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ABSTRACT

Urban areas are constantly undergoing change in response to broader developments in society and the economy, but the relationship of property ownership to political action and the interest of homeowners in amenity and property value remains strong. Sydney experienced many of the major postwar changes in social and physical makeup seen throughout Australia, and by the mid to late sixties demand had increased for inner city dwellings by middle-class purchasers. Because of the dilapidated condition of the nineteenth century dwellings, many purchasers renovated the dwellings, with more renovations by middle-class than working-class owners and more money spent on the renovations.

Owners could not "renovate" their immediate environment however, for improving local amenity was the responsibility of municipal councils. In the past, the working-class residents had relied on their Labor councils and Labor State governments to protect their interests as residents. The new middle-class owners were interested in different aspects of amenity, and some which directly went against Labor policy and local tradition. As a minority the new residents could only rely on political pressure to persuade municipal council. They could use the traditional tools of all homeowners, such as letters and petitions, or the more protest-oriented ones used more often elsewhere, and residents chose to use both.

One particular tool of middle-class residents was resident action groups, which formed in the six areas from 1965 to 1970. Resident groups were particularly useful for building group
membership, gathering political skills for integrative action and sufficient participation in large scale protests, such as expressways or industrial development, but were less successful when dealing with more singular problems of traffic and parking.

During the time that more middle-class residents moved into the inner areas, residential amenity and urban living became more desirable and resident groups more accepted as political actors. By 1980 there were enough middle-class residents in certain areas to form an electoral majority. While gentrification originally increased the incentive for middle-class residents to act on property matters, it also increased their electoral strength such that they eventually moved from the political margins to the centre of the political arena.
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Urban areas are constantly undergoing change in response to broader developments in society and the economy. Changes in the use and value of properties result from both individual actions in the marketplace and collective actions through government investments and regulations. The impact of urban change, in terms of both returns to capital and quality of residential amenities, plays a major role in accentuating inequalities originally based in private income and wealth (Harvey, 1973).

While the main force in urban restructuring over the early post war years was suburbanisation and the expansion of land servicing, new questions concerned with the residential amenity of the inner city are being raised in many major cities of the world as the middle classes and their subsequent residential investment have returned to inner city areas. In Australia, research on the middle-class revival of inner city residential areas has concentrated primarily on the market and social explanations of gentrification with relatively little attention given to the consequences of the changes for local politics.

This thesis examines the ways in which gentrification in inner Sydney has led to residents directing their political action to local government over property matters during the 1960s
and 1970s. Gentrification is defined as the movement of middle-
class owner occupants into nineteenth century housing formerly
occupied by working-class tenants or owners. The focus on inner
areas over this period of history is especially useful because
there has been considerable diversity and change in these areas,
both in the competition for land use and in the social
composition of the residents. While much of the residential
change occurs through individual actions in the property market,
such as selling and buying, or improving, both residential
amenity and the value of property are also affected by government
and corporate policies which can only be influenced through
collective actions and contests.

The scope of this thesis is limited to local government
because it is the level of government most directly concerned
with residential property and amenities at the local scale. The
focus is not so much on either the electoral politics or daily
operations of local government, because in the initial stages of
gentrification the new, middle-class residents did not have
sufficient numbers to influence councils dominated by other
interests. Instead, the intention here is to analyse political
actions taken outside the usual institutional and electoral
channels by a small but politically-skilled minority of middle-
class homeowners concerned primarily with a range of property-
related issues. Special emphasis is given to the new forms of
political action which have developed as the process of
gentrification progressed in a political and social environment
which was also undergoing major transformations.
The purpose of this introductory chapter is to provide an overview of the scope, themes, and major research questions of the thesis. The following section provides background information on the changing residential structure of inner Sydney and the issues it poses for property-based political action. The next section draws primarily on the pluralism literature to outline a conceptual framework for understanding urban change and resident-based political action. This is followed by the specification of the spatial and temporal scope of the research and the multiple sources of information required to address the questions raised in this introduction. The chapter concludes with an overview of how the thesis analyses the developing property interests in areas undergoing gentrification, changes in the local political institutions responsible for determining land uses, and the collective actions and specific issues which arose as the new middle classes pursued their property interests in the arena of local government.

