

'Nice Plan, Shame about the Place' – Putting the Community into Planning

Conference paper prepared by:
Brian Elton, Managing Director, Elton Consulting
with Brendan Blakeley, Associate Director and Steve Rossiter, Principal Consultant

Introduction

This paper is about building communities. Part of that process is a physical one with the creation of homes, streets, parks, and places to shop, work and play, all essential elements of a community. We see these physical elements as critical building blocks to creating communities. However, while these physical elements provide a foundation, we suggest that they are not enough to support and sustain a real sense of community. In our view, what makes an authentic community are the actions of people - the relationships they form, the sense of identity and ownership they develop, the ways in which they interact with each other, how they come together to celebrate their place, and the opportunities they have to cooperate with others to influence what happens around them.

These are essential features of a sense of a community that require more than a two dimensional master plan and the third dimension of built form and public realm. To build a sense of community we need to move beyond a three dimensional planning process and look at how community engagement, community and cultural development, local economic development and community governance can be woven into the planning and design process to ensure that people are involved in the planning, design and lived experience of a place.

Community as a shared goal

'Community' has now become an essential feature in the sales and marketing of new residential suburbs, particularly master planned estates. The development industry has moved from selling lots and houses, to subdivisions, to estates, to suburbs and then to selling lifestyle and now, to community. The 'commodification of community' is a term that has been used by some academics to describe this interest by developers in communityⁱ. A cynic could view the increased emphasis on 'community' as 'commodification' and purely part of a marketing and positioning strategy. However the developer interest in community coincides with, and perhaps responds to, a renewed public interest in the 'people' aspects of land development and the importance of 'community', 'place' and 'neighbourhood'. Across a range of spheres it would appear people are seeking, indeed "craving community" and that a "revolution to reconnect" is afoot.ⁱⁱ

Practical experience demonstrates that if a particular approach can be shown to produce better results in terms of market interest and return for developers, or in the case of policy makers, improved social dividends then it will be embraced. Building authentic communities is one of those things that is both profitable and creates good social outcomes. Although motivations may be different, if the desired outcome is to create better, more liveable and healthy communities that a range of people enjoy to live in, then we should explore opportunities and seek to maximise community benefit where we can. An essential starting point is a common understanding of what 'community' actually is and what can be done through the planning, design and development process to create 'community' in a way that is real, meaningful and sustainable for residents, and not just developers and their marketers.

What do we mean by community?

A fundamental step in understanding the extent to which land development through urban planning, design and the development process can build a feeling of community, is to understand more about what this feeling of community actually is. Definitions of 'community' are many and varied. For this discussion we equate the feeling of community with 'sense of community', a term commonly used throughout the academic literature. This literature is extensive but much of what has been written on 'sense of community' over the last 20 years can be traced back to a couple of seminal articles. One of

those is an article written by MacMillan and Chavis in 1986ⁱⁱⁱ. MacMillan and Chavis defined 'sense of community' as "a feeling that members have of belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members' needs will be met through their commitment to be together."

MacMillan and Chavis (1986), in their still influential work, identified the following four dimensions of 'sense of community':

- Membership – a sense of belonging and identification
- Influence – the feeling that residents can be influential in the neighbourhood
- Integration and fulfilment of needs – the degree to which neighbourhoods are able to meet the social needs of residents
- Shared emotional connections – a bond achieved through shared history, events and recognition.

We will come back to this definition and dimensions and will argue that physical planning and urban design can play an important role in laying the foundation for 'sense of community' (understood as membership, influence, fulfilment of need and share emotional connections). We also argue that planning and design by themselves are only part of the solution and are necessary, but not sufficient, in encouraging a real sense of community in our neighbourhoods.

