity are fundamental to transforming cities.

Assemblage Theory

Assemblage theory is a loose body of ideas primarily developed by Delanda from a framework of Deleuzian philosophy, through which processes of urban place making and changing are seen in terms of the connections and flows between parts of socio-spatial assemblages—from the micro-urban scale of the dwelling to the macro-urban scale of the city-region. Flows of people, vehicles and goods are linked to flows of desire for profit, views, amenity, sunshine, privacy, open space and access. These desires play out in the politics of urban planning through the interests of developers, residents, retailers, commuters and neighbours, intersecting with, reinforcing and often contradicting each other in ways that are counter to stated policy goals and long-term social and environmental interests. The quality of place (place-identity or urban character) becomes an emergent property of this assemblage.
Resilience Theory

Urban places viewed as socio-spatial assemblages link to theories of resilience and complex adaptive systems, where parts are independent yet interdependent, where outcomes are essentially unpredictable. Resilience theory, largely developed from the sciences of complexity and ecology through the work of Holling, Gunderson and others, involves a focus on the adaptive dynamics of complex socio-spatial systems, cycles of change and multi-scalar interconnectivity. The resilience of the emergent system—a dynamic capacity to adapt to change without slipping into a new regime or identity—is a key concept for understanding resident resistance to change as well as the necessary adaptations to cities for low-carbon futures. The resilience of the system is multi-scalar—parts of the system can adapt to change by initiating or preventing change at lower and higher levels of the system. This is what happens when residents mount political campaigns at metropolitan scale to stop local change, and when the state responds by expanding urban growth boundaries.

Morphological Mapping

These projects have involved significant amounts of urban mapping at a range of scales, with many layers of data. This mapping is more than a research method, it is also a way of thinking about the city and seeing it in new ways. The focus here is not on individual maps but on the relations between them, both actual and potential. Maps are more than simply tracings of states of affairs. The multi-layered database becomes a surrogate city that can be explored and tested for its links, flows, inter- and intra-scalar connections and contradictions—it is a tool for re-thinking the city.
PART 1.
WHAT IS URBAN CHARACTER?
ARC Discovery Project 2002-5

Chief Investigator: Kim Dovey
Research Assistants: Ian Woodcock, Stephen Wood

Urban design issues in Australian cities from the 1990’s onwards have often focused on questions of ‘urban character’. Claims about the threat to ‘urban character’ are used to defend cities against what is seen as ‘inappropriate development’ at every scale from the suburban neighbourhood to small township and central city. While there are clearly economic, social and environmental imperatives for innovative higher density development, such projects often meet powerful resistance from a burgeoning ‘urban character’ movement determined to protect certain qualities and amenities of urban places. This project addresses these issues at both theoretical and practical levels. Urban design projects and regulatory frameworks have a major impact upon the character of the city. Existing urban and suburban areas become subject to pressures for densification through site consolidation, multi-unit projects, lower setbacks, greater bulk and height. Decisions such as those to allow a site amalgamation, additional height or bulk, changes in use and changes to the public/private interface often set in train a series of effects within that district which fundamentally change the urban or neighbourhood ‘character’. Such a concept is notoriously difficult to define, yet it has a currency in urban policy debates which is out of step with the research and theory. ‘Character’ has become a key criterion for decision-making in the absence of clear definition or analysis. Such decisions result in urban design frameworks and guidelines that similarly suffer from a lack of theoretical rigor. While there are a range of research fields which bear upon this issue, such practices of urban transformation proceed in what is largely a research vacuum.

Research Questions

While the movement to protect urban character is primarily one of protecting existing values it can also put a brake on processes of urban change that create urban character in the first place. A key task of this study was to develop an understanding of urban character that will not only protect highly valued places but also the ways in which character is understood in innovative new projects where ‘character’ is self-consciously created.

There were 6 key research questions:
• How is urban or neighbourhood character experienced and understood in everyday life?
• How are such experiences of character constructed in public discourse?
• What is the relationship of character to urban morphology and built form?
• How do the various forces for change impact upon urban character?
• What is the role of architectural and design innovation in the creation of urban character?
• What is the relationship between character and practices of urban regulation?

The project reviewed all of the urban character studies and policies in Melbourne over the preceding 15 years. The focus was on a series of case studies in the Melbourne metropolitan area where either the creation or protection of ‘character’ has been an issue. Fieldwork utilizing urban design mapping techniques was conducted in six areas. Three were older neighbourhoods where urban character was being defended against change (Camberwell, Fitzroy and Hedgeley Dene) while the other three were new neighbourhoods created within the last decade, with a self-conscious desire to create urban character (Beacon Cove, Kensington Banks and Caroline Springs). In-depth interviews were conducted with key residents, planners, architects and developers. An overview of the case studies is provided in the following pages.
Key Findings

Urban Character is Social and Spatial
Urban or neighbourhood character is an emergent property of the relations between people and built form—inherently both social and physical. The everyday experience of character is most commonly captured through words such as the ‘look and feel’ or ‘atmosphere’ of a place—a feeling that has become embodied in neighbourhood form.

Urban Character is Fluid
Definitions of character are fluid, nebulous and often circular (defined as that which is threatened by inappropriate development). Character is often constructed and transformed through the process of contestation over urban planning and urban design.

Urban Character is Multiple
Character can mean many things to different people—resident activists, developers, architects, lawyers and planners. The character of some places is conceived as fixed, purified or closed forms of place identity, while in other places character is described as diverse, mixed and dynamic.

Legislated Character is Problematic
The use of ‘character’ as legal criterion in planning legislation is problematic for three main reasons. Because character is inherently social as well as spatial, objections to the wrong kind of buildings can be used as a cover to exclude the wrong kind of people. The lack of clear definition provides a legal loophole that can open the door to highly damaging developments. Attempts to locate character within urban morphology have a tendency to reduce character to formal characteristics, and can turn character into caricature.

Publications
See pages 52-53 for relevant publications by number: 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 & 23.
CAMBERWELL: Modest Prospects

This case study is focused on the middle-ring suburb of Camberwell where the railway station—
one of the city’s primary transit nodes—has been the subject of fierce resident resistance to change based on protection of character. Interviews with those most involved in this resistance reveal a range of dimensions to the experience and meaning of ‘character’. Character emerges as a ‘consistency’ or ‘uniformity’ of both built forms and people, a socio-spatial ‘comfort zone’ where anything that stands out is seen to violate the character.

This is a place that is being defended against both formal and social differences. Urban character is seen as a legacy inherited from a primarily Victorian and Edwardian past; the values that are seen to prevail are modesty and taste. Camberwell is defended against differences of built form and style but also (more subtly) differences of class and ethnicity.

One contradiction here is that suburban Camberwell is already well controlled by heritage legislation—the railway station site is largely an excavated carpark surrounded by 4 storey buildings. This case study is a good example of a closed conception of place identity and is revealing of the ways in which character can be deployed as part of the politics of place.

Reference:
Interviews

(Characters: 'the feeling it creates in you ... you walk through an area and you feel comfortable with it ... you get a reasonable continuity of single dwelling homes, leafy trees'.

'To me urban character... is actually what’s the general atmosphere, the ambience of an area, which is probably made up of a combination of things, such as types of buildings... vegetation... what’s the actual lifestyle of the area.'

'... a lot of the people like to think of the area as being almost, even though it no longer is, but almost, as a Victorian-Edwardian ... bastion'

'My preference from the point of view of daily living is to be in a low-scale area where I have a sense of my own being and not being dwarfed.'

'(in) Camberwell I’m surrounded by PLU’s - people like us. I see that as a comfort zone.'

'most people ... fit in the Camberwell tribe ... without sort of standing out too much... if a guy drives a bright gold ... Mercedes or BMW ... (people) would walk past and say what a tasteless individual ... and that again I think is part of the character.'