Gentrification in Sydney

The early post war decades in most Western cities saw the continuing suburbanisation of the middle classes along with rising private incomes and increasing car ownership. Since the affluent 1960s, however, there has been increasing interest by a minority of the middle classes in alternatives to the conventional suburban house and garden living. Although some of this interest in alternatives is expressed for ex-urban retreats (Vidich and Bensman, 1971), the most significant innovation in urban restructuring has been the return of substantial numbers of middle-class residents into inner urban areas in cities as

The extensiveness of and the explanations for this "return to the city" movement are as diverse as the cities and the countries themselves (London and Palen, 1984; Smith and Williams, 1986). Some analysts have explained the phenomena in terms of traditional influences on urban structure such as increasing inaccessibility to employment of outer suburban homes and rising costs of home ownership (Clay, 1980). Emphasis has also been placed on the many childless couples on two incomes (products of the baby boom generation) who are choosing to remain in the inner city after completing technical or tertiary training. Other commentators have emphasized that new entrants to housing markets are placing greater value on the social diversity, historical significance, and specialized cultural attractions typically concentrated in inner areas (Mullins, 1982; Jager, 1986).

Nevertheless, through the 1960s and 1970s the primary force in Australian urban development was a continuation of the demand for free-standing houses which had been underway since the turn of the century. When Prime Minister Menzies retired from office in 1966, many inner residential areas of Australian cities were still considered slums of obsolete housing "ripe" for redevelopment. By that time, however, there already were the beginnings of considerable middle-class interest in inner-city residence and lifestyles, as noted by Roseth (1969) in his study
of "spontaneous rehabilitation" in Paddington. This Australian experience in gentrification, as outlined below, is quite different from that in many other Western cities, with different implications for the social, political and market outcomes (Kendig, 1979; 1984). Local political action and urban restructuring in Australian inner cities contrast particularly sharply with the defeated inner areas and defended suburban areas in the United States.

A number of structural features of Sydney and other Australian capital cities have been conducive to a re-settlement of inner residential areas by the middle classes. The city centres have traditionally been dominant in employment and cultural activities. Sydney, in particular, has the unparalleled attractions of the harbourside. The old housing stock, consisting primarily of brick terrace housing, was seriously run-down during the Depression and Second World War but the dwellings were basically structurally sound, had individual parcels of land and separate property titles (which facilitated private purchase and improvement), and (for those who wished to see it) considerable charm and historical significance. Most Australian cities have neither the heavy reliance on local property taxes or the racial segregation and incidents of conflict which encouraged middle-class flight from the inner city in the United States.

Inner Sydney has provided a number of residential advantages for some members of the large baby boom cohort which entered the housing market during the 1960s and 1970s. Over the post war years these attractions increased considerably as white-collar employment rose rapidly in inner areas, the physical
growth of the city made the urban fringe even more remote, and the inner city housing stock was converted to owner occupancy and subsequently upgraded by working-class tenants and recently arrived overseas migrants (Kendig, 1979).

The generation of new professionals and office workers would have been attracted by the cultural diversity of the inner suburbs and the opportunities to develop cosmopolitan life styles, contrasting with the uniformity of the new, outer suburbs where many would have grown up. Inner city life could be valued as distinctive and unusual for the young middle-class adults who would have been taking up the new white collar jobs, and who were at the vanguard of the major social and cultural changes underway in Australia at that time.

The re-settlement by the young middle classes into the inner areas needs to be understood as resulting from the combination of several related housing processes, each of which would have had different implications for political action. One group of middle-class residents moved primarily into the large numbers of rented flats built from the late 1960s onward (Kendig, 1979). A second group made use of the innovation of shared housing in which several or more young adults would jointly rent a house. The direct effect of these particular residential changes on inner area politics, in terms of the property-based political action examined in this thesis, could not be expected to be very great. Tenants do not have any direct property interest in their dwelling and young adults are in a stage of life when neighbourhood conditions are not particularly important.
For the purposes of this thesis the young middle-class tenants in inner Sydney have been significant only in two indirect ways. First, a new generation of the young middle classes would have become familiar with the potential advantages of remaining in the inner areas when they wished to buy a home. Second, a number of them would have become aware of the potential problems of inner city living and the usefulness of local political action as seen in the struggles of tenants against displacement by public and private redevelopment including freeways and flats (CURA, 1977, Hargreaves, 1975).