When old is new again

There has been some progress and a reawakening of sorts in the planning and design professions. It seems that many planners and designers have become adherents to the set of ideas that have been branded as 'New Urbanism'. The upside of this is that the principles, when properly applied, are more likely to produce a better physical form than the standard approach to suburban post-war development. 'New Urbanism' and 'Traditional Neighbourhood Design' base neighbourhood design around a discernible centre and uses the five minute walk 'pedestrian shed' as a fundamental planning unit. Mixed zoning is encouraged so that a variety of dwelling types and uses are interspersed within neighbourhoods rather than being located in separate, often distant, precincts. Pedestrian movement is prioritised with connected networks of footpaths and trails and streets and the reduced dominance of the car. Streets are often planned on a grid layout (or modified grid) to maximise connectivity.

The principles of New Urbanism have been defined^{iv} as:

- Walkability
- Connectivity
- Mixed use and density
- Mixed housing
- Quality architecture and urban design
- Traditional neighbourhood structure
- Increased density
- Smart transportation
- Sustainability
- Quality of life.

Although considered somewhat groundbreaking in the United States (and perhaps deservedly so given the appalling standards of their conventional suburban development), in the Australian context it could be argued that New Urbanism is not perhaps that novel. New Urbanist-type principles are considered standard practice by most Australian urban designers – not necessarily 'new urban' just good, common sense planning. On the master planned projects that we have worked on, our experience supports the observations of Rosenblatt et al (2008:9) that common design practice in master planned communities includes: dividing the estate into smaller (linked) villages based on walkable catchments to create more localised neighbourhoods with a greater potential for sense of community; provision of some form of town or village centre that acts as a focal point for the whole of the community; an emphasis on greater street connectivity and increased walkability; and parks, walking trails, bushland etc. designed to get people active and about^v.

The potential benefits of good quality urban design are significant and are not disputed. Movements like New Urbanism should be recognised for helping to revive the importance of design and public realm to development. However, like any other aspect of community planning, design by itself is insufficient to sustain a broad range of objectives particularly those that deal with social issues such as equity, access to services, building community capacity and participation in decision making and governance. While design can provide a physical foundation for addressing social issues, it cannot, in itself, strengthen the social relationships that are the real basis of 'community'.

Just add water ... or people

There is a strong deterministic tendency in New Urbanism and similar design philosophies that believe that if you get the design right, then 'community' will follow. Gleeson (2003:57)^{vi} comments on what he sees as a very simplistic approach to building 'community' by New Urbanists and others:

Just as Sea Monkeys could be willed into life by adding water to a strange powdery substance in a mail order packet, now community is willed into life by pouring money, lots of it, into nostalgic combinations of bricks and mortar.

New Urbanism and similar design philosophies are borne from a belief that the problems with our suburbs, towns and cities are technical ones that can be solved through applying a set of design principles. An alternative view is that while design is essential in laying the foundation for new suburbs and towns, a purely deterministic reliance on design is a partial solution at best. There appears to be a reasonable level of acceptance in Australia that there is a need to move beyond physical determinism. Australian design professionals are largely, in our view, not nearly so dogmatic in their approach and have a better appreciation for both physical and social context. The challenge for us all is understanding and appreciating the things that can help us move beyond the physically determinist approach and instilling a focus on people (their needs, ways of using space and the relationships that they form) throughout the planning and design process.

A recent project we have worked on involved the recognised Danish architect Jan Gehl whose simple philosophy of 'life, space, buildings' elegantly summed up the priority of thinking that is needed to plan and design communities that will continue to work for residents, visitors and others users long after the design awards have been accepted and the celebrations have ended. Architects and planners play a critical and very important role, but it is people's everyday participation, their day to day use and the relationships that are formed that make a place. What value people ascribe to a place and the relationships they form (with both the physical place and the social relationships that the place acts as a setting for) are the things that can make a difference. As practitioners, we are not going to understand this process, unless we engage with people, not only in the design and development of a place but also in its ongoing management and governance. We need to think about what things we do to create the conditions where those elements that make up a 'sense of community' can be addressed.

The main point of this paper is that there is an over emphasis on the capacity of physical design measures to create enduring and widespread social benefits. Good design is fundamental and it provides an essential foundation upon which community can be built. But, in and of itself, it is not enough to create the lasting social benefits that make up a socially sustainable community and the places, networks and relationships that are valued by residents.

