

## **Paradigm lost or paradigm regained? – current Australian metropolitan strategies**

Raymond Bunker,  
Visiting Senior Research Fellow,  
City Futures Research Centre,  
University of New South Wales.

### **Contact details:**

Raymond Bunker,  
City Futures Research Centre,  
University of New South Wales,  
NSW 2052,  
Australia.

e-mail: [r.bunker@unsw.edu.au](mailto:r.bunker@unsw.edu.au)  
Tel: (02) 9385 5309

**Keywords:** metropolitan planning, evolution, paradigm, state Labor governments

**Running title:** A paradigm of Australian metropolitan planning

**Wordcount:** 5152

## **Abstract**

The paper investigates the hypothesis that there is a distinctive Australian approach to metropolitan planning. It does this by examining the major strategies formulated for the mainland state capital cities since the Second World War. It finds that an Australian paradigm of metropolitan planning evolved over the years of the 'long boom' from the end of the Second World War until the 1980s. The recent metropolitan strategies formulated for Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and region, Perth and Adelaide by state Labor governments are then reviewed to see how far they reflect this paradigm.

These recent strategies appear to reflect the Australian paradigm in more sophisticated and intricate forms. However, they do need frequent revision and benefit from association with other plans for economic development, sustainability, infrastructure provision and transport planning.

# **Paradigm lost or paradigm regained? Current Australian metropolitan strategies**

## **Introduction**

With the emergence of globalisation, it has been argued that there is a convergence of planning processes across the world so that “unprecedented similarities across leading cities of the world are happening” (Taylor, 2006, p. 1164). Others, however maintain that this is unlikely given the differences in culture, political economy, resources and circumstances of nations. Newman and Thornley (2005) particularly emphasise the influence of city governance that “can shape global forces ... strategic plans interpret global forces and can act as vehicles to manage different spatial responses to globalization and promote particular visions of a city’s global role” (Newman and Thornley, 2005, p. 276). In this vein they identify American, European and Asian models, contrasting the more interventionist approaches of the two latter with that of America.

Given the distinctive nature of Australian urbanisation, dominated by state capital cities and a federal system of government, is there a characteristic style, or paradigm of Australian metropolitan planning? And if so, is it evolving and changing as new issues, challenges and circumstances arise? The question has been posed by Sanyal (2005) who has argued that there are different ‘planning cultures’:

meaning the dominant attitude of professional planners in different nations towards the appropriate role of the state, market forces and civil society in urban, regional and national development ... (and) ... (A)re they indigenous and immutable, or do they evolve with social, political and economic changes both within and outside the national territory? (Sanyal, 2005, p. 3).

This paper investigates the hypothesis that there is a distinctive style of metropolitan planning in Australia. A similar approach has been used to organise a history of metropolitan planning in Australia in a sequence of planning ‘paradigms’ for each decade since the Second World War (Hamnett & Freestone, 2000). However this paper attempts a further level of abstraction, seeking those distinctive features of planning which reflect Australian society, space and governance. It has been argued that these three characteristics shape spatial discourses of the kind embodied in metropolitan plans (Madanipour *et al.*, 2001; Richardson & Jensen, 2003; Salet *et al.*, 2003; Healey, 2006). The same kind of approach was used by Gleeson and his colleagues in 2004 when they carried out a socio-theoretic analysis of metropolitan planning in Australia in terms of five investigative themes – policy, space, governance, finance and democracy (Gleeson *et al.*, 2004).

## **1. The development of Australian metropolitan planning in the long boom years till 1980.**

A distinctive style of Australian planning developed in the long post-war boom years when strong economic and population growth took place reflecting stable conditions and the 'Australian Settlement' (Kelly, 1992; Gleeson and Low, 2000). These conditions included strong immigration flows, development of manufacturing industry behind a tariff barrier, a guaranteed minimum wage, and provision of infrastructure by the state. The first post-war metropolitan plan, - or County Scheme - (Cumberland County Council, 1948) for Sydney established many of the characteristics of later plans of this kind. It was heavily influenced by British practice of the time. The plan was comprehensive and detailed, and arranged land uses and communications to accommodate an anticipated population increase of some half million by 1972. It included a network of 'County Roads', and a system of District Centres or concentrations of business and commercial activities which were meant to act as the focus for relatively self-contained districts of suburban living.

The County Scheme's estimates of population growth were much too low, and suburban growth of much greater magnitude than that envisaged soon took place.

Later metropolitan plans in Australia in this period of the long boom up until about 1980, developed and reflected these conditions of:

- long range planning a generation ahead;
- a comprehensive and interlocking 'blueprint' for the development of the city;
- considerable detail as to the arrangement of activities, land uses, location of centres and communications;
- acting as a coordinating instrument for infrastructure development;
- relying on private investment and the market to flesh out growth and change;
- reflecting planning legislation that married strategic purposes for directing metropolitan growth with local control;
- absence of Commonwealth interest and involvement in this period (with the exception of the Whitlam years of 1972-75).

