

Housing Displacement in Australian Cities: A Brisbane Case-Study

Anne-Sophie Iotti¹, Wendy Steele¹, Neil Sipe², Jago Dodson¹,

¹ School of Global, Urban and Social Studies, RMIT University

² School of Geography Planning and Environmental Management, University of Queensland

Abstract: Australian capital cities are being redeveloped through urban renewal and gentrification, especially in their inner cities. However, too often the market-led urban consolidation used in main Australian capital cities contributes to the displacement of low-income households from the inner cities into the outer suburbs which has implications for socio-spatial equity (Atkinson and Wulff, 2009; Atkinson et al., 2011). Housing displacement of low-income households is a growing problem both internationally and nationally however within the Australian context the focus has been on Sydney and Melbourne with little research focused on the other capital cities such as Brisbane. Over the last 20 years, the City of Brisbane has undertaken many urban renewal projects that have led to gentrification in its inner city, but few precautions have been taken to avoid or rigorously understand through research, policy or planning the displacement of low income households (Darchen and Ladouceur, 2013; Walters and McCrea, 2014). This paper explores housing insecurity and displacement within the case-study of Brisbane the impact of these factors on low to middle income households; and the implications for planning policy and practice at the metropolitan scale.

Introduction

Over the last fifty years Australian cities have undergone significant changes related to population growth and development (Beer and Forster, 2002; Forster, 2006; Randolph, 2004). For housing this has resulted in a shift towards higher density suburbs, urban renewal, inner-city gentrification, and the restructuring of public housing which have implications for socio-spatial equity. Australian capital cities, in particular, are being redeveloped through urban renewal and gentrification, especially inner-city and middle suburban areas (Atkinson and Wulff, 2009; Atkinson et al., 2011; Darchen and Ladouceur, 2013; Randolph, 2004).

These redevelopment processes bring uneven benefits to the population. The gentrification process is often framed in the literature as “having winners and losers” (Doucet, 2009, p.299). The literature on critical geography often points out the negative consequences of these processes on low income households such as their displacement (Atkinson et al., 2011; Davidson and Lees, 2010; Marcuse, 1986; Newman and Wyly, 2006; Porter and Shaw, 2009; Slater, 2009). Within the Australian context, the problem of displacement is recognised among researchers (see Atkinson et al., 2011; Engels, 1999; Shaw, 2008; Weller and van Hulten, 2012) however, the focus has been on Sydney and Melbourne (Atkinson et al., 2011; Engels, 1999; Weller and van Hulten, 2012). Little research has been done in other Australian capital cities such as Brisbane, located within South-East Queensland, which for more than two decades has been the fastest growing urban region in Australia (Steele and Gleeson, 2010). The City of Brisbane has undertaken many urban renewal projects within the inner city but few precautions have been taken to avoid or rigorously understand through research, policy or planning the displacement of low income households (Darchen and Ladouceur, 2013).

This paper identifies the extent of gentrification within the City of Brisbane to draw conclusions about the housing displacement of low income households. To this end, the paper will first highlight the transformation of Australian cities through the processes of gentrification and urban renewal. Secondly, it will draw the context of the case study and outline the methodology of the project and results. Finally, the implications of the findings for planning policy and practice at the metropolitan scale are considered within the Australian context.

The transformation of Australian cities

There is an argument in the critical geography literature of that urban renewal is often followed by gentrification (Porter and Shaw, 2009). Urban renewal and gentrification are regarded as inter connected and share the same negative impacts for low income households such as a housing stock becoming unaffordable for them and their displacement (Davison, 2011). Often, urban renewal is part of the will to redevelop cities (Porter and Shaw, 2009). These urban renewal projects are based on the assumption that there is a lack of a middle class in certain part of the cities, which contribute to marking them as being deprived and disadvantaged, consequently a governmental approach is necessary to upgrade the image of the city (Porter and Shaw, 2009). They are also commonly used to

redevelop 'under-utilised sites or precincts' which through the process redevelopment activate the process of gentrification (Davison et al., 2012, p.15).