'Some of these Chinese monied people... they come in and they build this wall to wall thing, no garden, just concrete because they’re not used to gardens in Hong Kong, they’re not. So they change the character'
HEDGELEY DENE: Constructing Arcadia

Hedgeley Dene is a neighbourhood in the wealthy middle-ring suburb of East Malvern which became the first place in Victoria to become the subject of a legislated ‘Neighbourhood Character Overlay’. While the defining boundaries of this neighbourhood have been the subject of contention, the site is clearly centred on Hedgeley Dene Gardens, a small linear park that was developed from a creek during the early 20th century. Building styles are mixed with a predominance of interwar housing, generally set behind well-treed gardens but increasingly replaced with multi-unit developments that are seen to damage the ‘character’ of the neighbourhood as a whole and the park in particular.

A highly political process led eventually to the state’s first neighbourhood character legislation in 2003. The legislation ostensibly enacts agreement – between residents, consultants, planners, and local and state government - concerning the particular ‘character’ in need of protection. Yet analysis reveals that parties to this agreement were only sometimes talking about the same thing. For some the issue was protecting the park from overlooking; for others building materials and roof pitch were at stake; some simply wanted to stop multi-unit development. For planning consultants defining character boundaries was an issue of professional expertise; for the Minister for Planning it was politics. This case study reveals the different conceptions of ‘character’ and the manner in which they intersect, overlap, and interfere with one another.

Publication:
Interviews

‘It was actually about that ‘character’ aspect of the neighbourhood … being single dwellings on large blocks … family homes as opposed to multi-unit developments with a transient population …’

‘I liked (the neighbourhood) because it wasn’t 100% uniform, I liked that it hadn’t been ‘got at’… we liked the freedom that gave us at the time. Yeah. We didn’t feel restricted in that sense (of) a streetscape to keep in.’

‘it’s an insult to modern architecture… (to) keep in lock-step to an idea of attic only upstairs, colours and fences designed to fit in with an area that never existed, only existed in someone’s mind.’

you feel like you’re walking by yourself, not subject to any inspection by anyone else … it’s the feeling of … the false … the false sense of being able to get away from the suburbs in such a small space …’

What we found ourselves thinking is how come we’ve got this concept of where we live - its specialness, the choices it offers people - how come no-one else gets it, how come we’ve got to somehow define this…

… people next door can’t build a front fence because the overlay tells them they can’t; … the grass roots people involved were not on about putting stipulations on fences, roofs and colours.
FITZROY: Jazz Grates

In 2002 a highly innovative housing project known as NKYA was proposed for a former industrial site in the inner-city suburb of Fitzroy—a gentrifying district with a mix of functions, building types and heights. The proposal containing a total of 152 apartments and some cafes filling most of an urban block. The proposal was fiercely opposed by residents who dubbed it the ‘cheesegrater’ based on its innovative tapered tower. Yet it was primarily the height that ‘grated’ and was seen to violate the local ‘character’.

The different buildings ranged from 3-8 storeys (peaking at 26 metres) in a context of 1-5 storeys (peaking at 19 metres)—depending on how one defines a ‘storey’ and the ‘context’. The desired ‘character’ of Fitzroy was broadly defined in a 1997 Neighbourhood Character Study as “notable for the consistency of its Victorian streetscapes” and the Council’s local planning framework required that “streetscapes maintain a consistent scale and rhythm”. In his submission, architect/developer (Ivan Rijavec) suggested the opposite, that Fitzroy’s ‘urban character’ was defined by its ‘inconsistencies’—a variegated landscape with juxtapositions of scale, type and style. He suggested that the NKYA proposal was consistent with such an approach which he labelled ‘urban jazz’—inventive, transgressive, multicultural and free-form; unconstrained by neo-colonial ideology or blanket height limits. The Fitzroy character was defined as a variegated ‘mix’ of juxtapositions and differences with which the project was paradoxically ‘consistent’.

Our research shows that this conception of Fitzroy’s ‘character’ as a mix of types, functions and building heights is largely shared by residents; their fierce opposition to the project was in defence of a different conception of the mix. What are the prospects for regulating urban places that are not identified by their uniformities or consistencies? If a valued urban character is produced by an unregulated market then what is the role of regulation in protecting it? To what degree does the discourse of character open or close the city to the formation of new kinds of place identity? And to what degree can such discourse be a cover for damaging market-led development?

Publication:
Interviews

(character is) ‘the feel of a place, what it represents to you, the people the buildings the things that happen there are all part of the urban character’

‘It has that “edge” — that people are interesting, that it has a good atmosphere. It has a sort of a seedy side, a sort of an underbelly that is in a way a little bit scary, but also has a community, it has character and it has depth.’

‘I think you can take some buildings that are three storeys but eight - no. I think that does start to change the village quality that we historically had about Fitzroy.’

‘...you don’t get the sense that people really care what you look like or what you say or how you act because there’s so many different people doing so many different things ...’

‘Fitzroy’s all different ... my house is single fronted, all the houses round here are like that, but two blocks over they look completely different, I don’t think it detracts from the area at all ...’

‘I think it’s fascinating to see the different types of warehouses and creative people are, and generally they keep well within the look and feel of the suburb.’

‘[Fitzroy is] predominantly two-to-three storeys and I think that’s really important to its urban character, the scale ... I think scale is more important than anything ... we have large buildings, we have five or six, but they’re landmark buildings, they’re not the norm.’
BEACON COVE: Loving Legoland

Beacon Cove is a new inner-city waterfront project developed in the late 1990s on a former industrial site within the former seafaring town of Port Melbourne. Here the desired ‘character’ was a key driver of the design process, an instant place identity constructed largely from scratch using models from both the local context as well as ‘new urbanism’ and global prototypes. A limited number of housing types are replicated with many small variations to enclose a series of common parks or ‘greens’. The development is largely protected from through traffic as a ‘soft-gated’ community, turning inwards to construct a uniform character with a sharp formal and social contrast with its Port Melbourne context.

From the beginning Beacon Cove was often seen by outsiders and depicted in the press as a formulised and artificial enclave, constructing an illusory identity rather than ‘real’ urban character. It was designed with a pre-conceived and market-led image, a place where character and identity are manufactured—a socially engineered and class-based happiness linked to the essentialist ideals of the ‘cove’ and the ‘village green’. The project is infused with a series of repetitions of types: buildings, open spaces, behaviours and identities. While disparaged by outsiders for its ‘legoland’ aesthetic, enforced with colour codes and design covenants, the place attracts a largely satisfied market of professional classes. The closure and uniformity of the urban form belies a more complex social reality as the place attracts diverse residents and embodies conflicting desires for both retreat from and engagement with the city. While character was initially constructed using neo-traditional styles, the market turned out to prefer contemporary architecture. While the project turns its back on neighbouring public housing, a remnant street of formerly working-class housing was incorporated into the project (after a long struggle to defend it) and some residents now proudly point to it as a signifier of the real character of Beacon Cove.
Interviews

‘Beacon Cove, although it’s not constructed that way, could be seen to have certain elements of a
gated community ... there’s limited access points’.

‘People have said to me... it looks like a stage set, a film set... well ‘legoland’ perhaps... We love liv-
ing in Legoland!

‘We are kind of subverting the covenants. Everyone does it to an extent. If we painted the front
facades pink they’d come down on us like a ton of bricks, but they’re not stopping people doing
doors.’

‘people came here from ...places ...where they weren’t accepted into the character of that area un-
less they’d been there 30 or 40 years. Because we all came together... the community feeling was
established at a fairly early stage.’

(open space)’ I don’t use it a lot... but I find it very pleasurable to know that I can go out there at
any time. And I glance out, say late afternoon, that’s when its in full-use. People are home from
work, they’ve got their wine in their hands, they’ve got their dogs running around. That to me is
lovely.’