There was considerable variation on how successive metropolitan plans incorporated these characteristics as discussed in Hamnett and Freestone (2000). However the seminal ones are that for Melbourne by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works (1954) which reflected the responsibilities of the Board for providing infrastructure to service suburban development; the Sydney Region Outline Plan (State Planning Authority of NSW, 1968) which specified the location and timing of future suburban development so successfully that it was labeled a 'developer's guide'; the metropolitan plan for Adelaide (Town Planning Committee of South Australia, 1962) which provided a detailed plan for urban growth with a hierarchy of centres and a comprehensive arrangement of land uses and communications; and the plan for the metropolitan region of Perth (Stephenson and

Hepburn, 1955), an advisory metropolitan plan largely followed in the subsequent metropolitan regional scheme (Metropolitan Regional Planning Authority, Perth, 1962).

## **2. Changes in the fundamental drivers of metropolitan plans 1980-2000**

It can be argued that this Australian paradigm reflected three main drivers. First, the metropolitan strategies are state government documents and as such reflect the powers and resources of the state government in providing services and programs for the capital city with the opportunities for coordination that this provides, together with the ability to implement metropolitan strategies through supervision and direction of local plans. The second is through the provision and coordination of infrastructure to service growth. The third is the strong emphasis on metropolitan growth through suburban development, whose advantages had been discussed by Stretton (1970) and later by Troy (1996) and Gleeson (2006).

However the 1980s and the 1990s saw fundamental changes in these circumstances. One was a move to urban management and a ‘whole of government’ approach on the part of state governments, offering a more flexible and shorter-term planning process closely linked to state government policy-making, administration and budgeting. The debate about urban management and urban planning is well illustrated in a publication authored by Neutze and Mant in 1988. Another was the move by both Labor and Liberal-National Party state governments towards neo-liberalism.

Another important change was the opening up of Australian society and its economy to globalisation. The exchange rate was released to find its own level in the market and tariffs and customs duties lowered so that Australian businesses now received less or no protection from foreign competitors. Flows of capital were free to find their own avenues of investment and travel and movement of people and migrants increased. This process was aided by the information revolution which enabled ideas, information, and data to be disseminated and accessed with increasing ease. In metropolitan planning terms this drove strategies to seek urban forms and structures to facilitate economic development and improve the competitive powers of the city concerned (Hamnett, 2000).

The state government’s ability to provide and coordinate infrastructure provision was eroded by the moves to sell off services in public transport, water supply and management, and energy generation and distribution. There were also public-private enterprises in developing rail routes, roads and tunnels which had mixed fortunes. Such privatisation and outsourcing diminished the ability of state governments to coordinate and deliver public services. These issues were identified by Graham and Marvin (2001) as *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructure, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition*.

Finally the suburban condition came under attack with arguments that more compact and higher density cities had many advantages in reducing the costs of urban development and especially in the use of energy for transportation by encouraging the use of public

transport (Newman and Kenworthy, 1999). Urban consolidation became a strengthening theme of urban development, particularly in Sydney, Australia's largest city.

These changes led to some ambivalence and lack of purpose in the few metropolitan plans produced in this period. "(I)n the early 1980s metropolitan planning in Australia was in the doldrums" (Lennon, 2000, p. 149). While various plans were formulated in the 1990s they tended to be indicative and broad-brush with most of them produced by the conservative Liberal-Country state governments then in power. They include *Living Suburbs* (1995) for Melbourne and the *Planning Strategy for Metropolitan Adelaide* (1994) where a Labor Government draft plan was appropriated and modified by a newly-elected Liberal government for economic development purposes (Hamnett 2000). The two Sydney plans of 1994 and 1999 were in urban management vein reflecting the state government's neo-liberal ideology and too vague to command much credence (Searle, 2004a).

### **3. Changing conditions, new issues and the emergence of State Labor governments**

The first years of the new millennium brought some considerable changes affecting metropolitan planning in Australia. There was recognition of the lack of planning in the last two decades of the Twentieth Century and a growing need to upgrade, extend and improve the infrastructure of the capital cities (Troy 1999). There were also new and evolving challenges in terms of climate change, water management and use, rural-urban fringe development, energy production and use, transport and travel, and concentrations of social disadvantage and poverty (Randolph 2002; Randolph and Holloway 2005). A new theme of 'sustainability' developed with interwoven strands of economic, social, environmental and ecological concerns. The new century also saw the election of Labor governments in all the states of Australia, and the production of metropolitan strategies for Melbourne in 2002, Perth, Sydney and Brisbane and region in 2005, and Adelaide in 2006/7.

These changing conditions raise the question as to whether adjustments might occur to an Australian paradigm of metropolitan planning.

