

**TRANSFORMABILITY OF CIVIC ENGAGEMENT IN TIMES OF ECONOMIC CRISIS**

Crystal Legacy, Research Fellow, Centre for Urban Research, RMIT University: [crystal.legacy@rmit.edu.au](mailto:crystal.legacy@rmit.edu.au)

*Economic uncertainty coupled with post-political urban governance arrangements that disperse responsibility and undermine political citizen engagement have enlivened debates in urban theory (Bylund, 2012). One such debate concerns the role and efficacy of public and citizen responsibility in periods of economic crisis and ongoing uncertainty, and the other, the evolutionary potential of citizen participation in the face of such economic crises. Considering the relationship between citizen participation and government intervention strategies in Australian cities in a post-GFC urban landscape, the paper examines how citizen participation is transformed and reconstituted through economic uncertain landscapes. Focusing upon fifteen semi-structured interviews with senior state and federal elected leaders and executives, as well as fifteen interviews with community campaigners against the controversial East West Link project in Melbourne reveals questions for urban theory and practice about the relationship between national economic imperatives to sustain growth during economic crises and the durability of civic engagement and democratic structures to evolve within such periods.*

## 1. Introduction

Civic engagement manifests in a variety of forms. Through government-initiated, often one-off formal engagement opportunities, a government will organise events where citizens are invited to consider the future of their city. Other times, particularly when there exists a sense of injustice and inequity (Ranciere, 1998), citizen engagement is expressed through local opposition to a proposed development scenario. In some rare cases, opposition may transpire into a kind of counter movement seeking to shift dominant modes of thinking on matters related to and affecting cities and its citizens (Iveson, 2013). While it is suggested within the urban planning literature that, ostensibly, resident and community-group participation may have a transformational impact on institutional structures and arrangements (Healey, 2006), little is known about the extent to which challenging economic contexts, and how governments choose to respond, can also shape citizen participation.

This paper examines how citizen participation is transformed and reconstituted through challenging economic periods and government intervention to stimulate growth. Like many other countries, in the period following the Global Financial Crisis the Australian Commonwealth Government intervened into local economic markets using the implementation of urban infrastructure to incentivise growth (Raco et al, 2012). Following the formal stimulus period between 2009-2012 the Commonwealth Government continued to commit and narrowly direct public money to support the construction of some forms of infrastructure over others. In the inner-city of Melbourne the 6-kilometer East West Link was proposed by the State of Victoria and supported by the Commonwealth Government as a 'done deal', accelerating contract signing to mere weeks before the 2014 Victorian election. In the face of national and state government top-down intervention to stimulate growth in Victoria, formal engagement opportunities were considerably reduced (during the stimulus and in alignment with government intervention strategies post-stimulus) which impacted the public's participation. Examining the transformability of public participation, this paper presents the analysis from fifteen interviews with senior state and Commonwealth elected leaders and senior executives, as well as fifteen interviews with community campaigners. This paper begins by engaging with the idea that citizen participation is a constantly emerging practice in the field of urban planning. The paper then turns its focus to the changes to economic conditions in Australia from the past ten years that has prompted Commonwealth government intervention into infrastructure decision-making. Then through the East West Link case study, the paper illustrates the transformability of public participation in the face of national level intervention and economic uncertainty. The paper concludes by problematizing the conceptualisation of 'participation' before arguing that participation is a constantly evolving and transformative practice.

## **2. Citizen participation as an emergent practice**

The ‘promise’ promulgated by the collaborative planning literature inspired urban theorists to denote a ‘turn’ in planning theory and practice that attributed value to the engagement of citizens in city development. Giving ‘voice’ to citizens was not itself a new concept in planning when it gained credence in the 1990s (Davidoff, 1965; Arnstein, 1969). In the urban planning literature, advocacy planning, insurgent planning, tactical urbanism (to name a few) each offered insight into different ways citizens engage in the (re)making of cities. What set the collaborative planning literature apart from these other citizen engagement modes was the conjuncture that formed between (1) the potential to achieve cultural and institutional change (Healey, 1997); (2) the value of tacit, community-local knowledge and the role it plays (Polanyi, 1966), (3) the ability to seek out legitimation of process and outcome (Legacy, 2012), and (4) the role of the planner as mediator and adjudicator of planning’s politics (Forester, 2009). Taken together, planning could forge a more equitable and procedurally-focused approach to city challenges. Collaborative planning transformed and opened up planning to multiple rationalities and city experience.