The key message to those in the development industry and those responsible for urban policy and governance is that embedding social sustainability objectives and community processes in the creation of new communities is as important as quality urban design and architecture.

Recent post occupancy research that involved surveys and focus groups of residents of a master planned community in South East Queensland found that although residents valued the 'environmentally friendly setting' they also valued friendly people, a quiet and peaceful atmosphere, safety and security, and strong community spirit. The authors, in support of the view that design is essential but not sufficient, suggested that the "finding that the physical environment was something that people valued most about living in Springfield Lakes is not an indication that physical setting is more important than community, but rather that it is an inextricable component of it"^{vii}.

3 dimensional planning

An overemphasis on the influence of the physical qualities of a place represents an approach to planning and design that is based on the designer as determiner of human behaviour. This view believes it does not have to extend itself beyond a two dimensional process where the product is a master plan that conforms to certain principles. Built form and public realm add the third dimension. It is at this point that many would see the planning process as being complete.

The table below represents this three dimensional approach to planning.

Dimension	Name	Elements
1 and 2	Land use / master plan (two dimensional)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walkable communities Neighbourhoods based on a discernible centre Integration of public transport Accessible public spaces Mixed uses
3	Built form and public realm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streetscapes that promote human activity Quality architecture and urban design Facilities, infrastructure and design that promote walking and bicycling Range of housing types Design that provides for human connections with the natural world

The table above shows some of the key elements that characterise the three dimensional approach to planning and design. The intention here is not to dismiss the validity and importance of these elements. They are critical and are recognised as providing an essential physical foundation for new and renewing communities.

The 4th dimension

For a more comprehensive and sustainable planning process, a fourth dimension that includes community engagement, community and cultural development, capacity building, local economic development, education and governance can supplement the three dimensional approach. These social planning elements help to create the 'social glue' that holds the more physical elements together and gives them real meaning and value.

This approach is more aligned with recent developments in place making where there is a greater emphasis on people's use and understanding of space, the creation of opportunities for social interaction, community celebration and cultural recognition, and an emphasis on community engagement, participation and ownership.

The following table shows a four dimensional approach where social planning elements and a 'people centred' focus influence all aspects of the planning and design process.

Dimension	Name	Social Planning Elements	Approach
1 and 2	Land use / master plan (two dimensional)	Beyond conventional planning and design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Healthy community planning Child friendly cities Universal/inclusive design Crime prevention and community safety 	People/user focused Not sequential
3	Built form and public realm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Place making Social infrastructure Affordable housing 	Integrated Sustainable Evolutionary – responds to and supports
4	Social / community processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community engagement Community development Cultural planning and events Community education Community governance Local economic development 	community needs as they emerge

The table above not only adds the fourth dimension but also shows the range of social planning elements and influences that can be incorporated into all dimensions of the planning process. This reinforces that the fourth dimension is not necessarily an 'add on' but is, or should be, a key influence during the planning, design delivery and occupancy phases of a project. Social planning input at all stages is critical with community engagement being an obvious example that should be incorporated early in planning and design processes to reinforce that the creation of meaningful places and sustainable communities relies on community input and experience as much as it does on professional expertise.

The planning and design processes should provide a number of opportunities to incorporate the needs of people. This ensures that the physical environment is designed in a way that encourages, rather than impedes, the desired social behaviours that are seen as essential to creating vibrant communities. The social planning frameworks identified in the table can be utilised to inform and enhance the design and planning approach. They include healthy community planning, child friendly communities, universal design and crime prevention. These frameworks have distinct physical planning and design implications, yet are focused on desirable social outcomes for a range of different population groups. Through referral to these kinds of frameworks the planning and design process can help to encourage physical activity, healthy lifestyles, places for children and families to use, enjoy and learn from, improved accessibility for a range of different population groups, community safety and greater sense of belonging and wellbeing.