### **4. Themes emerging in the early 2000s**

In this review, discourse analysis is used to establish the presence of particular themes. This can be done in two ways: in identifying the dominant themes in socio-political space and using appropriate documents to illustrate the nature of these discourses, and in analysing documents themselves to ascertain their inherent discourses. By using both these deductive and inductive approaches, it is hoped to combine textual analysis with an understanding of the political, economic and social context within which debates and arguments about the nature and content of policy take place, in order to gain insights into the nature of the plans and their strengths and weaknesses. Accordingly I start by identifying six themes informing metropolitan planning processes.

### *Multiplicity of planning documents*

Whereas previously metropolitan strategies might have been regarded as the coordinating instrument for metropolitan growth and change in terms of urban form and structure - and to some extent even of metropolitan conditions - a number of strategies, plans and programs have been developed in recent years to address emerging issues and the complexities of regional planning and the urban condition. These included state plans, sustainability plans, housing strategies, transportation plans, water management plans, economic development programs and so on. Metropolitan strategies appropriated and related to these in an uneven manner. The most obvious connections should be with a state plan and an infrastructure strategy and these associations have been explored in New South Wales and South Australia (Bunker, 2008). This showed that supportive and interactive relationships could be struck between them, but the nature of the leading plan in this *troika* varied with circumstances and much depended on the profile of portfolio responsibilities and strength of various ministers. This situation obviously became even more problematic with a change of government, particularly as these plans often contained considerable spin as well as substance.

### *Centralisation*

In order to encourage property and business investment, state governments moved to take more control of local government plans and development assessment processes, controls and approvals. Peter Williams in his recent review of the legislative framework for planning concluded that:

contemporary planning systems aim for ‘simplification’, ‘integration’, ‘certainty’ and ‘fast-tracking’ ... as governments use planning to achieve objectives primarily focused on economic growth and the attraction of investment (Williams 2007, p. 112).

This centralisation included the setting up of special-purpose corporations to plan and develop large projects and the ‘calling-in’ of development applications for determination by the minister without appeal where they were deemed to be of particular importance, scale or urgency.

### *Sustainability*

A transition towards a more sustainable future is a feature of recent planning. Thus Beatley and Newman argue (2009) that “Australia’s metropolitan areas are guided by visionary and ambitious regional plans – a distinctive and exemplary feature of the Australian sustainability scene” (pp. 188-189). This is mainly because there is a growing realisation that the natural resources upon which the city depends require more sustainable management. This is evident in the case of water (Troy 2008), and continuing concerns about the dependence on private vehicles for travel in Australian cities with rising prices for oil and high levels of carbon emissions (Holloway 2008; Rickwood *et al.*, 2008; Glazebrook & Rickwood, 2008; Rickwood & Glazebrook 2009).

It is also apparent in more sensitive shaping and management of ecological systems; better protection and management of good agricultural land, particularly at the rural-urban fringe; and lesser production and more recycling of waste.

#### *Promoting economic development and enhancing competitiveness*

Hamnett (2000) characterised the late 1990s as one of “competitive versus sustainable cities” and concluded there was “a stronger emphasis on economic policy, on the purpose of plans to provide a framework for investment, and on their means of implementation” (p. 173). The emphasis in the various state plans and general policies is on economic development; of expanding advanced business services; providing land, and infrastructure; and shaping suitable conditions and agreements to attract investment such as Fox Studios to the former Agricultural Society Showground site in Sydney.

#### *Infrastructure provision*

Significant elements of metropolitan infrastructure have been privatised or built by public-private partnerships over recent years – with mixed results, several having to be bailed out by the state. These circumstances and experiences make investment, coordination and accountability more difficult. The South Australian Strategic Infrastructure Plan for South Australia (Office for Infrastructure Development, 2005) commented that “the privatisation of South Australia’s electricity system has resulted in increased prices ... (A)ugmentation of the system to meet increased demand has been made more difficult by privatization” (p. 125).

Even where infrastructure remains with the state government, there are abrupt reversals of policy. The public transport proposals contained in Sydney’s *City of Cities* were initially supported by the later *State Infrastructure Strategy* (Office for Financial Management, NSW, 2006). However the necessary extensions to the heavy rail system to the north-west and south west growth centres have since been cancelled. New proposals for underground ‘metro style’ lines have been announced. In relation to these the Planning Institute of Australia (NSW Division) commented that “the announcement of the North West Metro ... overturns years of careful planning by the State Government to integrate landuse and transport planning for Sydney’s global city corridor” (PIA of NSW, 2008: 17).

Reputable community organisations such as the Friends of Greater Sydney (FROGS) have produced alternative public transport plans, and the *Sydney Morning Herald* has set up its own public transport planning process with a report to be produced by an expert panel following public meetings and submissions.

#### *The compact city*

All state governments have embraced urban consolidation, higher urban densities and more compact cities in contrast to the low density suburban growth prevailing up to the 1980s. The reasons for this and the advantages and disadvantages which could result

have been widely canvassed (e.g. Holliday and Norton 1995; Troy 1996; Holliday 2000; Searle 2004b).