Urban renewal is often considered successful if there is more middle-class inhabitants and costly housing and if social inequalities are increased. This relates to the process of gentrification (Shaw, 2008). According to Porter and Shaw (2009, p.3) "regeneration becomes gentrification when displacement or exclusion occurs. The concept of 'exclusionary displacement' (see Marcuse 1985) is important here: if people are excluded from a place they might have lived or worked in or otherwise occupied had the place not been 'regenerated', then we regard this as gentrification as much as had they been directly displaced". Gentrification is defined by Atkinson and Wulff (2009, p.6) as "the migration of higher income and status groups to lower social status/income neighbourhoods and derelict housing and the consequent transformation of such areas to higher status neighbourhoods". In brief, this is the replacement of one class by another (Porter and Shaw, 2009). In this research the definition proposed by Porter and Shaw (2009) that urban renewal is connected to gentrification is adopted.

Redevelopment of Australian cities through urban renewal and gentrification

One of the major changes Australian cities have experienced is the redevelopment of the inner urban areas. According to Randolph and Tice (2014), the gentrification of inner cities in Australia is now almost complete. Inner cities were traditionally inhabited by working-class workers, whereas higher income households occupied the suburbs (Randolph, 2006; Smith, 1996). Over time the population of inner cities has declined, as has the areas themselves. Since the 1970s, the working-class population has been replaced by a "new inner urban middle class closely associated with the expansion of the tertiary and quaternary labour markets in these locations" (Randolph, 2004, p.487). "These areas have merged with the older established upper income areas in most cities to form a solid middle-class urban core" (Randolph and Tice, 2014, p. 389). As a result, they are considered as advantaged due to their close location to the city-centre services (Randolph and Tice, 2014). However, they no longer offer options to house low income households (Randolph and Tice, 2014). As a result, low income households especially renters have been relocated in middle suburbs into aging housing (Randolph and Tice, 2014).

In Australian cities, urban renewal is driven by government and commonly used for three purposes. Davison et al. (2012) highlight the main characteristics of Australian urban renewal within the context of the 'compact city'. Governments in Australia are advocating for 'a compact city' which implies to contain population growth within the existing urban areas. Overall, 'a compact city' leads to a better use of existing infrastructure which results on saving costs. This becomes a central goal of metropolitan planning. Hence, since 1990s urban renewal is used as a tool to reach this outcome. As Davison et al., (2012, p.7) highlight "renewal strategies can support such containment, maximising the use of existing infrastructure and minimising the need for land conversion on the city fringe, while adding to new housing supply".

However, Davison et al. (2012) raise concerns with regards to affordability as often housing delivered through urban renewal is not affordable for low income households. Despite a will to include affordable housing in urban renewal policies, in practice urban renewal bring little benefits for low income households. This is especially true if containment policies have not been well designed. This exacerbates the shortage of affordable housing for low income households in Australian capital cities.

Secondly, urban renewal in Australia is occurring in middle suburbs with the goal of replacing the original housing (small, low amenity and ageing housing) with a new type of housing of higher densities. As Randolph (2004) highlights, urban renewal is typically a market-driven process that occurs in parts of the cities where land values remain relatively depressed. Some instances see intervention in public housing in middle suburbs with the aim to replace public housing with mixed tenure and mixed income developments to diminish the concentrations of disadvantage in middle suburbs. For Forster (2006) urban renewal is at the cost of the established community and will contribute to the reduction of public housing and increase the marginalisation of public tenants. Additionally, the private rental sector is neglected and their programs can increase the dependence of low-income households on the private rental market.

Third, arts-led urban renewal is commonly used in Australian cities to design a 'creative city'. This new form of urban renewal in Australian cities is based on the argument of the scholars Landry and Florida that creativity is of importance for a successful economy (Atkinson and Easthope, 2009). This contributes "to stimulate local economic competitiveness through developing cultural capital" (Munzner

and Shaw, 2015, p.18). Hence, urban renewals are used as a tool to implement 'creative cities' (Atkinson and Easthope, 2009).