In parallel with the ascendancy of collaborative planning within Western planning systems has been a growing interest in the role of ‘good governance’ (Hendriks, 2008; Fischer, 1991). Imagining what is possibly meant by ‘good’ conjures up several images. The dominant image is one of a more inclusive and ‘open’ decision making space, but where inclusivity is restricted to certain individuals who appear as representatives of their respective communities (Legacy et al, 2014). As this relates to making decisions about cities, and acknowledging that full participation and inclusivity is difficult to achieve, the good governance discourse has provided a convenient framework to concentrate engagement to a select group of stakeholders and citizens and focus that engagement at particular points in time. Quasi-governance arrangements, which bring the private and public realms together, have grown in use and acceptability in planning, particularly within the implementation stages of planning. But Hendriks (2008) cautions that these styles of good governance arrangements actually produce a kind of ‘governance by elites’ – those that are nominated to sit on governance committees are drawn from a select group that reside in cities. The good governance model also reduces urban politics to the management of decision-making and building legitimacy – what could be described as an “administration of social affairs” (Teschfahoney and Ek, 2015: 181). What Zizek calls a politics by “expert administration” (Zizek, 1999: 353). Good governance subordinates politics, minimising contestation against market logics. These processes help to maintain this logic via twin processes, which Zizek describes as the “economization of politics” and “radical de-politicization of the sphere of the economy” (Zizek 1999: 353, 182). Governance arrangements designed in this light have been heavily criticised as state apparatus that excludes any politicisation that citizens might incite. Instead, these governance

## State of Australian Cities Conference 2015

arrangements use consensus building and the mere presence of these governance bodies to produce perceived legitimisation of planning outcomes. The common good is determined by an “enlightened government of elites” (Ranciere, 1998: 92-3). Another critical view connects good governance directly to neoliberal ideology. Mantysalo et al (2011) examines the extent to which urban planning has transformed into a set of processes that support “output legitimacy” and efficiency that can support a dominant growth paradigm.

The literature on urban politics emphasises a dialectical space of resistance, struggle and mobilisation occurring within the informal spaces beyond the state (Purcell, 2013) and beyond the formal, yet exclusive good governance settings. Inch (2014), drawing upon Hajer describes community engagement at the planning proposal stage as a form of summoning: a dutiful citizen will respond to the call – when it comes around – to offer their participation. Other research, including that on the transition town (Scott-Cato et al, 2010) and the Occupy Wall Street movements (Graeber, 2013) narrate a political struggle that occurs outside the state and led by the public against prevailing practice and policy orthodoxy. Writing about the postpolitical context of some urban planning contexts, Allmendinger and Haughton (2015: 30-1) argue:

*“post-politics seeks to displace politics through the projection of a world without conflict where a consensus order is already established or where it can be established through the deployment of various strategies of politics such as deliberative democracy.....Allied to this we have seen a blurring of institutional responsibilities, accountability and legitimacy, where planning’s commitment to a more participative, communicative approach has been used to obscure properly political moments of dissensus”.*

The ascendancy of deliberative democracy within planning theory and practice has provoked urban researchers such as Purcell (2009; 2013) to consider the evolution of deliberative democracy in the face of neoliberal planning. Offering a counter view that questions the efficacy of participation in a context of growth, Raco (2015: 156) provocatively argues that “it does not matter *how* decisions are arrived at or *who* it is that ‘delivers’ state services. In short citizens are happy to sacrifice democracy and accountability for efficiency and tangible outcomes such as schools, hospitals, or mega-projects. Delivery has replaced democracy as *the* core principle of Good Governance”. Raco is suggesting that the relationship between citizen engagement, democracy and infrastructure planning and delivery is not necessarily clear. Raco is also calling into question the balance between getting on with the business of implementation on the one hand and the expectation imposed on the planning profession to be consultative on the other (March, 2012). Swyngedouw (2009: 615) describes this tension as a ‘scandal of democracy’; what Metzger et al (2015: 13) interprets as the “promise openings and vast possibilities, yet always also ending up in some form