But in terms of the argument of this paper, the important point is that planning and infrastructure has been dominantly directed at expanding the city until relatively recently, and it may be difficult to turn infrastructure spending (Wilmoth, 2005) and planning instruments to the much more complex tasks of urban renewal, regeneration and intensification. Institutional path dependency can be entrenched.

## **5. Current metropolitan strategies**

How, then do current metropolitan strategies reflect these new emphases? How far do they reflect the processes and practices of the Australian paradigm? How far are they differentiated by the different issues addressed and planning approaches of each state? It will be appreciated that space constraints will mean that only general conclusions can be drawn and those within the framework of argument presented by this paper.

*Melbourne 2030 (Department of Infrastructure 2002) and update*

This was the first of the current array of metropolitan strategies and has been influential in those following. A new Labor government came to power in Victoria in 1999 and launched a number of planning initiatives including a new metropolitan strategy *Melbourne 2030*.

Early research for the plan was concerned with globalisation and the strengthening of economic competitiveness. One report discussed the influence that urban policy and metropolitan strategy might have on such competitiveness (SGS, 2000) and concluded the most important policy 'levers' were:

- road network planning;
- public transport policy;
- transportation pricing policy;
- activity centres policy;
- employment zone policy and standards; and
- airports.

The resulting strategy encourages the growth of advanced businesses by gathering them into specialised clusters and precincts. A parallel policy is in defining major centres as concentrations of business and community enterprise so that investment, transport links, mixed land uses and jobs are encouraged. These are also seen as the focus for higher density residential renewal. An Urban Growth Boundary was defined.

The result is a sophisticated and comprehensive strategy in the classic Australian mould. While its benefits have been quantified (McDougall, 2007), the main critique has been as to whether its assumptions are realistic and whether it can be implemented (O'Connor, 2003; Birrell *et al.*, 2005). There is also considerable resistance to higher residential

densities. More recently, it has been argued that the strategy was dominated by land use considerations, and lacked an effective process for delivering the infrastructure needed, particularly the necessary improvements to public transport (Dodson, 2009).

In December 2008 a revised metropolitan strategy was released, recognising the higher rate of growth than that anticipated in *Melbourne 2030*. It was called *Melbourne 2030: a planning update Melbourne @ 5 million* (Department of Planning & Community Development). In general its proposals were less prescriptive than that of *Melbourne 2030* and included a revision of the Urban Growth Boundary; concentration on growth in six new Central Activities districts; 'employment corridors' linking activity centres and specialised precincts such as airports and universities; and the building of 284,000 new dwellings in growth areas at the fringe, somewhat relaxing the compact city provisions of *Melbourne 2030*.

Shortly afterwards *The Victorian Transport Plan* was released linked with the planning update (Department of Transport, 2008). It contained costings and scheduling of projects and programs. These new plans begin to more effectively link metropolitan land use planning with infrastructure provision, most importantly in transport planning. It convinced the federal government to allocate 3.265 billion dollars for two Victorian projects in its 8.453 billion dollar stimulus to infrastructure spending on roads, rail and ports in its May 2009 budget.

*Sydney's City of Cities* (Department of Planning 2005).

The home page for the metropolitan strategy called it the "NSW Government's long term plan to maintain Sydney's role in the global economy and to plan for growth and change" ([www.metrostrategy.nsw.gov.au](http://www.metrostrategy.nsw.gov.au)). The same consultants as those engaged in the Melbourne strategy prepared an important paper on trends and drivers in Sydney's economic geography (SGS Economics and Planning, 2004). This concluded that if Sydney was to retain its economic competitiveness on the world stage, it needed to fashion those urban conditions that would attract advanced business activities. A more compact city, using the urban policy levers identified previously in the case of Melbourne, together with good place management and urban design was needed.

Despite public consultation forums conducted at the beginning of the *City of Cities* exercise, the resulting strategy is a top-down 'predict and provide' plan. Local government was not consulted in the dwelling targets established for the 11 sub-regions within which each sits. From population projections it is estimated that 445,000 new dwellings will be needed by 2031 and 60-70 per cent of these are to be located in existing urban areas, mainly in the form of higher-density housing.

A strengthened centres articulates the development of the more compact and higher-density city. They are arranged in a hierarchy with the central business district (including North Sydney) at the top as 'Global Sydney'. There are four regional cities and some 19 existing or potential major centres. There are also nine specialised centres such as Sydney Airport, and 'corridors' of renewal and enterprise.

Transport is the weakness in *City of Cities*. This is illustrated even more by abrupt later changes of policy by the state government, including dropping the heavy rail extension to serve the north west and south west greenfields growth centres, and the *ad hoc* insertion of ‘metro’ systems to provide the fast, reliable and frequent underground systems that serve other global cities.