‘I don’t say I live in ‘Beacon Cove’... I didn’t like it that this little estate was being given a name. I
don’t think I’ve ever used the name.’
KENSINGTON BANKS: Walking Contradiction

Kensington Banks is a recent inner-city housing development on the site of a former abattoir driven by the ideal of a walkable ‘urban village’ influenced by the ideas of ‘new urbanism’. This is a public/private partnership driven by public interests such as community participation, sustainability, diversity, walkability, affordability and open space—all strongly mediated by market imperatives. Key ideas included relatively low-rise small-grain development and a diversity of house types fronting generous open space. The ‘character’ of Kensington Banks as understood by its most active residents is formed out of the intersections of these often-contradictory values and imperatives. The project has been conceived for a mix of household types and social classes (including public housing) yet the market has determined that it has become dominated by young singles. The very generous provision of open space and walkable networks is underutilized, yet pedestrian-oriented design has largely strangled car transport producing traffic jams in peak hour. The open space is often lined with housing that ‘faces’ the park yet is entered from the ‘rear’; back lanes lined with garages have become the main entries while the ‘front’ becomes symbolic. Perhaps most tragically the ideals of the urban ‘village’ have been deployed at a density too low for shops or public transport—the ‘village green’ without the village.
Interviews

‘We find that in this estate particularly there’s not a lot of character ... it doesn’t have that interaction that we’re looking for ... there’s not that feeling’.

‘This block’s a hundred square metres we’re sitting on and I’ve got a very adequate lifestyle here.’

‘I think you’ve got the illusion of participating, probably without having to... There is a tendency to like having people around and to enjoy that sense of community but without having to actually get involved in it ...’

‘These young Asian tenants up the end here, they got their garage full of all this shit... they can’t keep their garbage cans in their garage, they leave it out in the street... and I say to these people, ...”we’re trying to keep the streetscape looking like a ‘mews’.” [in mock-Asian accent] “Oh! I did no understand”.’

‘It’s open space but not really open space ... this is not somewhere I’d say “Let’s go and sit in the park” ‘cos everybody’s houses look on it. As if that park belongs to those houses ... why would you want to sit and look at somebody else’s house? I also feel like a privacy invader.’

[The street network in Kensington Banks] is just a maze. If I went of the beaten track, I myself would get lost. There’s just no logic to it ... there’s no system ...’
CAROLINE SPRINGS: Faith and Covenants

From 1995 a flat and featureless plain of thistles on the outskirts of Melbourne was transformed into a burgeoning suburb comprised of a series of ‘villages’ surrounding parks and lakes with names to match—‘Brookside’, ‘Springlake’, ‘The Bridges’. With their keynote slogan of ‘creating special places’ the developers, Delfin, have marketed and created a vision of place identity and character in which residents invest their faith. Caroline Springs is strongly market-led and privately controlled; a consistency of character within each of the ‘villages’ is a key to marketability and is strictly controlled through detailed covenants. Consistency of housing type and bulk is coupled with an enforced diversity of housing styles—a broad range of neo-traditional and contemporary. This mix of different characters within a common covenant reflects a market of social and ethnic differences.

This is a suburb that claims to be different, to escape the conformity and consistency of suburbia with a stronger sense of place, community, identity, security and home. Caroline Springs has a low density and poor public transport, yet it also seeks to import an image of urbanity through higher density housing types such as inner city ‘warehouses’. Interviewees speak of the ‘faith’ they had in Delfin’s vision and the swift creation of community and place identity. Yet interviews also suggest an ethos of self-reliance, self-creation and self-expression—individuality rather than community; an evolving rather than instant character. Some ‘villages’ are clearly more upmarket than others and residents are very alert to status. This is a place of aspirations with an ethos of self-reliance, self-creation and social status; climbing the ladder of opportunity involves moving from house to house and village to village.
Interviews

Everyone who moves in ... has to be willing and wanting to be community minded’.

‘Just something about it. You know you drive in some places and it makes you feel at home, and you drive in other places it makes you feel - I really can’t explain it, why.’

‘You can’t really beat a row of period homes. You can go into really nice streets around the eastern suburbs, lovely array of period homes together.’

You go down the street and don’t see the same house, hardly anywhere... And they are doing warehouses. They went berserk.’

‘People really complain that covenants aren’t enforced... they get really shitty, this house is letting the whole street down... because that’s the community, that’s what we bought into.’

‘The houses are very much like each other. I mean different varieties, but you wouldn’t walk past this one and say oh this one belongs to an Indian, this one belongs to a Maltese. Nothing stands out for me that says that that belongs to a different nationality.’
Abstract:
Public debate periodically erupts over definitions of urban graffiti as either ‘street art’ or ‘vandalism’. Our focus in this paper is on the ways graffiti is seen by residents to contribute to or damage urban character or place identity. Through interviews and mapping in two case studies of inner-city Melbourne we examine the ways graffiti infiltrates particular urban contexts. The paper maps the ways the potential for different types of graffiti – tags, throwups, stencils, pasteups and pieces – is mediated by the micro-morphology of the city and its public/private interfaces. We explore the ways graffiti negotiates ambiguous territories combining public/private, visible/invisible, street/laneway and art/advertising. The paper also explores the intersecting and often conflicting desires to establish territory, to avoid arrest, to create art, to purify the neighbourhood, to create and protect urban character. The paper concludes that the contribution of graffiti to urban character and place intensity in some locations is seen by residents as profoundly, but not exclusively, positive. The desire to erase graffiti is productive of new work; the desire to promote or protect it is more problematic.

PART 2. THE CHARACTER OF URBAN INTENSIFICATION: Protecting and creating place-identity in activity centres

ARC Linkage Project   LP0669652   2006-2010

Chief Investigator:   Kim Dovey
Research Fellow:   Ian Woodcock
APAI PhD Scholar:   Gethin Davison
                       Ammon Beyerle (2009)
Linkage Partners:   Dept of Planning & Community Development
                      Cities of Melbourne, Moreland and Yarra

Research Questions

Intensified land use near mass-transit nodes within existing urbanised areas is a key strategy for the sustainability of Australian cities. A major barrier to such development often lies in resident resistance to densification based on the protection of neighbourhood ‘character’. This project, in collaboration with state and local government, conducted a multi-scalar analysis of Melbourne’s latent intensification potential related to activity centres and transit lines, and investigated three activity centres in the Melbourne metropolitan area where both the protection of existing character and the creation of new forms of place-identity are key issues. The project contributes to our understanding of both resistance to density and the place-making opportunities that emerge in activity centre development.

The primary objectives of the project were to investigate the relationship between three related issues:
1. to understand the conditions that densification in activity centres will produce;
2. to understand the ways that densified activity centres may interface with residential hinterlands,
3. the role of place-identity in such processes of urban change management.

The main research questions were at once both theoretical and practical. The three main phenomena the project sought to understand are: a) the extent to which potentials for sustainable urban place-making are limited by existing place-identity; b) the effects of densification on ‘urban character’, and c) how the concept of character itself mediates processes of densification. These phenomena were studied via a multiplicitous methodology employing morphological mapping, qualitative interviews and discourse analysis to answer primary questions about residents’ experiences of place identity, the regulation of place identity and the creation of activity centres.

We undertook a series of case studies, primarily within the jurisdictions of our Linkage partners, in Brunswick, Fitzroy and Blackburn/Nunawading. Early findings led to an expansion of scope of the project with a broader dataset and a more comprehensive multi-scalar understanding of the issues associated with urban intensification with both a metropolitan scope and a series of inter-related components at urban design scales. This work built on mappings of transit accessibility within the northern metropolitan
region and patterns of intensification and resistance across the metropolitan area, as well as an investigation of the intensification capacity of activity centres and transit lines. The project has been geared to a number of urban design studios taught (by Ian Woodcock) within the Melbourne School of Design where students have engaged with issues of urban intensification on case study sites related to this project. Students have utilized the project research base to develop urban design visions and strategies which have in turn been used as a basis for community engagement and feedback as part of this research. The student work has appeared in public exhibitions and public meetings have been held to stimulate public debate. The work has also appeared on interactive web sites where resident responses have been elicited. The project has incorporated PhD Scholar Gethin Davison who has conducted a parallel benchmarking study of issues of character and place identity through four global case studies (UK, USA, Canada, Australia).