## State of Australian Cities Conference 2015

of, by necessity, exclusionary arrangements that again close down certain openings to try to steer development onto a specific path towards the future". As cities are subject to economic pressures and changing institutional and political focuses in periods of economic shock (e.g. the recent GFC) and ongoing uncertainty, the intersection between government intervention through infrastructure building to promote economic growth and citizen participation processes requires further attention. The following section examines how challenging national economic conditions in the post-GFC era has inspired government intervention strategies and altered governance arrangements which have acted to displace community engagement.

### **4. Government intervention and community response**

The Global Financial Crisis (GFC) of 2008 that threatened to slow Australia's national economy also marked a transition towards Commonwealth-State governance arrangements to support infrastructure delivery during this period. In the years leading up to the GFC, Australian cities developed a track record of engaging its citizens in strategic thinking about the future of their cities. Preceding the Commonwealth stimulus packages of 2008 and 2009, Australian urban planning had largely embraced the normative values associated with participatory planning. Cities including Melbourne, Adelaide, Perth and Sydney were experimenting with innovative participatory planning processes such as large citizen juries in the development of local strategic plans in different local government areas in Melbourne and Perth (see eg City of Melbourne, 2008, 2012 and 2015; Perth, 2003; City of Port Phillip, 2007). Citizen engagement in some jurisdictions across Australia were evolving and achieving considerable sophistication.

Despite the known benefits of participatory planning in city development, when the Commonwealth Government became concerned that the financial crisis affecting other OECD countries could also have negative implications for jobs and growth in Australia, the Commonwealth government reacted by adopting policy interventions aimed at stimulating economic growth to mitigate a possible recession. In this climate, the Commonwealth Government showed itself willing to trade off longer term citizen acceptance of planning decisions against the rapid implementation of major public investment decisions to create jobs. The Commonwealth government directed public investments into some forms of infrastructure by establishing the \$42 billion Nation Building and Jobs Plan (NBJP) designed to boost Australia's economic productivity from ½ percent of GDP in 2008-9 to 1 percent of GDP in 2009-10 (Commonwealth Government, 2008). The Commonwealth Government would invest \$5.6 billion into the construction of social housing delivering 19,700 new dwellings (KPMG, 2012, 1-3) and would produce nearly 50,000 projects across Australia over a period of 3.5 years (Australian Government, 2011). This incredible injection resulted in the scaling up of control to higher orders of government.

## State of Australian Cities Conference 2015

While this shift does not reflect a significant departure for larger more complex urban infrastructure projects, smaller scale projects such as social housing was streamlined and control shifted away from local government (Davison et al, 2013). State Governments were able to deliver projects on a demanding timeline by altering the processes and governance structures supporting urban infrastructure implementation (Owens et al., 2011) and by disrupting their participatory components during this time (Ruming, 2012). For instance, the Social Housing Initiative (SHI) allowed social housing decision making to shift to state planning authorities who could overwrite local planning decisions (Ruming, 2014; Davison et al, 2013). This movement away from localised decision making was identified by Ruming (2014) as locally 'undemocratic'.

Australia approached all threats to the GFC at the start of 2009 with federal commitments to inject local economies with federal stimulus money. The implication of this concentrated and intense period of investment was increased awareness of the connection between urban infrastructure and economic sustainability. This provided a central platform for urban debate and contestation, which was fuelled by the inevitable disruption to communities during the stages of implementation, but also by the difficult decisions surrounding more strategic questions like infrastructure prioritisation and sequencing of delivery - not everyone will receive their desired project and some communities could become recipients of undesired projects. As one senior government official remarked about the growing politicisation of urban infrastructure decision-making:

It is fierce. I was talking to someone yesterday who's been very instrumental in convincing governments to create Infrastructure Australia and Infrastructure New South Wales and now the Victorian government's Infrastructure Victoria, etcetera. And he said, "I'm starting to wonder whether we made a terrible mistake." "Because," he said, "what we've managed to do very successfully, and through the creation of these organisations, is really raise the interest in infrastructure, its right up there on the agenda, people talk about it, if you only go back ten years, people didn't know what infrastructure meant and everybody's talking about it these days, governments have sort of jumped on it, like the Prime Minister's saying, "I want to be the Infrastructure Prime Minister," and government's saying, "We're going to drive the development of infrastructure, we need huge investment, and we're going to be the government who makes that investment." So it's so high profile, which means the politics just get harder and harder" (Federal Senior Executive, Interviewee 3)

The attention and commitment by the Commonwealth Government to use infrastructure investment to support economic growth in cities was uniquely politicised during the Abbott administration following the statement that it would 'stick to our knitting' and continue to fund urban roads

## State of Australian Cities Conference 2015

(Carey et al, 2013). The intervention directed Commonwealth funding, and constrained the Victorian Government to solely fund and prioritise the East West Link project. This, coupled with compressed decision-making timelines and community engagement, sparked a transformation in citizen participation around this particular project.

### *The East West Link Tunnel in Melbourne*

The 6 km East West Link tunnel was one such urban infrastructure project that attracted considerable political contestation. Political rhetoric framed the East West Link as a project that would deliver jobs (ABC News, 2014). To fast track the signing of the contracts, community engagement was limited to a thirty day public submission, followed by a thirty day public hearing as part of the process surrounding the assessment of the Comprehensive Impact Statement (LMA, 2014); at no point were the community invited to consider whether this project should be the state's top priority infrastructure project (Legacy, 2015). Without a process in place to include residents and community-based groups in a discussion about transport priorities for the state, proposing the East West Link project in the absence of such a process prompted a range of community responses and action. When public investment decisions are made on urban infrastructure, in an environment where little public money is available, and that little money is being used to target limited forms of infrastructure, these decisions become the focus of political agitation. This agitation occurs both within affected communities, but also across those communities that are left waiting for their desired project to surface to the top of the government's agenda.

In the case of the East West Link project, the government ignited opposition to the project by limiting spaces for engagement, and considerably reducing what was up for discussion. For instance, the public submission hearing process as required under the *Major Transport Projects Facilitation Act 2009* was followed by a public hearing where anyone from the public who provided a submission could make a short presentation to the independent panel. Some resident groups responded to the call to participate, while others who felt left out of the formal processes that led to the decision to prioritise the East West Link and were critical of the government's formal public hearing sought alternative ways to participate. Although some groups that formed could be described as single-interest NIMBY groups, there were others that embraced a broader view and engaged more actively in debates about urban mobility in the state, but also about questions about economic growth:

The aim is to see the East West Link is not built and that there is significant money put into public transport and public transport infrastructure improved, and services improved, to the extent that public transport actually challenges the car in terms of people's desired mobility choice... It's a really difficult space because three quarters of the public

## State of Australian Cities Conference 2015

discourse is all about public transport, but 95% of funding and infrastructure investment goes to roads. So it's a really interesting, challenging policy space to be campaigning in because there's levels of political operations occurring and it is very hard for the community to break through and get some real traction in that space (Community Campaigner 9).

Beyond the walls of the public hearing, community-based groups were turning their focus to influencing public debate about the future of transport in metropolitan Melbourne. These campaigns successfully wielded the power of social media to convey public concern and disseminate publicly available information about the proposed road project. Other groups took more traditional approaches to citizen action by organising public meetings and panel discussions to share expertise and guide thinking on alternative transport opportunities. In other instances, full reports on the efficacy of the project to serve the broader social, economic and environmental needs of the state were produced (Dodson et al, 2014). These efforts created a dynamic space for groups to air their aversion, but to also create a speculative space for engaging in new ideas and different ways to 'solve' the congestion and mobility problems that plagued Melbourne and to think through these issues with considerations for the local economy. Community efforts allowed groups to engage in a debate over Victoria's transport possibilities. The intersection between engaging with the brief as set out by the government seeking to delivery this project, and engaging with the protest outside, was blurred. In the case of the East West Link, formal public participation was strait jacketed into responding to a narrow brief leaving the other aspects of the plan to be addressed in informal spaces. Yet, some of the community campaigners interviewed for this research spoke fluidly about how they were expected to play a double game that would see them go through the motions of engaging in the formal hearing process, but taking their oppositional action to other spaces. While the community campaigners were responding to the narrow remit of the public engagement brief, their participation had to adapt to be 'effective' – which some campaigners described as stopping the project, and changing the discourse on transport alternatives.