*City of Cities* then is also in the classic vein, but subject to the same doubts as *Melbourne 2030* about its realism. The higher density dwelling targets depend on whether they can be accommodated in the envisaged locations and patterns. They also rely on private investment, and accordingly whether they are viable under changing and complex market conditions. A review of the Sydney metropolitan strategy has recently been announced by the Minister for Planning.

*Brisbane and region (Office of Urban Management Queensland 2005) and update*

The South-East region of Queensland has been the subject of a long-running cooperative planning study between the state government, local authorities and regional organisations, included the Brisbane City Council, the largest municipal authority in Australia. The resulting regional plan in 2005 reflected this history. It echoes many of the themes and proposals of the Sydney and Melbourne plans, but is less prescriptive and more connected with local government planning processes. While population and housing targets for the year 2016 and 2026 are set for the four sub-regions involved in the plan, these are called ‘indicative’ but infill and renewal processes are assumed to be dominant by 2026. It is closely linked to the South East Queensland Regional Infrastructure Plan and Program providing funds annually as part of the state budget.

This plan is also subject to a review process announced in December 2008 with the release of a draft plan for comment by the Department of Infrastructure and Planning. The review signals a number of important new directions and emphases. It includes specific new aims such as addressing climate change and oil price increases; reducing automobile dependence and congestion; and promoting the regional landscape and supporting rural production. It provides a framework for linking broad regional land use proposals with local government plans. It outlines a process for agreeing future population and dwelling numbers with local governments and promises to maintain the partnership of the state government with the Council of Mayors of South East Queensland (the number of local government in the area had however been reduced to 11 since 2005 by amalgamations).

*Perth’s Network City (Government of Western Australia & Western Australian Planning Commission, 2005) and later elaboration*

Perth’s ‘Network City’ (Government of Western Australia & Western Australian Planning Commission, 2005) is claimed to be “the foundation for active policy and plan making, not a blueprint or master plan simply to be carried out” (Government of Western Australia and WAPC 2006: item 6.3).

This planning process drew on two main sources. The first was an extensive exercise in public involvement called *Dialogue with the City* (Government of Western Australia, n.d.) culminating in a large interactive forum of 1100 participants in September 2003. While unusual and innovative this exercise has been criticized for its manipulation by planners (Albrechts 2006; Hopkins 2007; Maginn 2007). The other major input came from work which developed an institutional model to achieve desired outcomes for integrated land use and transport (Curtis & James, 2004). This was applied to Perth to stimulate more sustainable travel by the integration of land use and transport networks within both new and established areas (Curtis, 2006). The key elements in these connections are centres, activity corridors and transport corridors.

In September 2004 the community planning strategy for Perth and Peel was released for public comment (WAPC & Dept. of Planning and Infrastructure), mentioning the strategy had already been endorsed in principle by the government and the Western Australian Planning Commission. In response to the submissions received, a summary report was issued in November 2005 (Government of Western Australia & WAPC) called '*Network City – a milestone in metropolitan planning*'.

The Western Australian Planning Commission is a powerful body whose powers and responsibilities link strategic decision-making about Perth's future with local government in a continuing dialogue. The Commission has identified nine priority tasks (Government of Western Australia and WAPC, 2006) in developing the plan in detail. They include detailing the metropolitan structure; determining local population, housing and job targets by constructing appropriate methodologies collaboratively; and developing the activity centres, activity corridors and transport corridors. The tasks will be driven by key WAPC committees.

While these earlier planning documents cited were short and general in nature, they were followed by much more specific proposals in the June 2009 document *Directions 2031* a Draft Spatial Plan for Perth and Peel put forward for public comment (Government of Western Australia and WAPC). It shaped and pushed forward the process, outlining the same kinds of planning proposals contained in the other metropolitan strategies. These included a long-term planning horizon with the consequent estimates of population and necessary additions to dwelling stock allocated among six planning sub-regions. A 'connected city' was formed structured by an activity centres network, a movement network and a green network. The implementation section contained a long list of things to do - including an economic strategy for Perth.

This draft spatial framework accordingly continues the planning process in Perth by elaborating the general ideas and themes discussed earlier into more concrete, detailed and familiar forms.

*Adelaide (Government of South Australia 2006/7) and revision.*

The 2006/7 planning strategy was caught between a new State Strategic Plan (Government of South Australia, 2007) and a State Infrastructure Strategy (Office for Infrastructure Development, 2005), both driven by the Premier and Cabinet (Bunker, 2008). It is best seen as a holding operation. No targets were set for population and urban growth in the strategy, but the well-established Residential Development Program continued its detailed short-term forecasts of future dwelling growth by region and type.

It combined conceptual and schematic statements about the long-term with reasonable certainties about short-term growth especially in residential development. The Infrastructure Strategy provided the certainty needed to attract business enterprises and property investment and acts as a framework for the state annual budget spending on capital works.