The final stage of the project has involved the development of a series of urban design simulations for two key Activity centres (Richmond and Balwyn). Based on these and other simulations a range of interviews were conducted with representatives of resident action groups from across the Melbourne Metropolitan area covering a large number of Melbourne’s suburbs. Interviewees were asked to respond to these design visions for intensification of Melbourne’s primary public transit-corridors and activity centres, with imagery derived from the metropolitan-wide capacity studies.

Key Findings

During the course of this project, issues of urban intensification have become more salient for Australian cities as questions of population growth, urban infrastructure and climate change have risen to the top of the political agenda. Key findings of the project include the following:

Intensification does not mean high-rise
Our capacity modelling suggests that Melbourne’s population targets can be achieved through transit-oriented development (within existing urban areas) at heights of about 4-5 storeys in the larger activity centres and along transit corridors.

Residents can accept urban change
Most resident activists are open to change if sharp juxtapositions and transformations of bulk and height can be avoided. The main resident opposition to intensified development in Melbourne applies to bulk and height of 6 or more storeys.

Planning process matters
Since urban ‘character’ is always both social and physical, the ways in which resident opposition plays out has a lot to do with the development process – both ‘character’ and resident resistance can be constructed through this process.

Height and setback make a difference
Building heights, setbacks and development take-up rates are key salient variables in relation to the acceptability of intensified streetscapes.

The planning system needs reform
Victoria’s planning system is not an effective governance framework for implementation of intensification policy, tending to produce both an escalation of conflict and land speculation.

Publications
See pages 52-53 for relevant publications by number: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 & 24
BRUNSWICK: The People’s Republic

Forming a large part of the inner-Northern suburbs of Melbourne, Brunswick was first surveyed in 1830, and is one of the city’s oldest suburbs. Brunswick’s initial growth was rapid as a manufacturing and service centre, capitalizing on the flows of people to the Victorian goldfields. Much of the suburb’s housing dates from the pre-WW1 period, with narrow-frontage single-storey terraces and small free-standing worker cottages, and many streets are a mixture of residential and industrial stock. Brunswick also displays a range of higher-density housing types found elsewhere in Melbourne – low-rise units on sub-divided houseblocks; ‘six packs’ up to three storeys from the 1970s and ‘80s, and more recently townhouses and warehouse conversions. In the last decade, small numbers of four to five storey apartments have replaced industrial buildings and appeared as infill on or close to Brunswick’s three major activity corridors, all of which are major public transit routes, and all predominantly single or double storey. In recent years, proposals for significantly larger and denser development along these corridors, of between 7 and 16 storeys have all met with fierce opposition.

Brunswick has a colourful history of left-wing politics, multiculturalism and community activism that gave rise to its nickname ‘The People’s Republic’, though in recent years, Brunswick has become the rapidly gentrifying southern end of the rather disadvantaged municipality of Moreland. Brunswick’s ethnic diversity is declining due to an influx of young professionals, couples without children, group households, and people living alone. Proposals for intensification are frequently met with trenchant resident opposition to change.

Interviews with those involved in this opposition reveal a range of dimensions to the meaning of Brunswick’s character and the ways in which it is seen as threatened by development. The place-identity of Brunswick is seen through a series of themes such as chaos, mix, and community. Brunswick’s history as a place of progressive left-wing politics and multiculturalism provides fertile ground for understanding some of the paradoxes of place-identity.
Interviews

‘Brunswick is chaotic and it’s crazy and it’s noisy and it’s smelly and it’s all that stuff, sometimes that stuff really gets to me, but... if we got rid of all the trams and the traffic and the light industry it wouldn’t be Brunswick... And the people are crazy and chaotic and all over the place’

‘We walk a lot, to the shops, to school, to kinder, we walk to the parks... seeing familiar faces, on nodding recognition, you feel like you’re part of it, when you’re on the street... you’re really part of Brunswick’

‘It felt like [VCAT was] going “Brunswick is not special, Brunswick is open slather, such a mess of industrial and other things”... a green light to developers to do whatever they want... because it’s not a consistently special place where everyone’s got heritage colours’

‘The two really big buildings ... they actually [wouldn’t] affect my little northern backyard... I’m pretty safe where I am in this context, but I didn’t like what it was doing to the neighbourhood’

‘... people going up in lifts and driving into carparks, they’re not connecting with the neighbourhood in the same way... that scares me... into your own thing and not taking any notice of what goes on around you’

‘I would like to see [old buildings] incorporated into new projects. Even if they add 2-3 storeys on top, even if not sympathetic... Whereas knocking something down, plonking something... that could be anywhere’
NOT IN MY REPUBLIC: Resident opposition to intensification in inner-city Melbourne

Abstract:

Brunswick is an inner-northern suburb of Melbourne, long a centre of leftist politics that is colloquially known by insiders as the ‘People’s Republic of Brunswick’. There is currently a high level of contestation over the approval of new multi-unit housing development. Based on interviews with residents who have been involved in resistance to such development, this paper explores the ways Brunswick is experienced and the characteristics of developments that are opposed. The defence of Brunswick is not primarily a NIMBY syndrome; residents are generally defending a broad sense of place and community rather than the amenity of their private property or immediate neighbourhood. This place has few boundaries or centres and is interpreted as a series of overlapping ‘fields care’. Large-scale development is seen to threaten the sense of community as sustained by certain building types and public/private interfaces. The urban character of Brunswick is widely described as a mix of different people (ages and ethnicities) linked to a mix of building types (houses, factories, flats) and functions (industry, commerce, retail, residential). While the planning scheme requires that neighbourhood character be protected, the somewhat inconsistent and chaotic mix that residents are trying to defend is paradoxically seen from the outside as a lack of urban character. Thus the mixed character that is so valued within Brunswick becomes an excuse for the Planning Tribunal to approve its transformation.

Compact city policies such as Melbourne 2030 have been established in Australia for a range of reasons including climate change. It is now clear that the Melbourne 2030 policy has not been effective – with new development mostly on the urban fringe. This policy failure has often been sheeted home to resident and local government resistance to densification. This narrative is insufficient to explain this failure at a metropolitan-wide scale, and it is clearly mistaken in one suburb where aspects of the planning system appear to thwart the aims of strategic policy by encouraging speculation and producing vacant sites. Brunswick is an inner-city suburb with good opportunities for intensification adjacent to transit lines and on former industrial sites. In spite of resident resistance, 80% of new dwellings proposed were approved for construction between 2002 and 2007 that would have increased housing stock by 13%. By 2009 just under half of all approved dwellings had commenced construction with construction of the taller and higher density projects tending to stall. Many such sites have been on-sold with permits extended. We suggest developers anticipate that the Planning Tribunal will approve significant increases in height and density, using Melbourne 2030 to over-ride local policy. Such permits produce significant capital gains that can be cashed without construction. The planning system encourages ambit claims, contestation, cynicism and speculation as it thwarts negotiations between residents, councils and developers towards a more compact city. The idea that resident resistance is the problem obscures the role the planning system itself plays in frustrating the goals of Melbourne 2030.

EXTENSIVE INTENSITY:
Brunswick Major Activity Centre Studio
Postgraduate Urban Design/Architecture Studio 2007
led by Ian Woodcock
Studio URL: www.abp.unimelb.edu.au/re-imagining-brunswick/

‘Melbourne 2030,’ the Metropolitan planning strategy for Melbourne was based on the idea that the inevitable significant population increases in the city can best be accommodated by intensification of ‘activity centres’ – i.e. places that are centres of commercial, community and cultural activity that are well-served by public transport.

We wanted to know what this might mean for Brunswick, one of Melbourne’s ‘iconic’ inner-city suburbs, a place that is very well-served by public transport almost everywhere, and a place with a lot of ‘character’ of various kinds. Could its character be both protected as well as enhanced, and could there also be room for significant change that worked to intensify that character, rather than replace it or destroy it?