The value of having a voice and making your voice heard in a political culture where it's quite difficult to do that and it's not acceptable to do that has really been quite empowering and I think has been for a lot of people. A lot of people who would normally not choose to voice anything have found that it's actually a really good thing to do. Or deep level engagement...critical thinking, you know, what is this going to do? Where we can blow some of the arguments out of the water like traffic modelling – we have had some analysis on that – or the costings. Why doesn't it get more attention? We do get distracted easily. We need to start asking bigger questions?

What about a liveable city? With the population growth we are expecting...a city that is equitable for everyone....what kind of city do we want? (Community Campaigner 12

Residents were able to respond to questions about transport challenges in the state by attending the East West Link consultation process, but also by creating alternative participation settings, challenging traditional conceptions of participation as a state-led practice (e.g. the state opening its doors and inviting the community to have their say). For many residents and community-based groups, participating in the submission and hearing process alone would not suffice.

## **6. Conclusion**

Recent actions of the Australian Commonwealth government to invest in cities— both in periods of acute economic crisis and then ongoing economic uncertainty – raises questions for the way citizen participation occurs and how it is conceptualised in these periods as a praxis of planning. While cities continue to be the focal points of global trade and commerce, the threats affecting the economic functioning of cities requires supra-national and regional coordination and response. This is resulting in a more active federal government in infrastructure implementation in cities, raising questions about how the local impacts of government decisions about urban infrastructure, which are made at higher tiers of government, intersect, enable or constrain citizen participation. In some ways the good governance arrangements, like the ones put on place to support the stimulus period, enable the involvement of some citizens helping to build consensus and to legitimise decision making processes. This approach to engagement has been criticised in the literature for serving a neoliberal project of elitism governance and streamlined decision making (Purcell, 2009). In view of the limits of the good governance models described within the literature, and the exclusion and opposition this might inspire, what it means to engage in city planning during ongoing periods of economic uncertainty and government intervention driven by narrowly conceived economic imperatives is being brought into question.

Drawing upon the analysis of the post-GFC policy landscape and the East West Link case study, this paper argues that citizen participation – both formal and informal modes of engagement – occur in a co-evolutionary fashion within the economic contexts they are situated within. Shifting the discourse away from pure opposition to change, to one that is more engaged with the challenges that cities face – infrastructure deficits, climate change, accommodating a growing population, changing demographics, scarcity of funding and political will – some very engaged citizens are entering into a different kind of politically engaged space. Ongoing economic uncertainty and urban austerity have raised the stakes on infrastructure investment decisions and prioritisation. With the long lead times required to build large urban infrastructure such as public

## State of Australian Cities Conference 2015

transport, setting investment priorities can also attract significant contestation and politicisation of infrastructure in this 'transitional phase' – post plan-making stages - in the planning process (Legacy et al, 2015) as was seen in the East West Link case.

Nearly seven years since the 2008 crash, the post-GFC era has witnessed emerging urban governance ideology and citizen engagement practices that support consensus-driven good governance structures and processes. Managing the political in planning has accompanied new 'elite' governance institutions that aim to legitimise a planning process over actually offering a platform for new ideas, difference and scrutiny to be observed. In the case of the East West Link project a formal and confined public submission and hearing process prevented residents of Victoria to consider alternative transport priorities for the state. In this case, there was a removal of politics out of infrastructure, with the hope that the project would be delivered quickly to spur economic growth (Raco, 2015). As good governance and urban politics exist in a constant dialectic tension, the question can be asked, what does it mean for citizens to be 'engaged' in urban planning under constantly changing economic conditions and neoliberal planning practices? (Boland, 2014).