In July 2009, a draft plan, *Planning the Adelaide we all want* (Department of Planning & Local Government) was released for public comment, filling the gap in metropolitan plan-making. It was based on an even higher level of population growth than that required in the Strategic Plan, and includes an Appendix showing its contribution to its targets. In other respects it is structured in a similar way to the updates/elaborations of Melbourne, South East Queensland and Perth.

## **6. Conclusion**

There does appear to be a distinctive style of Australian metropolitan planning developed in the stable conditions of the three or four decades after the Second World War. These might be summarised as set-piece representations of the city a generation or so hence. They show land uses and communications arranged in a way to reflect social, economic and cultural objectives. Those produced in the period 1948 to 1980 were basically concerned with suburban expansion and paid relatively little attention to older established areas. They largely succeeded in their purposes of servicing these areas of growth and change with the required infrastructure provided by state instrumentalities.

The last two decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century showed metropolitan plans in transition, reflecting new issues regarding economic competitiveness and sustainability paralleled with privatisation and outsourcing of much physical infrastructure and growing attention to the renewal and intensification of existing urban areas.

From 2002 new metropolitan strategies were produced by the mainland states all governed by Labor. Although informed and driven by these new circumstances, they tended to develop the basic characteristics of the older metropolitan plans in more sophisticated and intricate forms. This is particularly the case with Sydney. The strategies for Perth and Adelaide were not initially in this mould, but the revisions and elaborations recently released revert to type.

While remaining largely within the Australian paradigm developed earlier, these recent metropolitan strategies require frequent revision. Further, the dynamics and complexities driving urban change mean that a variety of other plans have developed, of which the most important partners in metropolitan growth and change are those concerned with state plans, economic development, infrastructure provision and transportation planning - particularly for public transport.

*(Insert Table 1 about here)*

Table 1 summarises the metropolitan strategy formulations and connections for the five cities in the period 2002-2009. The judgments on connections rely on a comparison of planning and budget documents over the years from the state governments involved, and apply to the revisions of the original metropolitan strategies. Different state governments have different arrangements, and these can change over time. For example South East Queensland has a detailed annual infrastructure plan and program, and a transport plan in preparation. Victoria has a recent transport plan at the same time as it has produced an associated revision of *Melbourne 2030*. The new draft Adelaide plan makes much of transit-oriented development associated with the electrification of the suburban rail system in current budgets.

These distinctive characteristics largely reflect their status as state government documents, dominated by the resources, roles and responsibilities of those governments. Because state planning legislation involves close control and supervision of local government planning operations, the metropolitan strategies contain a fair amount of detail.

In facing these new issues and challenges in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, Australian metropolitan strategies appear to have taken a different path to the developments in spatial planning taking place in Europe (Albrechts, 2004, 2006; Healey, 2004, 2006, 2007). While carrying on many of the features of earlier strategies, they now need frequent replacement and association with a changing spectrum of associated policies and programs with which they need to connect to be effective – in infrastructure, transport, water and energy use and management, and housing. This is particularly the case in infrastructure and transportation (Powell, 2003, 2006; Dodson, 2009) and especially so when the infrastructure needs arising from denser cities and rebuilding older areas become paramount (Wilmoth, 2005).

The earlier metropolitan planning *paradigm*, lost in the 1980s and 1990s has been regained in more sophisticated form but requires frequent revision. *Palimpsest* may be a better description, where earlier writings on the metropolitan tablet have been partly effaced: superseded by later writings but still bearing traces of the earlier form.

## References

- Albrechts, L. (2006). Shifts in Strategic Spatial Planning? Some Evidence from Europe and Australia. *Environment and Planning A*, 38:1149-1170.
- Beatley, T. & Newman, P. (2009). *Green Urbanism Down Under: Learning from Sustainable Communities in Australia*. Washington, Covell, London: Island Press.
- Birrell, B., O'Connor, K., Rapson, V. & Healey E. (2005). *Melbourne 2030: Planning Rhetoric versus Urban Reality*. Melbourne: Monash University Press.
- Bunker, R. (2008). A plenitude, plethora or plague of plans? *Built Environment* 34(3), 319-332.
- Cumberland County Council (1948). *County of Cumberland Planning Scheme Report*. Sydney: Cumberland County Council.
- Curtis, C. (2006). Network City: Retrofitting the Perth Metropolitan Region to Facilitate Sustainable Travel. *Urban Policy and Research* 24 (2), 159-180.
- Curtis, C. and James, B. (2004). An Institutional Model for Land Use and Transport Integration. *Urban Policy and Research* 22 (3), 277-297.
- Department of Infrastructure & Planning, Queensland. (2008). *The Draft South East Queensland Regional Plan*. Brisbane: Queensland Government.
- Department of Infrastructure, Victoria. (2002). *Melbourne 2030: planning for sustainable growth*. Melbourne: Department of Infrastructure.
- Department of Planning, NSW. (2005). *City of Cities: a plan for Sydney's future* Sydney: Department of Planning.
- Department of Planning & Community Development, Victoria (2008). *Melbourne 2030: a planning update Melbourne @ 5 million*. Melbourne: Department of Planning & Community Development.
- Department of Planning & Local Government, South Australia (2009), *Planning the Adelaide we all want*. Adelaide: Department of Planning & Local Government.
- Department of Transport, Victoria (2008). *The Victorian Transport Plan*. Melbourne: Department of Transport.
- Dodson, J. (2009). The 'Infrastructure Turn' in Australian Metropolitan Spatial Planning, *International Planning Studies*, 14(2), 109-123.