These strategies aim to be beneficial for the whole community (Munzner and Shaw, 2015). However, concerns with regard to the uneven distribution of benefits among the population - especially between 'creative class' and 'un-creative others' – have been raised (see Atkinson and Easthope, 2009). In addition, Munzner and Shaw (2015, p.21) point out that these projects are 'economic development strategies' and favour 'middle-class cultural consumption', despite their original claims. As a result, such policies are often leading to gentrification and to the displacement of low income households due to the commercial and residential raise of rents (Atkinson and Easthope, 2009).

These urban renewal strategies widely used in Australian cities are leading to the same negative consequences for low income households. Often, they are displaced due to the increase of land value in the process of redevelopment. In short, for Porter and Shaw (2009, p.1), "jobs and activity and improvements to the built and natural environments brought by successful regeneration bring, in turn, increases in land values, which can cause displacement or exclusion of lower income users of that place". The danger that Porter and Shaw (2009) outline is the potential effacement of low-income households from the city centres. This market-led urban consolidation contributes to the displacement of low income households into outer suburbs of Australian cities which further increases the inequalities between inner and outer suburbs.

Brisbane as a case-study of gentrification and housing displacement

Within the literature on housing displacement in Australian cities, Brisbane has been less well studied. However, a few studies mentioned that Brisbane is gentrified and displacement is probably occurring, but both scales are unknown (Atkinson and Easthope, 2009; Darchen and Ladouceur, 2013; Walters and McCrea, 2014). Brisbane is the third largest city in Australia and the largest local government authority with a budget comparable to the State of Tasmania. Positioned centrally within the nexus of the urban megalopolis of South-East Queensland which includes the Gold Coast/ Tweed Heads, the Sunshine Coast and Toowoomba, Brisbane used to be known as Australia's largest country town, but more recently 'Brisvegas' or the 'Cinderella city'. Scratch the shiny surface however and the uneven growth paradox is revealed through the ongoing debates around the impacts of rapid population growth and urban development (Gleeson and Steele, 2010).

Urban renewal occurring across Brisbane has several effects. It is focused towards middle class and young professional couples or single households. According to Davison et al. (2012), the ULDA as the institution formerly in charge of delivering affordable housing, targeted households with income between \$44,000 and \$105, 000. Brisbane has been promoted as "Australia's 'New World City' with a growing economy, globally connected and increasingly integrated to the Asia Pacific region and knowledge-based growth driven by technologically, environmentally and culturally progressive investment" (Jensen 2011, p.21). Within this context, specific types of dwellings such as studio and one-bedroom apartments are targeted to provide affordable housing.

Market-based urban renewal often leads to gentrification. West End, an inner city area of Brisbane is a classic example of this process. According to Walters and McCrea (2014) West End is gentrified. The first phase was "a 'bottom-up' process "where people look to revitalise existing period housing stock" (p.359). The second phase of the process is a 'top-down' process "led by capital and the state planning policies" (p.356). The aim is to introduce policies in favour of urban consolidation to concentrate the population. This has several effects. First, it is observed that the arrival of higher income households results on the displacement of lower income households especially tenants. Second, alternative and marginal are currently being displaced from the public space of West End. Third, West End residents were concerned by the loss of social diversity as a result of the decline of housing affordability (MacCrea and Walters, 2012). West End was originally considered as one of the cheapest neighbourhoods, but today it is one of the most expensive in Brisbane (Walters and McCrea, 2014).

According to Atkinson and Easthope (2009) Brisbane has a clear creative cities strategy with a focus on business and economic growth. This is perceived as having negative consequences for low income households. NGO and community organisations notice a disconnection between the economic objectives of the city council and the interest of the existing community. In addition, they observe a lack of response to housing stress and to the benefits of lower income households. "It would seem that there is a benign ignorance of much of the social pain, loss and general discomfort that lower-income families have experienced during the long boom of the past decade" (Atkinson and

Easthope, 2009, p.75). Overall, Atkinson and Easthope (2009) notice a process of gentrification, a loss of social diversity and housing stress among low income households.