A four dimensional approach can help to bring a plan to life and transform a sustainable design into a sustainable community (a nice plan and a great place). The social and community processes highlighted in the table above as the fourth dimension¹ include:

- Community and stakeholder engagement genuinely involving the community and other stakeholders through a variety of means throughout the process
- Community and cultural development identifying and addressing community needs through a process that is participatory, builds local capacity and encourages self sufficiency and shared identity among community members
- Community education involving a range of learning activities which focus on sustainability, providing information on sustainable lifestyles and practices, and raising awareness about opportunities for local environmental stewardship.
- Community governance involving the development of mechanisms to enable community members to participate in decisions that may affect them. Examples include the establishment of neighbourhood associations or residents groups, or linking with existing bodies such as precinct committees or community councils
- Local economic development providing for jobs close to home and ensuring that local people have an opportunity to share in the benefits of the development through jobs, training and supply of services.

To use an analogy if the built form and public domain (including educational, health and childcare centres, places to shop, playgrounds/parks and meeting spaces etc.) act as the "hardware", the social and community process outlined above are the "software" that activates and animates the physical platform provided. One cannot work without the other.

¹ It is important to note that although listed separately these four components are ideally viewed as part of an integrated strategy to maximise the synergies between engagement, development, education and governance

The 4th dimension and sense of community

Going back to the four key elements of 'sense of community' we see that although physical design plays an important role, by itself, it has only a limited influence on the social processes, relationships and networks that are fundamental to building a 'sense of community'.

The following table illustrates the point by highlighting how the different capacities of urban design, physical planning, urban form (dimensions one, two and three) and community, social and cultural processes (dimension four) influence the four key aspects of sense of community as identified by MacMillan and Chavis (1986).

Sense of community*	Definition	Dimensions 1, 2 and 3 Urban design/physical elements/built form and public realm	Dimension 4 Community/social/cultural processes
Membership	Sense of belonging and identification	Physical/place identifiers – town/village centre, gateway, name, features such as lakes, place making – accessibility	Neighbourhood associations, community groups – bush care etc, management committees, sporting groups Volunteering, involvement in community events and activities
Influence	Feeling that residents can be influential		Governance structures – micro (internal to neighbourhood), macro (relationship to other bodies e.g. local council), neighbourhood associations, community associations, management committees, Community engagement – involving residents in the design of plans, local parks, community facilities etc.
Integration and fulfilment of needs	Degree to which social needs can be met	Inclusion of local shops, community facilities, design of public spaces and streetscapes that promote social gathering and interaction	Community development, addressing local needs, establishment of local groups e.g. playgroups, Social capital – informal networks of support, neighbouring
Shared emotional connections	Bonds developed through shared belonging, events, recognition	Design of public spaces that act as venues for community and cultural events and a place for social gathering	Community and cultural development – events, activities, social capital

* Based on the four elements of sense of community identified by MacMillan and Chavis (1986)

The last column of the table includes the things that we refer to as 'the fourth dimension'. They include a variety of social and community processes that, while requiring good quality urban design to support them, occur and evolve over time long after the designers, planners and sometimes the developers, have moved on.

The table illustrates a point made by Emily Talen, a US academic who has written extensively about New Urbanism, who argues that although planning and design can create situations where people come into contact with each other, this is not sufficient to ensure that this contact develops into community relationships. While design can provide a physical foundation for addressing social issues, it cannot, in itself, enhance social resources and capital^{viii}. So while physical planning and design can create places where people come into close proximity with each other, this does not necessarily mean that any form of actual social interaction occurs.

Recent research

The four dimensional approach to planning new communities is not new, nor is it exclusive intellectual property. Leading developers have been utilising this type of approach for some time. It should be stated that the approach described here is not a 'magic bullet' for creating community. It is another layer or dimension to complement the design and planning processes to ensure that people are not only the focus, but also have the opportunity to be involved in working with their neighbours, influencing local decisions and celebrating community life, should they decide to do so. Recently, the University of Queensland has undertaken a research project to look at the benefits of a developer-initiated community development program. This work (reported on in Rosenblatt et al, 2008) identifies some key issues and challenges and (very importantly) highlights the value of applying some academic rigour and sound evaluation to this important work^{ix}.