Although the purchase of a home unit does involve residents in property interests, the political consequences of this housing choice are not explored in this thesis. These dwellings are to some extent insulated from local environmental problems, and more importantly, they do not have the cultural significance of "historic" terrace houses which was important for the local political movements in the inner city. Moves from usually rented home units into terrace houses, however, have provided ways in which individuals become part of the process of gentrification.

It was the middle-class purchase of terrace houses which was important to much of the political activity examined in this thesis. Certainly the dwellings were accessible to the city centre, and there were other attractions for all residents. Above all, though, the state of the residential property market during the 1960s and 1970s would have encouraged these purchases. As the entry cost of buying a home rose throughout the metropolitan area, first time buyers were attracted by the relatively low prices in inner areas, and the ways in which the initial costs of
buying could be spread by buying an inexpensive home and improving it later. Moreover, the prospects for capital gains would have been considerable because inner city prices had been rising faster than those elsewhere in Sydney for nearly all of the post war years.

In the late 1960s and 1970s, middle-class purchase and renovation of inner city houses proceeded at a high level, and spread through an increasing number of suburbs in addition to the initial foothold in Paddington (Newman, Annandale, and Duxbury, 1984). Inner city life was seen by middle-class buyers as not only "distinctive" and "interesting", but also a financially viable alternative to buying a first home in a middle or outer ring suburb. Moreover, a number of these buyers were, after some years in their terrace homes, selling and moving up in the housing market as they had children and their incomes and the equity in their homes increased (Kendig, 1979). With the high likelihood of mobility and of capital gains many owners would have been aware of the increasing resale value of their inner city homes as well as their value as places to live.

As a result of these residential changes, highly educated white-collar workers accounted for a growing percentage of homeowners in Sydney's inner municipalities. Part of this increase could be attributed to the sale of tenanted homes to new owner occupants, but the majority were sales by working-class, often migrant owners moving outwards to newer suburbs or reaching the stage in their life cycle when they were disbanding households. Between 1961 and 1981 home ownership rates rose
slightly in the inner city while the number of middle-class owners increased by a much larger margin. Over this period of time the share of inner city residents who were owner occupiers, white-collar workers or university graduates had risen much faster than had general levels throughout the Sydney metropolitan area (Newman, Annandale, and Duxbury, 1984). Yet even at the end of this period, middle-class owners were still only a substantial minority of residents and owners in the inner city suburbs.

In the private market their minority status did not matter. Middle-class residents had both the incentive and disposable income to make substantial dwelling improvements to overcome the obsolescence and deterioration of their older homes. Undertaking such individual actions would have resulted in increased financial and emotional value for owners.

Such individual actions could not redress, however, the environmental degradation caused principally by the well-established mix of non-residential land uses and through traffic patterns in the area. Although owners had the private option to sell and move, house prices in many areas reflected the neighbourhood problems and not the dwelling renovation, leaving the owner with an overcapitalized commodity they could not sell. As well, to move soon after the initial purchase and improvement of a dwelling would probably not yield substantial profits relative to the transaction costs of selling and buying again.

If owners did move, they would be hard pressed to find similar "historic" areas at similar prices. Alternative inner city housing cost more in the few areas of good residential amenity and the areas with good residential amenity with
affordable dwelling prices would be unlikely to have the distinctive historical features or accessibility to the city centre available in terrace houses (NSW, Valuer Generals Reports, 1981, 1986).

The only effective way for owners to improve their residential environment without moving, or to protect it from threats of environmental degradation is through their influence on public controls and regulations of land use and other amenity issues. While all levels of government influence the use of land in various ways, local government has particular responsibilities for the implementation of land use controls and the provision of property-related services, and it can also serve as the advocate for local interests to influence the actions of other levels of government (Power et al., 1981). Unlike higher levels of government, local councils are also likely to be more responsive to local issues arising from particular land use conflicts. The exercise of residents’ power over the actions of local government requires the political control of a majority however, and the new middle-class owners were often a minority even in areas which underwent substantial levels of gentrification (Cameron and Craig, 1986; Smith, 1984).