Australia has experienced significant fluctuations to its economic and policy conditions in the period since 2000. The federal budget of 2009, which both contained economic stimulus packages, occurred at a time when Australia had experienced decades of disinvestment into urban infrastructure (with the slight exception of a relatively recent resurgence of interest in cities and infrastructure in the 2000s). Nonetheless, long lead times involved in infrastructure implementation, lack of strategic prioritisation of projects and opaque responsibility structures all contributed to a decline. In this same period, the collaborative planning turn witnessed in the 1990s also corresponded with a rise in community engagement techniques and technologies that could enable broad-based inclusive engagement of citizens in the planning of their cities and neighbourhoods. These processes typically engage citizens in a conversation about their city – its challenges and scenarios for improvement – and generate knowledge about the deficiencies in urban infrastructure. Also, these processes are typically administered at the local and state tiers of government, with little scope (or interest) to engage with communities when national governments are making policies and decisions. But since it is national governments that lead the response to broad scale economic 'shocks' like the GFC through infrastructure stimulus, this raises an interesting question about scale and the engagement of citizens in the 'governance of infrastructure' in these periods and what impact this has on meeting growing infrastructure needs under difficult economic conditions, and doing so equitably and democratically.

# State of Australian Cities Conference 2015

## References

- ABC News 2014, 'PM committed to second phase of East West Link as job creation initiative'.  
ABC News, 14 May. Accessed 16 December 2014: <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2014-03-14/pm-committed-to-east-west-link-as-job-creation-initiative/5320636>.
- Allmendinger, P & Haughton, G 2015, 'Post-political regimes in English planning', in J Metzger, P Allmendinger & S Oosterlynck (eds), *Planning against the political: democratic deficits in European Territorial Governance*, Routledge, New York, pp. 29-52.
- Arnstein, S 1969, 'A Ladder of Citizen Participation', *Journal of the American Planning Association*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 216-24.
- Australian Government, 2011, *Nation Building Economic Stimulus Plan, Commonwealth Coordinator-General's Two Year Progress Report*, Commonwealth of Australia, Department of Infrastructure and Transport.
- Boland, P 2014, 'The relationship between spatial planning and economic competitiveness: the 'path to economic nirvana' or a 'dangerous obsession'?', *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 46, pp. 770-87.
- Bylund, J 2012, 'Postpolitical correctness?', *Planning Theory*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 319-27.
- Carey, A & Gordon, J 2013 'Abbott warns Victoria Libs: no money for urban rail', *The Age* April 4 2013, accessed 14 May: <http://www.theage.com.au/victoria/abbott-warns-victorian-libs-no-money-for-urban-rail-20130404-2h8uj.html>
- Commonwealth Government 2008, *Budget 2008-09 Updated Economic and Fiscal Outlook*, [http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:SxlyzvuiQ\\_YJ:www.budget.gov.au/2008-09/content/uefo/html/part\\_2.htm+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=au](http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:SxlyzvuiQ_YJ:www.budget.gov.au/2008-09/content/uefo/html/part_2.htm+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=au)
- Davidoff, P 1965, 'Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning', *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, vol. 31, pp. 331-8.
- Davison, G, Legacy, C, Liu, E, Han, H, Phibbs, P, van den Nouwelant, R, Darcy, M & Piracha, A 2013, 'Understanding and addressing community opposition to affordable housing development', *Australian Housing and Urban Reserach Institute*, vol. AHURI Final Report No. 211.
- Fischer, F 1991, 'American Think Tanks: Policy elites and the politicization of expertise', *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 332-53.
- Forester, J 2009, *Dealing with Differences: Dramas of Mediating Public Disputes*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Graeber, D 2013, *The Democracy Project: A history, a crisis, a movement*, Penguin Books, London.
- Healey, P 1997, *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*, MacMillan Press Ltd., London, U.K.
- Healey, P. (2006). Transforming Governance: Challenges of Institutional Adaptation and a New Politics of Space. *European Planning Studies*, 14(3), 299-320.

## State of Australian Cities Conference 2015

Hendriks, C 2008, 'On inclusion and network governance: The democratic disconnect of Dutch energy transitions', *Public Administration*, vol. 86, no. 4, pp. 1009-31.