Rosenblatt et al's (2008) work involved post occupancy surveys and focus group research of residents of a master planned estate in South East Queensland. Aware of criticisms regarding the limitations of physical design's ability to enhance social networks and create a sense of community, the estate developer recognised the need to go beyond physical design to deliver an extensive community development program that included: a welcome program for new residents; sponsorship of community events and activities; support for the establishment of community clubs and associations; a range of community information initiatives including newsletters and community portal web site^x.

A key finding of Rosenblatt et al (2008:3) was that residents identified a strong sense of community as existing in the estate, but it was also found that the level of actual social interaction between neighbours is generally low. While about half of the residents were not found to be socially interactive with neighbours (and were not generally interested in being so), most residents still reported a strong sense of community. Rosenblatt et al's research found that in explaining the lack of contact that many people had with their neighbours, respondents "frequently reported that becoming involved in community required a degree of effort" and that lack of time was identified as the primary reason for a lack of involvement in community activities^{xi}. Rosenblatt et al (2008:17) add:

"Affective ties of belonging to place and to a perceived community are strong ... but this does not equate with a desire by all residents to be involved in collective activity. Rather, they appear happy to attend entertainment and other events provided by the developer, which creates a sense of 'imagined community' but does not involve participation".

Rosenblatt et al's work highlights some real obstacles. It is apparent that there is a fine line between facilitating community development activities to make it easier for residents to participate and taking too much responsibility for organising and facilitating activities so that lasting social benefits such as social interaction, capacity building and community ownership are not achieved in this more 'community as passive' model.

Stimulating community not simulating community

We adhere to the view that the active creation of community and the introduction of catalysts, whether they be people or some form of activity or event can help to facilitate community development. As mentioned earlier, this social planning and community development approach, that we refer to as the fourth dimension, is not a guarantee of 'community'. However it can provide a catalyst for those relationships that community members are interested in and value. As we have observed elsewhere "opportunities for community development and the creation of social capital do not happen automatically, but need to be stimulated"^{xii}.

This 'stimulation' can occur through institutional arrangements, partnerships and direct resourcing to create structures and processes that forge connections between people and foster community life. Resourcing community development is a tricky process. As Rosenblatt (2005:10) warns too much 'regulation' "results in there being no community building projects available for community members to become a part of." Rosenblatt et al (2008:4) go on to suggest that if 'community' is 'contrived' or 'manipulated' as interaction, there is a danger that "the very idea of community that attracts residents to the estate in the first place" may be undermined. There is, however, a balance between leaving residents without resources to undertake community development activities and controlling those activities to the extent that residents are passive observers.

The community development initiatives (a welcome program, community events and activities, support for clubs and associations, and community information), that Rosenblatt et al (2008) studied in the Queensland master planned estate, are probably the right type of things to do, but there is a different approach to how they are done that can make a significant difference. There is a need for a catalyst and some 'enabling', but we think this needs to be grounded in the local community. While utilising a similar set of activities and events, the approach that we advocate has a fundamental and very important difference. Projects like Second Ponds Creek and Greenway Views in Western Sydney have involved the developers (both Landcom joint venture projects) working with a locally based and experienced community development organisation to deliver a community development program to new estate residents. Lyons in Darwin (a joint venture between Canberra Investment Corporation and Defence Housing Australia) has taken a similar approach. In addition, the ACT Land Development Agency is about to embark on a similar process with a 3 year community development program at one of their residential estates in the Gungahlin area. (It must be noted that these projects have not yet undergone the same level of post occupancy evaluation as have the community development efforts at Springfield Lakes).

A key element of this alternative approach is working with locally established community development organisations that have existing knowledge of, and relationships with, the community and, importantly, will continue to be part of this community after the developer has gone. While the development industry recognises the importance of community, it does not pretend that they have a long term interest in acting as community development practitioners. The employment of a local Community Development Worker, ideally from a local and experienced community organisation, is essential to 'grounding' this work in the local community and is also important to the sustainability of community initiatives beyond the time of the developer's direct involvement. A locally based Community Development Worker enables a much more 'organic' and responsive approach to community development and provides for opportunities for greater community involvement and ownership. The role of the Community Development Worker is critical. Authentic community is not achieved through fireworks displays and Christmas carols. The resourcing of a Community Development Worker provides an experienced locally based person that works with the local community to assist them in identifying and understanding their needs and to engage with local people on how to address them. This is a different form of community development work. We are not talking necessarily about a traditional social justice or welfare model, but we are talking about community based research, program development, group formation and facilitation, capacity building and skills development as well as the community and cultural events that help to bring local people together to celebrate their place.