Housing affordability within the City of Brisbane is declining. Wulff et al. (2009) and Hulse, et al. (2014b) point out a shortage of affordable housing across the city especially for the very low-income-households and difficulty for very to low income households to access the stock. It is comparable as "one dwelling stock for every eight very low income households" (Wulff et al., 2009, p.2). Therefore, observe that low income households have been relocated within disadvantaged suburbs located at the outer periphery of the city. In addition, Liu (2011) observes that 1/3 of the renters living at proximity of the city centre and in low rent value suburbs are in housing stress. Consequently, these findings highlight that low income households are at risk of displacement within the city of Brisbane.

Methodology

Given its relative neglect in the literature, this paper aims to identify the extent of gentrification for the City of Brisbane as a means by which to draw conclusions on the link to housing displacement. This forms part of a broader research agenda around housing displacement in Australian cities which aims to replicate the model of Atkinson et al. (2011) to identify gentrified suburbs within a city. This model has already been used in Australian cities (i.e. Sydney and Melbourne for the period 1996-2006); but will be applied and adapted to the Brisbane context. Specifically the aim of this paper is to measure the extent of gentrification within Brisbane and draw out the implications for housing displacement.

To this end and following the method of Atkinson et al. (2011) to identify gentrified suburbs, the following indicators have been retrieved from ABS census. Considering the difficulty of accessing comparable data for the timeframe of the study, Time Series Profiles have been selected as they offer comparisons across census periods. However, some indicators used by Atkinson et al. (2011) were not available in the Time Series Profiles. Hence, this analysis for this project used the closest indicators available. For example, households incomes were not available so family income were used instead. Time Series Profiles have been collected for each Brisbane's Statistical Local Areas (SLAs) for 2001, 2006 and 2011. Following Atkinson et al. (2011, p.15), indicators have been selected and grouped into seven variables:

- Managers and professionals
- Low income, private renters
- High income, private renters
- Low income family
- High income family
- Two incomes, couple only households
- Bachelor degree or higher

These seven indicators were used to measure the gentrification process in Brisbane. Following Atkinson et al. (2011, p.17), "if an SLA/LGA scored a point on each of these measures (seven points in total), it was deemed to have experienced the highest level of gentrification" between 2001 and 2011.

The project replicated Atkinson et al. (2011) model with data for Brisbane over the period 2001-2011 across the seven indicators. Averages were calculated for three ABS Queensland statistical divisions inner Brisbane (0501); middle suburbs (0503 Northwest Inner Brisbane and 0509 Southeast Inner Brisbane); outer Brisbane (0507 Northwest Outer Brisbane and 0511 Southeast Outer Brisbane) (ABS, 2006). The results that emerged provide a picture of the gentrification process in Brisbane.

Table 1 shows the highest scoring suburbs in Brisbane for the period 2001-2011. Three of these suburbs are located in the inner city (Bowen Hills, City Remainder and South Brisbane) whereas the remainder are located in the outer suburbs. Notably they are no middle suburbs among these suburbs. Thus, gentrification appears to be located primarily in the inner city and outer suburbs.

Table1: Gentrified suburbs in Brisbane between 2001-2011 scoring seven out of seven growth indicators

Gentrified suburbs in Brisbane	
Bowen Hills ^a	Parkinson Drewvale ^b
Chermside West ^b	Richlands ^b
City Remainder ^a	South Brisbane ^a
Durack ^b	Stretton-Karawatha ^b
Ellen Grove ^b	Taigum-Fitzgibbon ^b
Moggill ^b	Wakerley ^b

^a: Inner cities suburbs; ^b: outer suburbs

However, some suburbs that the model suggests are gentrified may in reality not be gentrified. Some of these suburbs are outer greenfield suburbs that used to be farming land and have been developed for residential purposes beginning in the 1990s. As a result, these suburbs have seen significant population and density increases as illustrated in Table 2 (note that Taigum-Fitzgibbon and Stretton-Karawatha experienced the most significant population growth before 2001).