Students spent 6 weeks (half a semester) researching Brunswick’s character through intensive fieldwork, some of which is illustrated here. They analysed this character in various ways and selected specific precincts as the basis of projects that would explore ways that Brunswick might accommodate significant change and become a more intense version of the way it is now. Each of these precincts already has its own character and the proposals sought to build on that particular set of qualities, though the futures imagined are quite different to what is there now.

While student work is often concerned with producing ‘edgy’ or ‘avante-garde’ buildings, the primary concern was to envision realistic environments that would dramatically improve how those places work, socially, environmentally, culturally, economically. Where the students have been radical is to imagine a future that is driven by a different set of priorities than currently prevail.

These are quite simple:
1. That planning and design can work from a hierarchy that puts pedestrians, cyclists and public transport first, and the private car last.
2. That one of a designer’s roles is to imagine possible futures and if these capture the public imagination, it is the role of governments, engineers and accountants to work out how to make them happen.

An exhibition of the design projects was held at The Brunswick Town Hall for 2 weeks in November 2007 (supported by Moreland City Council in the interests of fostering discussion and debate) and opened by Cr. Jo Conellan, which included a community Q & A session attended by about 40 local people. The drawings were also exhibited at Thousand Buddhas Cafe, 302 Sydney Road Brunswick between 7th January and 15th February 2008.
Above and Right:
New public plaza with intermodal transit exchange
Students: Rosie Spasevska, Claire Oliver & Joanna Lee

Redevelopment of precinct incorporating Jewell Railway Station and Barkly Sq, Shopping Centre
Students: Brett Hudson, Belle Wang, Cheryl Lim & Mandy Too

Arts and cultural precinct related to new laneways
Students: Alan Ting, Indah Mutia, Victoria Noble & Rosanna Ceravolo

Low-Rise High Density corridor intensification
Students: Rosie Spasevska, Claire Oliver & Joanna Lee
RE-IMAGINING FITZROY: Atherton Gardens Studio

M.Arch Urban Design/Architecture Studio 2008
Led by Ian Woodcock
Studio URL: www.abp.unimelb.edu.au/re-imagining-fitzroy/

Fitzroy is one of Melbourne’s oldest and smallest inner-city suburbs, and heritage overlays cover almost 100% of it. With a diverse urban morphology that is a legacy of an industrial past development before the advent of planning controls, Fitzroy has a strong history of resident activism on issues such as freeways, high-rise housing and social justice. Fitzroy also has some of the best access to the public transport system in Melbourne and is one of the city’s most sought-after places to live. Like much of inner-city Melbourne, some parts were redeveloped in the 1960s and ‘70s with high-rise modernist public housing. Although Fitzroy is one of Melbourne’s denser suburbs, it currently accommodates half the population it did in the early 20th century. A third of Fitzroy residents live in the Atherton Gardens public housing estate, which contains the only significant open space in the area. Increasingly, this public asset has become an enclave—socially and spatially. Atherton Gardens is bordered by the emerging arts and cultural precinct of Gertrude St, and effectively forms part of two of inner-city Melbourne’s iconic strips (Brunswick St and Smith St), both designated Major Activity Centres under the Metropolitan Strategy Melbourne 2030, both places of intense development pressure and passionate resident engagement. While many other inner-city high-rise estates had already commenced the process of redevelopment, we were not aware of any plans for Atherton Gardens. We saw this as an opportunity to explore future possibilities in the absence of pressure from an actual development proposal heightening local sensitivities and politics.

There are precious few sites left in Fitzroy where major sustainability initiatives can be made. Atherton Gardens is a key site to explore what could be possible. The students investigated possibilities for the re-urbanization of the Atherton Gardens/Town Hall precinct with the aim of engaging community stakeholders in a discussion about its future. The brief to the students was premised on a few core principles: to double the number of dwellings currently on the site and to maintain or increase the quantity of social housing; to minimise disruption of existing residents; and to improve the integration of the estate with the surrounding neighbourhood. There were three teams who explored the following options: keeping all four towers; keeping the two towers on Napier St; removing all four towers.

Rather than a blank slate, the students envisaged a set of possibilities to facilitate discussion. In addition to an exhibition at Fitzroy Town Hall and one at the Fitzroy Library (both adjacent to Atherton Gardens), the designs were put on the Faculty web site and the URL advertised locally to receive resident comments.
Clockwise from the top left hand corner: Building heights; Land uses; Travel time to city; Street interface typology; Grain Size; Net residential density.
RE-IMAGINING FITZROY: Resident Responses

‘The towers keep Fitzroy real!’

‘A really interesting and intelligent approach to space, land use and public housing. Nice that implementation would be straightforward and nice too that quality of life for tenants is a prime consideration. This is the sort of discussion we should be having in the community and one hopes that the next stage is constructive discussion with DHS and the government. Well done!’

‘Some impressive work – interesting concepts. I think that, as several students suggest, the towers should be retained and enhanced. They are an important part of the character of Fitzroy. Also, realistically, once they go, then the public housing will inevitably go too’
‘Prefer no towers – redevelop site with mix of public and private housing – keep it low rise!’

I like the idea of bringing the resident’s closer to the ground (accessibility) and the retention of some green space despite the increase in number of houses. I am concerned that the new frontage could ‘hide’ the public housing, providing a modern Brunswick St face to the oft-criticised public housing.

Going to Fitzroy is a cultural experience. It is a last vestige of the Boheim in Melbourne given that St Kilda has now become “soulless.” The site you have chosen is what actually keeps Fitzroy real. I think the designs are too sleek/ modern and cold. They have no touch base with the café latte ambience that makes Fitzroy special. These designs seem to lack the warmth and feel of the area and are at odd with the alternative “vibe.”
TRANSECT 201: Johnston Street Studio
... or ... what if everyone did that?
M.Arch Urban Design/Architecture Studio 2010
Led by Ian Woodcock

This studio utilized design-as-research methods to explore a series of questions about, and scenarios for the future of Melbourne’s commercial strips, using the major inner-city artery of Johnston/Elgin St as a test-ground. The development of a zoom-imagination that moves freely from the bird’s-eye to the streetview, from the urban strategy to the architectural detail was a primary objective of the studio process.

The intellectual agenda was linked to two major Australian Research Council research grants within the Faculty – ‘The character of urban intensification’ and ‘Planning the Creative City’. The former investigated the capacity for sustainable transformation of Australian cities focused on major transit corridors (how dense, how high, how much?). The latter is interested in the links between urban vitality/creativity and morphology/typology. This studio investigated the role that urban architectural design can play in these important, topical issues – understanding and inventing urban and architectural typologies that promote incremental urban compaction (what, where, how?). Is architecture necessarily the handmaiden of a gentrified, beige city? Or can certain kinds of typologies (especially those whose repetition is greater than their sum) lead to built environments conducive to difference, exchange, vitality—in short, urbanity?

The studio methodology involved structured fieldwork and mapping, analytic esquisses, theory seminars, urban strategies/scenario visioning, typological/precedent studies and architectural design of a series of interventions to test rigorously propositions developed as the studio progressed. Engagement with the local community along Johnston Street will be sought for feedback on the scenarios, via a public exhibition and website. The question: “what if everyone did that?”, often a normative rhetoric prohibiting transgression is here intended to extend architectural thinking beyond the focus on the unique and individualistic to the potential that iterability and repetition have for architecture’s framing of creative sociality.
Students: George Stavrias, Sarah Delamore, Lindsey Yen Li Ong, Andrew Carija & Philip Cheung
INTENSIFYING THE MEGAMILE: Blackburn/Nunawading Studio

B.Arch Urban Design/Architecture Studio
Led by Ian Woodcock
Studio URL: www.abp.unimelb.edu.au/megamile/

Blackburn and Nunawading are railway stations on the Lilydale-Belgrave line and are located at either end of a long commercial/industrial strip. The gap between stations creates the opportunity for a new train station and the light industrial land zoning creates the opportunity for substantial intensification. This case study was primarily based on an urban design studio. A range of visions produced by undergraduate students were mounted on an interactive website and resident response was elicited and collated.
Resident Responses

Just love the idea of being able to access this area without travelling on Springvale Road, which immediately makes it pedestrian and cycling friendly. It is so close by to where I live and an easy bike trip, but not one that I’d make with children currently as we’d need to travel down Springvale Road. With some street beautification work, this could be a really pleasant family friendly area.