This thesis will examine the ways in which the new middle-class owners tried to overcome their minority position to pursue their property interests in the arena of local government. While all residential owners and many tenants might be expected to have similar objective interests in protecting residential amenities, the frame of reference for the incoming middle class
residents could be expected to be quite different from those of long-established, working-class residents (Gans, 1977; Weiler, 1978). The expectations of the middle classes would have been influenced by their early experience of suburbs which were solely residential and concerns about environmental quality and local control of the 1960s and 1970s. Long-established working-class residents may well have become accustomed to the existing inner city residential environment of mixed land uses, and many of the locally employed would be aware that non-residential land uses provided jobs as well as threats to the environment (Johnston and Rose, 1977).

The other set of analytical questions for the thesis revolve around the political skills and goals and general sense of efficacy of the new middle-class owners relative to the already entrenched interests in local politics. The political awareness and ideology of young, middle-class inner city buyers may well have been distinctive in terms of their political commitment and potential to organize as well as in their assessment of important issues for public action and private rehabilitation investment (Sternberger, 1984). The thesis will examine particularly closely the opposing interests of usually Labor local governments and new middle-class residents, and the changes which gradually made them more similar.

**Conceptual Approach**

The relationship between residential property interests and local political action has been a major focus of the urban literature over recent decades. While nearly all of the conceptual development here is based on the experience of cities
overseas, it nonetheless provides a valuable base for understanding developments in Australia. In this section the discussion draws on this overseas literature to outline the elements of the conceptual approach of this thesis and the important relationships among residential actors and property interests, local political arenas, substantive issues, strategies of actions, and the questions these concepts raise for the research.

At the risk of some oversimplification, the literature relating property and local political action falls into two basic schools. The first of these schools includes the more traditional market and pluralist approaches to individual and collective action, and provides the principal focus for this thesis. The second school includes the various reinterpretations of Marx and Weber in the "new urban sociology", which provides a different set of approaches not wholly compatible with each other. A more detailed and critical review of the literature as it applies to this thesis will be presented in Chapter Two.

It is important to briefly review the "new urban sociology" because a few insights from several authors can be incorporated into the pluralist approach taken in this thesis. Central to virtually all of the wide ranging literature within this school of thought is the integrated analysis of economic interests and political action (Dunleavy, 1980; Saunders, 1983; Castells, 1977). When applied to local property-based political action, the actions of owners and residents are understood in terms of their relationship to capital and the means of production which
determines their position in the class system as well as in urban property markets. Harvey (1973), Cox (1982a), and Cox and McCarthy (1982), in analyses particularly appropriate for this thesis, argue that owner occupants come to see their dwellings and communities as commodities, the value of which can be protected or promoted through the actions of government. Castells (1977) and others (Jakubowicz, 1984) have focussed on the forms of political action taken in pursuit of the collective consumption goods allocated in distinctive ways through governments operating in capitalist systems and urban society.

A market analysis of property value and a pluralist framework of resident action address many of the same issues but using a different language and addressing each issue separately. Market analyses of urban development generally (Neutze, 1978; 1981) and inner suburban development specifically (Kendig, 1979; 1984) emphasize the dominant economic power of non-residential land uses and the substantial fixed investments of these interests in relation to those of residential users of land. In inner city residential areas, the conflict between residential and non-residential land uses is particularly intense because there is so much non-residential land already established, which provides advantages of proximity to transport facilities and other non-residential land uses.

In traditional economic approaches, many argue for public intervention on the grounds that the unfettered pursuit of self interest by individuals and firms in many cases of buying and using land does not result in the best outcome for the public interest (Neutze, 1978). In addition to the need for public
investment in dwellings, land servicing and social services at places of new development on the fringe of the city, there is the need for land use controls which take into account market "externalities" of land development. Without such controls, the use and exchange value of land for nearby owners and residents can be adversely affected in major ways by air and noise pollution, dangerous traffic, and other environmental problems external to individual dwellings. The provision of public goods such as open space and property-based services are beyond the scope of individual action. The other individual actions which residents undertake such as dwelling improvements are carried out within regulations of government, which makes local government especially important to dwelling owners. Owners of land thus have important stakes and keen interests in influencing the decisions of government, particularly in the arena of local government and its various responsibilities.

The specification of interest groups is central to any analysis of local government contests over property interests. A number of writers from a variety of theoretical positions--Rex and Moore (1967) in their work on housing classes, which was further discussed and refined by Haddon (1970), John Rex (1971) and Saunders (1983)--emphasize the over-riding importance of housing tenure as the basis for delineating residential property interests. The scope and nature of interests in a wide range of housing issues can diverge sharply between owner occupiers, tenants, non-resident owners and landlords. All of these groups except tenants have an interest in the exchange value of their
property and all but the non-resident owners have an interest in the use value of the dwelling and surrounding environment. Although the other groups are important actors in local property politics, the two interests in residential use and exchange values are combined only for the owner occupants.