Glazebrook, G. & Rickwood, P. (2008) Options for Reducing Transport and Fuel Consumption and Greenhouse Emissions for Sydney, *Built Environment* 34 (3), pp. 349-363.

Gleeson, B., Darbas, T. and Lawson, S. (2004). Governance, Sustainability and Recent Australian Metropolitan Strategies: a socio-theoretic analysis. *Urban Policy and Research*, 22 (4), 345-366.

Gleeson, B. and Low, N. (2000) *Australian Urban Planning: New Challenges, New Agendas*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Gleeson, B. (2006). *Australian Heartlands*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Government of South Australia (2006/7). *Planning Strategy for Metropolitan Adelaide*. Adelaide: Government of South Australia.

Government of South Australia (2007). *South Australia's Strategic Plan 2007*. Adelaide: Government of South Australia.

Government of Western Australia. (n.d.). *Dialogue with the City: Final Report of Proceedings*. Perth: Government of Western Australia.

Government of Western Australia and Western Australian Planning Commission (2005). *Network City: a milestone in metropolitan planning*. Perth: Government of Western Australia.

Government of Western Australia and Western Australian Planning Commission (2006). *Statement of Planning Policy: Network City (Draft)*. Perth: Government of Western Australia.

Government of Western Australia and Western Australian Planning Commission (2009). *Directions 2031*. Perth: Government of Western Australia & WAPC.

Graham, S. and Marvin, S. (2001). *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hamnett, S. & Freestone, R. (Eds.). (2000). *The Australian metropolis: a Planning History*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Hamnett, S. (2000). The late 1990s: competitive versus sustainable cities. In S. Hamnett and R. Freestone (Eds.), *The Australian Metropolis: a Planning History*, (pps. 168-188). St Leonards: Allen and Unwin.

Healey, P. (2004) The Treatment of Space and Place in the new Strategic Spatial Planning in Europe, *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research*, 28(1), pp. 45-67.

Healey, P. (2006) Transforming Governance: challenges of institutional adaptation and a new politics of space, *European Planning Studies* 14 (3), pp. 299-319.

Healey, P. (2007) *Urban Complexity and Spatial Strategies: towards a relational planning for our times*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Holliday, S. & Norton, R. (1995). Sydney's Future: Quo Vadis? *Urban Futures*, 17, 13-19.

Holliday, S. (2000). The Higher Density Debate. *New Planner*, 42, 6 & 15.

Holloway, D. (2008). Increasing public transport use and reducing emissions. *Australian Planner* 45(4), 8-11.

Hopkins, D. (2007). Multiple Dialogues and Conflicting Agendas on Governing the City: Western Australia's 'Dialogue with the City'. Paper presented to the third State of Australian Cities Conference, Adelaide.

Kelly, P. (1992). *The End of Certainty: the story of the 1980s*. St Leonards: George Allen and Unwin.

Lennon, M. (2000). The Revival of Metropolitan Planning. In S. Hamnett and R. Freestone (Eds.), *The Australian Metropolis: a Planning History* (pps. 149-167). St Leonards: Allen and Unwin).

McDougall, A. (2007). Melbourne 2030: a Preliminary Cost-Benefit Assessment. *Australian Planner*, 44(2), 16-25

Madanipour, A., Hull, A. and Healey, P. (eds.)(2001) *The Governance of Place*. Aldershot & Burlington: Ashgate.

Maginn, p. (2007). Deliberative Democracy or Discursively Biased?: Perth's Dialogue with the City Initiative. *Space and Polity* 11 (3), 331-352.

Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works (1954). *Melbourne Metropolitan Planning Scheme (2 vols.)*. Melbourne: Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works.

Metropolitan Region Planning Authority (1962). *Metropolitan Region Scheme Report*. Perth: Town Planning Department.

Newman P. & Kenworthy, J. (1999). *Sustainability and Cities: Overcoming Automobile Dependence*. Washington DC: Island Press.