I know architects love buildings, but why would you enclose Blackburn Village? It is much better as an open air experience.

Fantastic! It will be a dream come true to have the new station (and directly below Whitehorse Rd). Megamile is artificially divided by the Whitehorse Rd (no crossing) and inaccessible by public transport (no bus or direct train linkage)

Cyclist, pedestrian access, supermarket, community facilities are fantastic. But oops .... am I going to loose my home? Nevertheless the concepts are great.

Great. Connecting north and south is badly needed. We now feel that BBNorth and BBSouth are separate suburbs! Urban vegie gardens (in pic) are fantastisc.

Yes! Mix of employment, residential, entertainment, community is definitely the way to go.

My comments are on the entire project. Great ideas and if the Whitehorse city council adopts them, the entire area will be transformed dynamically and oozing ambience. As a resident in this location, I can’t wait to see these proposals come to fruition and the transformation that will be brought to our city and our lives.

The Megamile should be made more pedestrian friendly. As someone who actually walks to the Megamile, it obvious that it hasn’t been designed with pedestrians in mind. There are many points where you’re crossing entrances to car parks and the like, as well as ‘rough paths’.
SPACE-TIME MAPPING:
Isochrones & pools of access

One part of this project involves the production of time-space maps that model the potential for flows of pedestrians and public transport throughout those parts of the city represented by our Linkage Partners. These maps show how the structure of pedestrian networks together with public transport routes and timetables mediate the time required for travel to and from the central city. The coloured bands (isochrones) on the map show the travel time in minutes via the quickest route on either train or tram, including walking and waiting time at the most convenient stop. These maps enable us to read the relative pools of accessibility via public transit to and from the central city, and allow them to be mapped against the locations of designated activity centres. The map shows a highly uneven accessibility landscape and reveals that a number of areas of high transit-related accessibility could be designated as activity centres beyond those already determined by strategic policy development activities at local and state level. Two striking examples are Nicholson St, Brunswick East (which has since been incorporated into the Brunswick Major Activity Centre structure plan) and Clifton Hill. These maps reflect a form of urban phenomenology, but they are rather static in the sense that they privilege access to the central city and do not show the broader range of inter- and intra-suburban pools of access to and from the full scope of activity centres across the metropolitan area. This research is not complete, has not been published and we hope to extend it in future programs.
METROPOLITAN CAPACITY MODELLING

A major metropolitan modelling task was undertaken using GIS to quantify the latent capacities for intensified urban development in activity centres and along transit lines within the former growth boundaries of Melbourne. All land parcels within the main (Major, Principal & Specialised) Activity Centres and land contiguous with tram, train and the main orbital bus route were quantified and then either selected or discounted on the basis of developability without impacting on heritage, residential character, open space provision, or for inappropriate land-use or other technical reasons. The main aim of the exercise was to better understand the challenge of meeting projected population targets through intensification of the existing urbanised area rather than continuing to build on greenfield land on the urban fringe. The major findings were that accommodating an additional million people or 600,000 households can be done by building close to existing services and public transport, thus utilizing only 7% of the metropolitan land area, and at net residential densities equivalent to many of Melbourne’s most desired older inner suburbs. This suggests that accommodating the current population projections for Melbourne by building up rather than out can be achieved without high-rise, and with a much better distribution of economic and social benefits.

On 6,300 Ha, 600,000 new dwellings would produce average net density of ~130 DU/Ha @ 60% take-up
MODELLING THE COMPACT CITY

Abstract:
The metropolitan planning strategy ‘Melbourne 2030’ was released in 2002 as a major step towards a low-carbon city and a counter to urban sprawl; it provides for intensification of land-use within an urban growth boundary focused on activity centres and transit-oriented development. It is now widely acknowledged that this policy has not been implemented and the growth boundary has been expanded substantially. A primary reason for this failure is the government’s fear of electoral backlash if Melbourne’s much-loved urban ‘character’ is transformed. There has been a lack of both capacity modelling to show how the existing fabric can be densified, and of realistic urban design visions that might stimulate the electorate’s imagination. This paper seeks to quantify the capacities for compact growth and to use these measures as frameworks for understanding the urban design opportunities embodied in such responses to climate change. Using a combination of GIS mapping and digital modelling tools, scenarios based on transit-related planning principles and urban design criteria are explored as a basis for understanding resident responses. The key finding of this study is that Melbourne does not need a particularly radical change to its built form in order to achieve substantial increases in density. Modest height limits of 4-5 storeys along transit lines are easily enough to accommodate the projected growth. If height controls can be properly enforced then this can be done democratically and without an electoral backlash. The political paranoia that paralyses implementation of Melbourne 2030 is unnecessary.

This part of the project seeks to understand how the modelling explored above might translate into urban design scenarios and visions for specific streetscapes in Melbourne. Two modes of representation were used. First was a series of existing streetscape images supplemented with abstracted images of different scenarios of bulk and height envelopes in two different places. Here we varied three parameters of height, setback and development take-up rates. Second, with agreement from our Linkage Partners City of Melbourne we tested a small range of singular images of fully developed urban design streetscape visions. In interviews with resident activists we explored the different levels of acceptability and the urban experiences that these images evoked. In these primarily 1-2 storey locations, the bulk and height visions appear to cross a very blurred threshold of unacceptability when they rise from 4-6 storeys without a setback. The detailed streetscape visions, by contrast, are regarded as more acceptable despite a greater bulk and height but can produce cynicism. A key question here concerns the effectiveness of different forms of simulation within a political field predicated on a desire for accurate simulations of urban futures.
GLOBAL BENCHMARKING: Changing Places

APAI PhD Scholar Gethin Davison

APAI Scholar Gethin Davison successfully completed his PhD entitled ‘Changing Places: A Question of Character’ in 2010, with highly complementary reports from leading international scholars as Examiners. The key findings include the ways that resident concerns about transformations of urban character can be either ameliorated or escalated by design and development processes. Gethin’s thesis, findings and publications are outlined on the following pages:

Urban intensification is one of the key planning strategies of the early twenty-first century, but proposals for intensification projects in established urban places are frequently resisted by community members on the basis that they would be ‘out of character’. Through empirical research in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States, this study explored the factors underlying this resistance and the ways in which the character of a place might be enhanced, rather than damaged, by the process of intensification.

Four case studies were undertaken in four different countries: Subiaco (Australia), Collingwood (Canada), Dalston (Great Britain) and Fruitvale (USA). In each of these places, the design and development of an urban intensification project was either shaped by a conception of the existing character, or else it was resisted by community members in defence of that character, sometimes both. Prior to redevelopment, Subiaco was a highly-valued inner-city suburb of Perth with an extensive stock of heritage buildings, a busy commercial centre and leafy residential streets. Collingwood was a low-density and predominantly low-income suburb of Eastside Vancouver. Dalston was a socio-economically polarised and culturally mixed London district with a cheek-by-jowl mix of public housing and gentrified nineteenth century dwellings. Fruitvale was a low-income Californian neighbourhood with a culturally diverse population and a reputation for crime. The various ways in which these four places were transformed by intensification over the past fifteen years were the subject of the thesis.