Table 2: Population Characteristics

Suburbs	Area (km²)	2001 Population	2001 Density (pop/km²)	2011 Population	2011 Density (pop/km²)	Increase (%)
Ellen Grove	5.1	3,328	652.6	6,208	1217.3	86.5
Moggill	10.3	1,070	103.9	3,506	340.4	227.7
Parkinson-Drewvale	12.7	6,214	489.3	14,386	1132.8	131.5
Stretton-Karawatha	13.0	3,128	240.6	4,129	317.6	32.0
Taigum-Fitzgibbon	6.3	6,513	1,033.8	8,913	1414.8	36.9
Wakerley	4.9	1,530	312.2	7,720	1575.5	404.6

Source: ABS (2011)

The model has recognised these suburbs as being gentrified due to the significant changes in population. This is one of the limitations of the model used. Therefore, since few people lived in these suburbs prior to any development activity the risk of displacement of low income households is small. However, as noted by Davison (2011), there are potentially indirect effects such as the inability to access property in these areas for low income households. It appears that the new comers are mostly middle class given that they were recognised by the model.

At this stage of analysis, these suburbs have been removed from the list of gentrified list and Table 3 displays the results of our analysis excluding these suburbs.

Table 3: Gentrified suburbs in Brisbane between 2001-2011 scoring seven out of seven growth indicators

Gentrified suburbs in Brisbane
Bowen Hills ^a
Chermside West ^b
City Remainder ^a
Durack ^b
South Brisbane ^a
Richlands ^b

^a: Inner cities suburbs; ^b: outer suburbs

Most of the suburbs being gentrified are located within the inner city of Brisbane. The two others suburbs, Durack and Richlands are located in outer city. Interestingly, two neighbouring suburbs Inala and Acacia Ridge scored six out of seven in the model used. According to Baum et al. (2005) and Hulse et al. (2014a) these suburbs are considered disadvantaged.

A gentrified activity has been detected in inner city and to a certain extent in outer city. Hence averages growth have been calculated. These trends are even stronger when averages for the larger statistical division are considered (Table 4). The outer suburbs and particularly the inner city show high growth in comparison to the middle suburbs.

Table 4: Population Growth: Brisbane Statistical Divisions 2001-2011

Statistical division	2001-2011 Per Cent Growth
Inner cities	4.2
Middle suburbs	2.3
Outer suburbs	3.7

Source: ABS (2011)

Gentrification in Brisbane

Our analysis suggests a general process of gentrification. As expected, the inner city of Brisbane is highly gentrified, in addition to exhibiting a decline of housing affordability across the city (Wulff et al., 2009). Therefore, it is likely that a similar process of displacement of low income households from the inner city towards outer city is occurring in Brisbane.

The impacts on displacees described by Atkinson and Wulff (2009) and Davidson and Lees (2010) include the loss of social diversity, services, infrastructures, social networks, reduce accessibility to employment and education opportunities. Atkinson et al. (2011), in their research of Melbourne and Sydney, found that those who have been displaced describe a feeling of sense of loss, a loss of friendships and networking as a result of gentrification. According to Weller and van Hulten (2012, p.34) there is a discrimination process to access rental housing towards “young professional households over low-income households, regardless of their capacity to meet rental payments” operating in Melbourne.

The effects of gentrification are stronger for the poor, working class, elderly, immigrants and private renters (Atkinson and Wulff, 2009b; Newman and Wyly, 2006). Displacement of these groups is often induced by rental price gain which has been linked to a decline of housing affordability. Therefore, low income households are forced to relocate to more affordable areas further from the city centre (Atkinson et al., 2011). Within the context of Melbourne, Weller and van Hulten (2012) point out that low income households leave and end up in disadvantaged middle and outer western suburbs living in ageing and poor-quality housing.

Weller and van Hulten (2012) suggest that the housing affordability crisis in Melbourne results from the displacement of low income households due to the inability to pay the increased rents. This process is intensified for the poorest tenants considering that tenants have little governmental protection in Australia (Weller and van Hulten, 2012). Newman and Wyly (2006) report that increased housing expenses associated with gentrification displaces current residents as well as limiting entry by others. Therefore, researchers agree that housing displacement is strongly induced by housing affordability decline (Atkinson and Wulff, 2009b; Atkinson et al., 2011; Davidson and Lees, 2010; Newman and Wyly, 2006).