If part of a comprehensive program, and if planned with the involvement and ownership of community members, community and cultural events can help to create a sense of identity, encourage cooperation and bring neighbours together. The organisation of a cultural celebration or event can be great vehicles for bringing people together around a common cause and encouraging working towards a communal goal. Timothy Beatley^{xiii} writes of the importance of art and community celebration:

Community events can help to bring people and neighbourhoods closer together, help develop lasting community relationships, and build commitments to place. We need more community events that rally people together that call upon them to demonstrate (physically) their bonds to one another and to the community as a whole.

Another commonly used and important community development tool is a community trust or fund that uses relatively small grants (often funded through land/home sales) to support community identified priorities and projects. These initiatives are also fundamental to the sustainability of community development initiatives and the locally based organisations, and hopefully many of the initiatives funded under the community trust or fund, will continue to be active in the community after land sales have been completed and the developer has moved on. The community trust can be used to help fund resident organised community events and cultural festivals. On the Land Development Agency project at Franklin we are developing a program that includes outdoor cinema, food festivals, sustainability fairs, music events, as well as facilitating smaller scale (and largely self-organised) street parties and neighbourhood barbecues. There will also be a Community Development Worker employed by a local, well established community organisation who will be working with residents to

establish playgroups, homework help, exercise programs, language courses, a community garden and helping to set up a neighbourhood association.

Community and stakeholder engagement is another important aspect of this approach. There is a tendency with design driven master planning approaches for the design work to be the exclusive domain of the 'experts'. There is a growing recognition that a range of initiatives, disciplines and experiences are required to enable and facilitate the process of creating 'sustainable communities'. While there is certainly no agreed recipe for creating such communities, there is increasing agreement that the development of 'community' is a process, requiring a wide range of input, including most importantly, input from residents themselves, whether they are residents moving into a development or residents already living in the area. Community engagement can be viewed as the first steps in the community building process and has direct links to later work in community development, education and governance.

Gleeson (2004:6) advocates a community planning model that focuses less on physical infrastructure and "more on building the networks, relationships, capacities and possibilities for social interaction." In this model, new residents would be invited to participate in some of the planning tasks themselves. Gleeson (p.6) adds that this participatory model "is the one most likely to encourage the growth of strong and inclusive social bonding and the emergence of community" where (p.11) "there will still be a role for experts" but "also a role for everyone else"^{xiv}. The capacity for people to be involved in some of the planning tasks, recognises the importance of enabling community development to follow its naturally organic and evolutionary path. Although we are strong advocates of the importance of stimulating community development, particularly in new estates, we also recognise the importance of 'leaving some things undone'. These 'undone' things enable community members to play an active role in shaping their own communities. This is a challenge as for most master planned estates, the planning and design process is well and truly completed by the time the first residents move in. There are community building advantages in leaving some things 'undesigned' so that residents can attribute their own meaning to them and have the opportunity to work together to 'plan, design and develop' them in a way that suits their needs and fits their own image of their place.

Challenges (and opportunities)

We are the first to admit that creating or facilitating a sense of community, even with the proposed 'partnering' approach, is difficult. Some of the challenges are highlighted by Rosenblatt et al (2008:10) in their overview of the 'changing nature of community'^{xv}. They highlight a range of social changes that together lead to "reduced time spent on face to face interaction in a local context ... and a weakening attachment to place." These changes include:

- Longer work hours and commuting times
- Increased mobility associated with choice of place, work and school
- Mobility and fluidity of social relations
- The influence of information and communications technology such as the internet
- Increasing trends towards individualism
- Increasing privatisation of entertainment within the family home
- The existence of a multiplicity of 'communities' with place of residence being just one of many.