The meanings of character, the reasons for resistance to change, and the way that processes of urban planning and design were able, or unable, to respond to those meanings and concerns were explored in each place. The approach to empirical research combined semi-structured interviews, discourse analysis, focus-group sessions, morphological mapping, photography and observational analysis.
Key Findings

Resident conceptions of character in the four case studies were found to be based more in social measures and everyday experiences of place than they were in features of physical form and appearance. Resistance to change was usually linked to concerns about social change or a loss of place-distinctiveness. In Dalston and Subiaco, resident resistance to intensification was greatly exacerbated by a lack of community involvement in the decision-making process. In some cases, the existing character of a place was reinforced by intensification, in others new character was created. In all four cases, the question of whether character had been enhanced or damaged as a result of intensification was a subject of considerable debate. Overall, the findings suggest that whilst there are significant opportunities for intensification to enhance, rather than damage, the character of a place, this is unlikely to be achieved without genuine community consultation due to differences in the way that character is variously conceived by community members, planners, architects and developers.

Publications
DALSTON CASE STUDY, London

In the East-London neighbourhood of Dalston, a mixed-use redevelopment project, strongly supported by local authorities, was fiercely resisted by community members who argued that its character was being violated. The proposed project involved the redevelopment of two dilapidated sites to provide residential and retail uses, a new rail station, bus interchange, library and an area of public open space. It was found that resident resistance in this case was not simply a case of self-interested NIMBYism, but a product of important differences in the ways that character was variously constructed and valued by local authorities, architects, developers and community members. The character of Dalston was generally conceived as mixed and transient, but was also contested both within and from without.

FRUITVALE CASE STUDY, Oakland

In the inner-Oakland neighbourhood of Fruitvale, the process of planning and designing an intensification project was shaped by a conceived ‘Latino’ character. The ‘Fruitvale Village’ project was driven by a Latino-based community organisation who argued that its architecture and design should reflect Fruitvale’s history as a destination for Latino immigrants. The project references the California Mission-Revival architectural style and incorporates tiles, fountains, a paved plaza and a number of Latino-oriented businesses, events and institutions. It was found that whilst Fruitvale Village has successfully reinforced Fruitvale’s Latino character, the effects of this change have been to marginalise non-Latino residents (who comprised almost half the population) and to preclude the possibility that a multicultural character might develop.
SUBIACO CASE STUDY, Perth

In the inner-Perth suburb of Subiaco, the planning and design of a major intensification project was explicitly shaped by the highly-valued character of its surroundings, but many long-standing residents claim that the project is out of character nonetheless. The eighty hectare ‘Subi Centro’ project was informed and regulated by a set of purpose-made architectural, planning and urban design guidelines that specified detailed criteria for the project’s physical form and appearance. It was found that whilst many features of Subiaco’s physical character had been successfully replicated or reproduced as a result, there were important elements of its social and experiential character that had not. Opinion remains divided in Subiaco and in many ways the project has done more to divide the city than it has to unite it.

COLLINGWOOD CASE STUDY, Vancouver

In Collingwood, the process of urban intensification was shaped by a collaborative vision of neighbourhood character. Following a proposal for the redevelopment of an eleven hectare site adjacent to a transit station, a series of public education and consultation sessions were held. Through these, community members ultimately negotiated for an increase in development density in exchange for increased levels of community infrastructure. The outcome was a high-rise project that incorporates a range of new community facilities and open spaces. Long-standing community members claim that despite a clear contrast between the appearance of the project and its surroundings, the new facilities it provides have greatly enhanced the neighbourhood’s social character.
INTENSIFYING PLACES:
Transit-oriented urban design for resilient
Australian cities
ARC Linkage Project 2010-13

Chief Investigators: Kim Dovey (University of Melbourne)
Shane Murray (Monash University)

Partner Investigators: Geoffrey London (OVGA, University of WA)
Rob Adams (City of Melbourne, University of Melbourne)

Research Fellow: Ian Woodcock

Research Assistants: Lee-Ann Khor, Matthew Chan, Dave O’Reilly.

Industry partners: Office of the Victorian Government Architect
Department of Planning and Community Development
Department of Transport, Cities of Melbourne,
Moreland and Darebin, MGS Architects, David Lock
Associates, Aspect Studios.

Funding: ARC $408,000
Industry Partners $244,500

This project continues many of the research questions engaged in the earlier projects and initiates
new ones. In particular it will develop and test a range of urban design frameworks and visions,
focusing on transit-oriented development in areas most likely to achieve densification as well as
associated capacity gains for public transit. The research emphasis will be on design quality, the
sense of place created or enhanced by design intervention, and importantly, the interface between
such intensified places and surrounding suburban neighbourhoods. A major component of the
project will be investigating the forms of governance most suited to effective implementation of
transit-oriented development to achieve community acceptance and quality outcomes. A limited
series of case studies covering various types and scales of transit-oriented activity centre will be
investigated using design research approaches that will enable the lessons learned to be applied
more broadly to other sites and cities within Australia, and elsewhere with similar conditions of
low-density and car-dependence.

Vision of La Trobe University with developments over car
parks and proposed Tram Interchange points
ASSOCIATED RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Smart Green Schools
ARC Linkage Project LP0776850 2007-2010

Chief Investigators: Clare Newton, Sue Wilks, Dominique Hes, Kim Dovey
Partner investigator: Kenn Fisher

Funding: ARC: $340,000 Partners $100,000


This project is a study of educational and environmental outcomes of innovative school design. It is connected to the urban character study through the work of CI Dovey at a theoretical level. Changes in pedagogical theory are leading to a concomitant transformation of teaching practice, from a traditional didactic model towards a more mixed pedagogy incorporating student-centred and informal learning practices. Such changes are driving transformations in school building design from disciplinary technologies towards open learning assemblages. One way of looking this transformation is that the school becomes more like a library where students find resources and places to work; another way is to see the school as like a small city. Both schools and cities are complex learning assemblages.

Planning The Creative City
ARC Discovery Project 2009-2011

Chief Investigators: Kim Dovey, Stephen Wood (University of New England)
AR Postdoctoral Fellow: Kate Shaw
Research Assistants: Jana Perkovic, Anna Stathis, Sky Redman, Simon Wollan, Lucy Pike

Funding: ARC: $360,000

This project commenced in 2009 and is connected to the character study through the investigation of the urban design conditions of creative clustering. Creative city policies have proliferated in the wake of the popularity of the work of Richard Florida on the capacity of some cities to attract ‘creative classes’. How do creative sub-cultures infiltrate certain parts of the city and what are the urban design conditions of such infiltration? To what degree can Creative City policy contribute to the gentrification that displaces creative sub-cultures? This project maps and analyses the locations of a range of creative industries —both sub-cultural and commercial—in Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane over the past 20 years and seeks to better understand the relationships of such industries to urban morphology and creative city policy.
Informal Settlements

This project involves an investigation of the morphology and meaning of informal settlements in South and Southeast Asia. Thus far it involves a series of papers on the morphology of such settlements in Indonesia (with Wing Raharjo), a typology of settlement types and an aesthetic interpretation of slum tourism (both with Ross King). While often regarded simply as slums to be replaced, informal settlements have proven highly resilient, complex and adaptive forms of urban design. They are fraught with issues of place identity and sustainability that both contrast with and complement the studies on character and intensification in Melbourne.

Participants:
Kim Dovey, Wing Raharjo & Ross King

P&STA (Place and Social Theory Assemblage)

Since 2007, a reading group nicknamed ‘Place and Social Theory Assemblage’ has been convened on a monthly basis to keep abreast of a range of theoretical frameworks relevant to the agenda of these research projects and the interests of a number of colleagues and PhD students. P&STA is a broad framework for exploring the relationship of place theory to social theory, and assemblage theory in particular – a form of intellectual ‘tangliatelli’. Discussion has tended to be at an urban design scale but the intention is that conceptions of ‘place’ range from the room to the nation, with attention to multi-scale relations. Readings have been selected by participants for being innovative, seminal or intellectually provocative.