Inch, A 2014, 'Ordinary citizens and the political cultures of planning: In search of the subject of a new democratic ethos', *Planning Theory*, pp. 1-21.

Iveson, K 2013, 'Building a city for 'The People': The politics of alliance-building in the Sydney Green Ban Movement', *Antipode*, vol. 00, no. 0, pp. 1-22.

KPMG 2012, *Social Housing Initiative Review*, KPMG, Canberra.

Legacy, C 2012, 'Achieving legitimacy through deliberative plan-making processes – lessons for metropolitan strategic planning', *Planning Theory and Practice*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 71-87.

Legacy, C, Gleeson, B & Dodson, J 2014, 'Implementation: Getting our act together' in *Melbourne What Next? A discussion on creating a better future for Melbourne*, (ed. Whitzman, C, Gleeson, B & Sheko, A), Melbourne Sustainable Society Institute & Melbourne Social Equity Institute, pp116-130

Legacy, C & van den Nouwelant, R 2015, 'Negotiating strategic planning's transitional spaces: the case of 'guerrilla governance' in infrastructure planning', *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 47, pp. 209-26.

LMA 2014, 'About us. Linking Melbourne Authority, Melbourne, Australia'. Accessed 13 December 2014 at: <http://www.linkingmelbourne.vic.gov.au/about-us>.

Mantysalo, R, Saglie, I-L & Cars, G 2011, 'Between input legitimacy and output efficiency: defensive routines and agonistic reflectivity in Nordic land-use planning', *European Planning Studies*, vol. 19, no. 12, pp. 2109-26.

March, A 2012, *The democratic plan: Analysis and diagnosis*, Ashgate, Surrey.

Owens, S & Cowell, R 2011, *Land and Limits: Interpreting sustainability in the planning process*, Second edn, Routledge, New York.

Metzger, J, Allmendinger, P & Oosterlynck, S (eds) 2015, *Planning Against the Political: Democratic deficits in European territorial governance*, Routledge, New York.

Polanyi, M 1966, *The Tacit Dimension*, Doubleday & Company, Inc, New York, U.S.

Productivity Commission 2014, Public Infrastructure Inquiry Report, Volume 1, 27 May 2014, p. 5, [http://www.pc.gov.au/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/137280/infrastructurevolume1.pdf](http://www.pc.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/137280/infrastructurevolume1.pdf)

Purcell, M 2009, 'Resisting Neoliberalization: communicative planning or counter-hegemonic movements?', *Planning Theory*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 140-65.

Purcell, M 2013, *The down-deep delight of democracy*, John Wiley & Sons, West Sussex.

Raco, M 2015, 'Conflict management, democratic demands, and the post-politics of privatisation', in J Metzger, P Allmendinger & S Oosterlynck (eds), *Planning Against the Political: Democratic deficits in European territorial governance*, Routledge, New York, pp. 153-69.

Ranciere, J 1998, *Dis-agreement: Politics and Philosophy*, University of Minnesota Press, London.

Ruming, K 2012, 'Negotiating within the context of planning reform: Public and private reflections from New South Wales, Australia', *International Planning Studies*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 397-418.

## State of Australian Cities Conference 2015

Ruming, K 2014, "'It wasn't about public housing, it was about the way it was done": challenging planning not people in resisting the *Nation Building Economic Stimulus Plan*, Australia', *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 39-60.

Scott-Cato, M & Hillier, J 2010, 'How could we study climate-related social innovation? Applying Deleuzian philosophy to Transition Towns', *Environmental Politics*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 869-87.

Swyngedouw, E 2009, 'The antinomies of the postpolitical city: In search of a democratic politics of environmental production', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 601-20.

Tesfahuney, M & Ek, R 2015, 'Planning as war by other means', in J Metzger, P Allmendinger & S Oosterlynck (eds), *Planning Against the Political: Democratic deficits in European territorial governance*, Routledge, New York, pp. 171-89.

Zizek, S 1999, *The ticklish subject: The absent centre of political ontology*, Verso, New York.