These challenges are real but we believe that in an increasingly complex and globalised world the importance of place, neighbourhood and community become more important not less. We have not been addressing these challenges as comprehensively as we should have been. A four dimensional approach to the planning and design of our new and regenerating communities, while not a universal panacea, does provide us with greater opportunities to create real neighbourhoods that can foster the social relationships that are the building blocks of community. This approach adds to the two dimensional land use plan, and the third dimension of urban form, to include the social planning aspects of community building including community engagement, community development, education, governance, ongoing participation in decision making, strengthening networks (bonding and bridging capital) and building capacity in the community to work together to address common issues. This approach is not an 'add on' but affects all phases of the planning and design process. It is an integrating approach that reflects the essence of sustainability where environmental, economic, social and cultural dimensions are considered in concert and quality of life, capacity building and community engagement are recognised as fundamental.

As documented by Rosenblatt and others, the challenges to genuine community formation are significant. This reinforces the importance of sound post occupancy evaluation. The widespread and common interest in building real communities that are sustainable and work for a range of households presents a great opportunity. There is a need for collaborative research partnerships to build on the work already undertaken between the development industry and academia that can provide us all with a much more robust evidence base to support and guide the work we are doing.

We welcome what we see as a broadening of the horizons of the planning, design and development professions in Australia to embrace the importance of the social dimensions of planning and development. We look forward to the development of partnerships and relationships that can provide the robust evidence base we all need to continue this work towards the development of truly sustainable communities – places where we can say with confidence ‘nice plan, great place’.

ⁱ Rosenblatt, T. (2005), *Lakeside Living: Commodifying community in a master planned estate*, Paper given at the State of Australian Cities Conference, Brisbane, 2005

ⁱⁱ Mansfield et al (2007) *Craving Community: The New American Dream*, Abecedary Press

ⁱⁱⁱ MacMillan, D. and Chavis, D. (1986), Sense of community: a definition and theory, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 14(1), pp. 6-23

^{iv} Principles from <http://www.newurbanism.org/newurbanism/principles.html>

^v Rosenblatt, T., Cheshire, L. and Lawrence, G. (2008), Social Interaction and Sense of Community in a Master Planned Community, *Housing Theory and Society*, iFirst Article, 1-21

^{vi} Gleeson, B. (2003), What’s driving suburban Australia? Fear in the tank, hope on the horizon, *Griffith Review*, Summer 2003-2004, 55-71

^{vii} Rosenblatt, T., Cheshire, L. and Lawrence, G. (2008:13)

^{viii} Talen, E. (1999), Sense of Community and Neighbourhood Form: An assessment of the social doctrine of New Urbanism, *Urban Studies*, July 1999, 36,8, p.1361

^{ix} Rosenblatt, T., Cheshire, L. and Lawrence, G. (2008), Social Interaction and Sense of Community in a Master Planned Community, *Housing Theory and Society*, iFirst Article, 1-21

^x Rosenblatt, T., Cheshire, L. and Lawrence, G. (2008), Social Interaction and Sense of Community in a Master Planned Community, *Housing Theory and Society*, iFirst Article, 1-21

^{xi} Rosenblatt, T., Cheshire, L. and Lawrence, G. (2008:15)

^{xii} Elton, B. (2006), Building Sustainable Communities: Planning for social sustainability, in Freestone, R., Randolph, B. and Butler-Bowdon, C. (eds), *Talking about Sydney: Population, community and culture in contemporary Sydney*, UNSW Press

^{xiii} Beatley, T. (2004), *Native to Nowhere: Sustaining Home and Community in a Global Age*, Island Press

^{xiv} Gleeson, B. (2004), *Deprogramming Planning: Collaboration and inclusion in new urban development*, Paper presented at Delfin Debate – Mission Impossible: Can planning create community?, Brisbane

^{xv} Rosenblatt, T., Cheshire, L. and Lawrence, G. (2008:10)