Through P&STA, we have explored issues of mapping (James Corner), warchitecture (Andrew Hercher), lethal urbanism (Eyal Weizman), urubicide (Martin Coward), race/phenotypes (Arun Saldanha), place theory (Doreen Massey, Edward Casey), urban foam (Peter Sloterdijk, Marie-Eve Morin), TPSN [territories, places, scales, networks] framework (Bob Jessop, Neil Brenner & Martin Jones), gentrification (Alan Walks and Martine August), resilience theory (CS Holling, Lance Gunderson, Brian Walker), complexity theory (Juval Portugali), assemblage theory (Manuel DeLanda), informal settlements (Asef Bayat), actor-network theory (Ignacio Farias, Nigel Thrift, Bruno Latour), rhytmalysis (Monica Degen, Tim Edensor, Henri Lefebvre, Christian Schmid), contemporary public space (Matthew Carmona), and relational aesthetics (Nicholas Bourriaud).

Participants:
Kim Dovey, Ian Woodcock, Gethin Davison, Simon Wollan, Ammon Beyerle, Kate Shaw, Kate Gamble, Mirjana Ristic, Wing Raharjo, Jana Perkovic, Marjan Hajjari, Arash Jolfaei, Carolyn Whitzman, Elena Porqueddu

A.U.R.I.N. (Australian Urban Research Infrastructure Network)

Led by Professor Tom Kvan, Dean of the Faculty of Architecture Building and Planning, the University of Melbourne has been appointed to lead the initial development of a major socio-spatial urban database with $20m ‘Super Science’ funding from the Federal Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research. This project involves the development of an issues-driven urban database covering all Australian cities, including data at cadastral scale suitable for urban design research. This will be a major step forward from the current situation of databases being built from scratch on a project-by-project basis and we hope to be able to both contribute to and benefit from a liaison with this project.
Masters Research Projects & Honours Theses

A range of urban design research projects linked to urban intensification and place identity have been undertaken within the Melbourne School of Design and particularly within the Master of Urban Design program. They include:

- **Mathew Chan:** High Street Tram Corridor Urban Intensification – Rear Interface Study  
  (2009 – Supervisors: Kim Dovey & Ian Woodcock)

- **Zhen Hua Qui:** Urban Design and Social Capital  
  (2010 – Supervisor: Kim Dovey)

- **Kris Hanson:** Conceptions of Character: Discourse analysis of residents’ submissions to planning permit applications  
  (2010 - Kim Dovey)

- **Kristie Howes:** Place and Pedestrian Priority  
  (2009 – Ian Woodcock)

- **Sarah Oliver:** Pedestrianisation in Wellington  
  (2009 – Kim Dovey & Ian Woodcock)

- **Stevie Meyer:** Resident Opposition and Higher Density Development: Mentone Case Study  
  (2009 – Ian Woodcock & Carolyn Whitzman)

- **Winchelle Chuson:** Intermodal Transit Exchanges, Urban Design and Access For Mobility-Impaired People  
  (2009 – Ian Woodcock)

- **Juan Cardenas:** Hybridity and Porosity  
  (2010 – Kim Dovey)
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
2002-2010

Books and Chapters:

Refereed Publications
Forthcoming:
20. Dovey, K., Wollan, S. & Woodcock, I. ‘The Place of Graffiti’. (under review)

PRESENTATIONS & BROADCASTING

Members of the team have presented different aspects of the projects for many different audiences including government, industry, academia and community.

Government/Industry:
Ian Woodcock: Department of Transport, 2008, 2010
Kim Dovey: Municipal Association of Victoria, August 2010
Kim Dovey: Australian Institute of Landscape Architects, Public Realm Symposium, May 2010
Kim Dovey: Australian Davos Connection, Cities Summit, March 2010
Kim Dovey/Ian Woodcock: DPCD, June 2009
Ian Woodcock: Aspect Studios/David Lock Associates Australia, 2009
Gethin Davison: DPCD, 2009
Gethin Davison: City of Melbourne, June 2009
Kim Dovey/Ian Woodcock: Victorian Govt Architect’s Office, June 2009
Ian Woodcock/Gethin Davison: City of Yarra, 2009
Ian Woodcock/Simon Wollan: MGS Architects, 2009
Ian Woodcock: City of Moreland, 2008
Kim Dovey/Ian Woodcock/Gethin Davison/Simon Wollan: DPCD, June 2008
Kim Dovey/Ian Woodcock/Stephen Wood: DPCD, 2005

Public Lectures/Symposia:
Ian Woodcock: Research Seminar Series, Melbourne University, October 2010
Ian Woodcock: Climate Change Symposium, Melbourne University, 2010
Kim Dovey: Research Seminar Series, Melbourne University, August, 2010
Ian Woodcock: Architects for Peace, RMIT, 2010
Kim Dovey: Melbourne@5 Million - GAMUT Symposium, December 2009
Kim Dovey: Graduate House, University of Melbourne, November 2009.
Kim Dovey: Committee for Economic Development of Australia (CEDA), July 2009.
Kim Dovey: Geelong Philosophy Cafe, June 2009
Kim Dovey: A.V.James Lecture, Camberwell High School, September 2008
Kim Dovey: Housing Choices Australia, July 2010
Kim Dovey: Research seminar Series, University of Melbourne, August 2010
Kim Dovey: VicUrban, Melbourne Placemaking Launch, April 2010
Teaching:
Kim Dovey/Ian Woodcock/Gethin Davison: Urban Design Theory (Melbourne School of Design Masters Programs)
Kim Dovey/Gethin Davison: Urban Design Studies (Bachelor of Environments)
Ian Woodcock: Urban Design/Architecture Studios 2003-2010 (Inc. Linkage Project Case Studies)
Ian Woodcock: Morphological Mapping 2010 (Bachelor of Environments, with Steve Whitford)
Ian Woodcock: Future Cities 2010 (Bachelor of Environments, co-ordinated by Clare Mouat)
Ian Woodcock: Urban Open Space Studio 2010 (Bachelor of Environments, with Prof. Catherin Bull and Steve Whitford)
Ian Woodcock: Sustainable Urbanism Studio (Master of Urban Design/Master of Landscape Architecture, with Associate Prof. Darko Radovic and Dr. Jillian Walls, in association with the Victorian Eco-Innovation Lab)
Ian Woodcock: TOD Interdisciplinary Design Studio 2009 (co-ordinated by Kate Alder)
Ian Woodcock: Healthy Communities 2007, 2009 (co-ordinated by Carolyn Whitzman)
Kim Dovey: Master of Urban Design Investigation Program (Melbourne School of Design)
Ian Woodcock: Master of Urban Design Investigation Program, Bachelor of Urban Planning Honours Thesis Program
Simon Wollan/Ammon Beyerle: Urban Design/Architecture Studios 2009

Expert Witness/Consultation:
Kim Dovey: Lygon Street Gateway Project, Ministerial Panel Hearings, Sept 2009.
Kim Dovey: Bell Street housing project, Ministerial Panel Hearings, November 2009.
Kim Dovey: Victorian Law Reform Commission, Review of Law on Covenants

Conference Presentations:
Gethin Davison: ‘Place-making or Place-claiming’ The Politics of Space and Place, Brighton, 2009.
Kim Dovey ‘Performing Urban Character’ Senses of Place Conference, UTAS, 2006
Kim Dovey ‘Our home is girt by sea: Local/national characters’, Nation/City/Place: Re-thinking Nationalism conference, Melbourne University, 2006
Kim Dovey ‘Contesting Characters at Hedgeley Dene’, SAHANZ Annual Conference, 2006
Kim Dovey ‘Urban Character and the post-suburban city’, After Sprawl: Post-Suburban Sydney Conference, 2005
Kim Dovey ‘What is urban character? The case of Camberwell’, State of Australian Cities, Griffith University, Brisbane, 2005
Ian Woodcock ‘Limits to Urban Character’, SAHANZ Annual Conference, 2004

Mass Media:
Kim Dovey, ABC 7.30 Report January 2010
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