- Newman, P. & Thornley, A. (2005). *Planning World Cities: Globalization and Urban Politics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Neutze, M. (1988). Planning as urban management: a critical assessment, & Mant, J. The instruments of planning :urban management, Urban Research Unit Working Paper 6. Canberra: Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University.
- O'Connor, K. (2003). Melbourne 2030: a response, *Urban Policy & Research* 21(2), 211-215.
- Office of Urban Management, Queensland. (2005). *South East Queensland Regional Plan 2005-2026*. Brisbane: Office of Urban Management.
- Office for Infrastructure Development, South Australia (2005) *The Strategic Infrastructure Plan for South Australia 2005/6-2014/15*. Adelaide: Government of South Australia.
- Office for Financial Management, NSW (2006) *State Infrastructure Strategy 2006/7-2015/16*. Sydney: NSW Treasury.
- Planning Institute of Australia (NSW Division) (2008). PIA Position on Sydney Link. *New Planner*, 76, 16-17.
- Powell, T. (2003) Real Town Planning, *Urban Policy & Research* 21(1), pp. 113-119.
- Powell, T. (2006) Return to Real Town Planning, *Australian Planner*, 43(1), pp. 14-15.
- Randolph, B. (2002). Third City Suburbs: options for housing policy in ageing middle ring suburbs. *Australian Planner*, 39, 173-178.
- Randolph, B. & Holloway, D. (2005). Social disadvantage, tenure and location: an analysis of Sydney and Melbourne. *Urban Policy & Research* 23 (2), 173-201.
- Richardson, T. & Jensen, O. (2003) Linking Discourse and Space: towards a cultural sociology of space in analysing spatial policy discourses, *Urban Studies* 40(1), 7-22.
- Rickwood, P. & Glazebrook, G. (2009) Urban Structure and Commuting in Australian Cities, *Urban Policy & Research* 27(2), 171-188.
- Rickwood, P., Glazebrook, G. & Searle, G. (2008). Urban Structure and Energy; a Review. *Urban Policy & Research* , 26(1), 57-81.
- Salet, W., Thornley, A. & Kreukels, A. (eds.)(2003) *Metropolitan Governance and Spatial Planning: Comparative Studies of European City-Regions*. London: E and F.N. Spon.

- Sanyal, B., (2005). *Comparative Planning Cultures*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Searle, G. (2004a). Planning Discourses and Sydney's Recent Metropolitan Strategies. *Urban Policy & Research*, 22(4), 367-391.
- Searle, G. (2004b). The Limits to Urban Consolidation. *Australian Planner*, 41,(1), 42-48.
- SGS (Spiller, Gibbins Swan) (2000). Globalisation, Competitiveness and Metropolitan Strategy. Technical Report 3 of *Melbourne 2030*. Melbourne: Department of Infrastructure, listed as a 'Report in Progress'.
- SGS Economics and Planning (2004). Sydney's Economic Geography – Trends and Drivers. Report produced for the then Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources, NSW, as an input into the preparation of *City of Cities*. Sydney: Department of Planning, NSW.
- State Planning Authority of New South Wales (1968). *Sydney Region Outline Plan*. Sydney: State Planning Authority.
- Stephenson, G. & Hepburn, A. (1955). *Plan for the Metropolitan Region: Perth and Fremantle*. Perth: Government Printer.
- Stretton, H. (1970). *Ideas for Australian Cities*. Melbourne: Georgian House.
- Taylor, P. (2006) Book Review of P. Newman and A. Thornley (2005) *Planning World Cities: Globalization and Urban Politics*, *European Planning Studies* 14(8), 1163-64.
- Town Planning Committee of South Australia (1962). *Report on the Metropolitan Area of Adelaide*. Adelaide: Government Printer.
- Troy, P. (1996). *The Perils of Urban Consolidation*. Sydney: The Federation Press.
- Troy, P. (ed.)(1999). *Serving the City: the Crisis in Australia's Urban Services*. Sydney: Pluto Press.
- Troy, P. (ed.). (2008) *Troubled Waters: confronting the water crisis in Australia's cities* Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Western Australian Planning Commission and Department of Planning and Infrastructure. (2004). *Network City: Community Planning Strategy for Perth and Peel*. Perth: Western Australian Planning Commission and Department of Planning & Infrastructure.
- Williams, P. (2007). Government, people and politics. In S. Thompson (Ed.) *Planning Australia*, (pp. 29-48). Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Wilmoth, D. (2005) Urban Infrastructure and Metropolitan Planning: Connection and Disconnection, *Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> State of Australian Cities Conference, City Structure Section*. Brisbane: Urban Research Program, Griffith University.

<u>City</u>	<u>Metropolitan strategy</u>	<u>Revisions/elaborations</u>	<u>Strong connections</u>
Melbourne	Melbourne 2030 (2002)	Melbourne @ 5 million (Dec. 2008)	Victorian Transport Plan (Dec. 2008) State Budget
Sydney	City of Cities (2005)	Review to be carried out	
SE Queensland	Regional Plan (2005)	Draft Regional Plan (Nov. 2008)	Annual SEQ Infrastructure Plan and Program State Budget
Perth	Network City (2004)	Draft Regional Plan (June 2009)	Local government through WA Planning Commission
Adelaide	Planning Strategy (2006/7)	Draft Regional Plan (July 2009)	State Strategic Plan (2007) State Budget

**Table 1. Australian Metropolitan Strategies, 2002-2009.**