However, despite these common trends observed in most Australian cities. This project features an unexpected result such as the gentrification of part of outer city. It appears that some of these suburbs are considered disadvantaged suburbs. According to Hulse et al. (2014a, p.4) in their findings of disadvantaged suburbs across Australia, the suburbs identified in this paper excluding Richlands which does not fall in their model are near the CBDs "were characterised by high and growing levels of private rental and higher density housing, suggesting rapid change in which investor landlord activity has been a key housing market driver" (Hulse et al., 2014a). However, this paper does not highlight that all disadvantaged suburbs in Brisbane are getting gentrified. This is only a small part of them that falling into the description of Hulse et al. (2014a).

These findings have implications for low income households. First, following the discussion that low income households have been displaced from inner city to outer city it is likely that they are highly represented in outer suburban areas. Second, gentrification leads to the displacement of low income households. Therefore, within the context of Brisbane, it is highly probable that low income households in outer suburban areas are being displaced considering that a process of gentrification of these suburbs has been identified. These findings suggest that low income households are being displaced even further away from the city towards the urban peripheries which raise concerns about accessibility to transports, jobs, and services (Hulse et al., 2014a).

Implication for policies

Urban renewal and gentrification in Australian cities tend to diminish the stock of affordable housing due to land value increases as the result of the redevelopment process (Davison et al., 2012). Hence, Australian policies tend to secure affordable housing (Davison et al., 2012). According to Hulse et al. (2014a) to avoid the displacement of low income households policies should provide affordable rental options and social housing.

However, if policies aim to secure affordable housing they are limited (Atkinson and Easthope, 2009). More affordable housing and housing diversity are required to meet the demand for affordable housing (Atkinson and Easthope, 2009; Darchen and Ladouceur, 2013). In particular, Darchen and Ladouceur (2013, p.347) find in their research that "there is a lack of an effective mechanism in Queensland with which to deliver affordable housing, particularly within urban regeneration projects". In addition, avoiding displacement of low income households is not a prime concern in regeneration project (Darchen and Ladouceur, 2013).

In addition, as shown in the research often the population target to access affordable housing is more towards middle income households rather than low to very low income households. Additionally, studio and one bedroom apartments are often the target dwellings to provide housing affordability. As Davison (2011, p.2) raises "the risk that an emphasis on small one and two bedroom apartments in renewal projects may create a new form of segregation based on lifestyle and age; young professional couples and empty nesters will dominate in renewed centres, with families with children consigned to the suburbs". Furthermore, investors could also purchase affordable housing delivered as there is no guarantee that only low to middle income households could access this type of housing (Davison et al., 2012).

Additionally, considering the negative effects of gentrification on low income households, there is a new policy agenda in Australia cities which is 'gentrification without displacement' (Shaw and Hagemas, 2015) study the outcomes of such policies in two gentrified neighbourhoods in Melbourne. They discovered that in these neighbourhoods most shops and meeting places for low income households have disappeared. The implications are a feeling and sense of loss and exclusion for low income households. Hence, according to Davidson and Lees (2010) this contributes to a dis-attachment of the neighbourhood, which can lead to a desire to leave the area. Therefore, Shaw and

Hagemas (2015, p.16), concludes “this research shows that secure housing is not sufficient to alleviate the pressure of displacement on low-income residents of gentrifying areas”.

In short, despite a certain will of Australian governments to provide affordable housing and to control negative effects of gentrification such as the displacement of low income households. Often, researchers highlight limits of such policies as displacement of low income households occurs as a result of urban renewal and gentrification.

Conclusion

Australian capital cities are being redeveloped through urban renewal and gentrification, especially in their inner cities. However, too often the market-led urban consolidation used contributes to the displacement of low-income households from inner cities to outer suburban areas which have implications for socio-spatial equity (Atkinson and Wulff, 2009a; Atkinson et al., 2011). Housing displacement of low-income households is a growing problem however within the Australian context the focus has been on Sydney and Melbourne with little research on the other capital cities such as Brisbane.

This paper focused on housing insecurity and displacement within Brisbane through processes of urban renewal and gentrification: the impact of these factors on low income households; and the implications for planning policy and practice at the metropolitan scale. The City of Brisbane has undertaken many urban renewal projects that have led to gentrification in its inner city, but few precautions have been taken to avoid the displacement of low-income households (Darchen and Ladouceur, 2013; Walters and McCrea, 2014).

The traditional pattern of displacement is from inner to outer city (Weller and van Hulst, 2012). Building on the work by Atkinson et al. (2011), our research demonstrates that inner city and outer suburban areas of Brisbane are gentrified. Our results have important implications for low income households at the fringe as they are also exposed to displacement pressures. Policies exist to offer affordable housing and to implement ‘gentrification without displacement’, however, they are limited.

As Atkinson et al. (2011, p.3) argue, gentrified neighbourhoods are often considered to have improved where “the reality may be that poorer groups are thinned out or re-sorted through the housing system”. This result of what Wacquant (2008, p.199) calls “this literal and figurative effacing of the proletariat in the city”.

The model outlined in this paper captures an interesting feature: the gentrification of outer suburban areas, as well as the inner city. It would be interesting to understand the process of gentrification in outer cities or at least their residential redevelopment and their implications for low income households. A better understanding of this process occurring in Australian cities is required in the future, and how this links to housing displacement and equity as a context specific socio-spatial agenda.

References

- Atkinson, R., & Easthope, H., 2009. The Consequences of the Creative Class: The Pursuit of Creativity Strategies in Australia's Cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 33(1), 64-79. doi: 0.1111/j.1468-2427.2009.00837.x
- Atkinson, R., & Wulff, M., 2009. Gentrification and displacement: a review of approaches and findings in the literature (AHURI Positioning Paper No.115). Melbourne: Australian Housing and Research Institute
- Atkinson, R., Wulff, M., Reynolds, M., & Spinney, A., 2011. Gentrification and displacement: The households impacts of neighbourhood change (AHURI Final Report No.160). Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011. *Census of Population and Housing: Time Series Profiles 2011 Second Release*. Australia Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2006. *Statistical Geography Volume 1 –Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC). Catalogue No.1216.0*. Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.
- Baum, S., Haynes, M., Van Gellecum, Y., & Han, H., 2005. Typologies of Advantage and Disadvantage: Socio-economic Outcomes in Australian Metropolitan Cities. *Geographical Research*, 43(4), 361-378.
- Beer, A., & Forster, C., 2002. Global Restructuring, the Welfare State and Urban Programmes: Federal Policies and Inequality within Australian Cities. *European Planning Studies*, 10(1), 7-25. doi: 10.1080/09654310120099245
- Darchen, S., & Ladouceur, E., 2013. Social sustainability in urban regeneration practice: a case study of the Fortitude Valley Renewal Plan in Brisbane. *Australian Planner*, 50(4), 340-350.
- Davidson, M., & Lees, L., 2010. New-Build Gentrification: Its Histories, Trajectories, and Critical Geographies. *Population, Space and Place*, 16, 395-411.
- Davison, G., 2011. *The Role and Potential of Government Land Agencies in Facilitating and Delivering Urban Renewal*. In: State of Australian Cities National Conference, November 29-December 2 2011 Melbourne.
- Davison, G., Gurrán, N., van den Nouwelant, R., & Pinnegar, S., 2012. Affordable housing, urban renewal and planning: emerging practice in Queensland, South Australia and New South Wales (AHURI Final Report No.195). Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.
- Doucet, B., 2009. Living through gentrification: subjective experiences of local, non-gentrifying residents in Leith, Edinburgh. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 24(3), 299-315. doi: DOI 10.1007/s10901-009-9151-3
- Engels, B., 1999. Property ownership, tenure, and displacement: in search of the process of gentrification. *Environment and Planning A*, 31, 1473-1495.
- Forster, C., 2006. The Challenge of Change: Australian Cities and Urban Planning in the New Millennium. *Geographical Research*, 44(2), 173-182. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-5871.2006.00374.x
- Gleeson, B.J. & Steele, W., 2010. A climate for growth: Planning South-East Queensland. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press.
- Hulse, K., Pawson, H., Reynolds, M., & Herath, S., 2014a. Disadvantaged places in urban Australia: Analysing socio-economic diversity and housing market performance (Final Report No. 225). Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.
- Hulse, K., Reynolds, M., & Yates, J., 2014b. Changes in the supply of affordable housing in the private rental sector for lower income households, 2006-11 (Final Report No. 235). Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.
- Liu, Y. (2011). *Spatial disparity in the private rental housing market in Southeast Queensland, Australia*. In: 12th International Conference on Computers in Urban Planning and Urban Management, 5-9 July 2011 Alberta, 1-16.
- MacCrea, R., & Walters, P., 2012. Impacts of Urban Consolidation on Urban Liveability: Comparing an Inner and Outer Suburb in Brisbane, Australia. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 29(2), 190-206. doi: 10.1080/14036096.2011.641261
- Marcuse, P., 1986. Abandonment, gentrification and displacement: the linkages in New York City. In N. Smith & P. Williams (Eds.), *Gentrification of the City* (pp. 153-177). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Munzner, K., & Shaw, K., 2015. Renew Who? Benefits and Beneficiaries of Renew Newcastle. *Urban Policy and Research*, 33(1), 17-36. doi: 10.1080/08111146.2014.967391
- Newman, K., & Wyly, E., 2006. The Right to Stay Put, Revisited: Gentrification and Resistance to Displacement in New York City. *Urban Studies*, 43(1), 23-57.
- Porter, L., & Shaw, K., 2009. *Whose urban renaissance? : An international comparison of urban regeneration strategies*. London: Routledge.

- Randolph, B., 2004. The Changing Australian City: New Patterns, New Policies and New Research Needs. *Urban Policy and Research*, 22(4), 481-493. doi: 10.1080/0811114042000296362
- Randolph, B., 2006. Delivering the Compact City in Australia: Current Trends and Future Implications. *Urban Policy and Research*, 24(4), 473-490. doi: 10.1080/08111140601035259
- Randolph, B., & Tice, A., 2014. Suburbanizing Disadvantage in Australian Cities: Sociospatial Change in an Era of Neoliberalism. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 36(S1), 384-399. doi: 10.1111/juaf.12108
- Shaw, K., 2008. Gentrification: What It is, Why It Is, and What Can Be Done about It. *Geography Compass*, 2(5), 1697-1728. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2008.00156.x
- Shaw, K., & Hagemas, I., 2015. 'Gentrification without displacement' and the Consequent Loss of Place: The Effects of Class Transition on Low-income Residents of secure Housing in Gentrifying Areas. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 1-19. doi: 10.1111/1468-2427.12164
- Slater, T., 2009. Missing Marcuse: On gentrification and displacement. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, 13(2-3), 292-311.
- Steele, W., & Gleeson, B. (2010). Planning in Climate Change. In B. Gleeson & W. Steele (Eds.), *A Climate for Growth: Planning South-East Queensland*. Brisbane, University of Queensland Press.
- Walters, P., & McCrea, R., 2014. Early Gentrification and the Public Realm: A Case Study of West End in Brisbane, Australia. *Urban Studies*, 51(2), 355-370.
- Weller, S., & van Hulst, A., 2012. Gentrification and Displacement: The effects of a Housing Crisis on Melbourne's Low-Income Residents. *Urban Policy and Research*, 30(1), 25-42. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08111146.2011.635410>
- Wulff, M., Dharmalingam, A., Reynolds, M., & Yates, J., 2009. Australia's private rental market: changes (2001-2006) in the supply of, and demand for, low rent dwellings (AHURI Positioning Paper No.122). Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.