If people are dissatisfied with aspects of their residential environment, they can change residence (if they can afford to) or act politically, as emphasized in the work of Hirschmann's (1970) *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty* and Priemus (1986). In residential issues, owners' option in the private market is to move to another home in a neighbourhood which better meets their preferences and which may have a local government which will promote and protect their desired neighbourhood. However, moving can be costly and difficult (Fredland, 1974), and the historic and distinctive nature of many inner suburbs cannot easily be found elsewhere. For those who have already taken the private option of improving their dwelling, the emotional and financial commitment to the area can diminish their willingness to move, especially since many improvers act to improve the use value of their homes through renovation and "overcapitalise" in expenditure on improvements relative to the subsequent improvement of the exchange value of the home (Seek, 1981).

The alternative of "voice", to stay in the community and act politically, is the main focus of this thesis. Traditional pluralist and electoral analyses of local politics stress the options of residents to take part as one among a number of competing interests attempting to influence the actions of local government (Grace, 1979; O'Brien, 1975). Many citizens in a
democratic society perceive power in terms of majority interests, the coalescing into blocks of interests within political parties, and compromise and coalitions between various representatives in power (Painter, 1973).

A pluralist approach would examine the power of owner occupants in terms of their numbers and their political abilities and resources in directly influencing elections (Grace, 1979). However, in gentrification, the potential electoral power of the new middle-class owners has been limited because certainly in the beginning of the inner city residential changes they were a small minority among the various residential and non-residential interests in local politics (Power, 1969; Smith, 1984). Moreover, the issues on which they have acted, have to a large extent, cut across the lines of traditional power established by political parties at the local level which makes them inappropriate arenas for the new middle-class owners to exert their influence. For these reasons it is important for this thesis to move beyond traditional political analysis, usually focussed on elections and decisions by local Councils, and begin to consider less conventional forms of political action as discussed below.

The potential power of residents depends heavily on the structure of the "political arenas" in which they must operate as they attempt to have their "voice" heard. It is important to recognise that, throughout Australia, local government is but one several agents of public decision-making action on property-related issues (Bowman, 1979). State governments generally have
responsibility for setting the broad outlines for land use plans, and their instrumentalities have direct roles in providing and servicing major roads, public housing, and a number of other activities which are responsive to broader interests and constituencies which may well be at odds with those of local interests, especially in the inner areas which have economic activities of city-wide significance. Thus, local resident action can be part of a complex interplay of interests as conflicts are resolved between as well as within levels of government.

The "ground rules" for political action at the local level also have a critical influence on the potential for and the available forms of local political action. The size of the jurisdiction, the structure of "at large" or ward systems of representation, and the basis of voting rights at the local level have been set at the State level in Australia with major impacts on the potential for residents' political action. For example, conservative governments have generally reduced the size of the City of Sydney, and brought in property-based enfranchisement, in order to tip the balance of control over the city centre from residential to non-residential interests (Sandercock, 1975); State Labor governments have taken the opposite action. At the other extreme, relatively small inner city municipalities with less powerful non-residential interests provide greater scope for resident action, as shown in O'Neill's (1985) examination of Leichhardt in the late 1970s.

The ground rules for political action can also be set by the often entrenched traditional patterns of power relationships.
In inner Sydney municipal areas the traditional residential interest has been of working-class tenants represented by the Australian Labor Party (ALP) (Spearritt, 1978). But owner occupiers addressing issues unrelated to or opposed to ALP policy could not depend on these local political structures for the advancement of their interests. According to pluralist arguments, these residents would have depended instead on either forming an interest group to gain political strength of numbers to exercise in elections or to gain political skills to give them influence without the necessary political majority. This raises important questions about how new groups pursue interests which do not coincide with those of established structures of political power and their traditional constituencies.

In the terms of traditional pluralist analyses, the new middle-class owners could be appropriately considered "marginal" interests because of their small numbers and interests so different from those of the established power structures. The pursuit of their interests, especially in the early stages of gentrification, needs to be understood in terms of protest demonstrations, petitions to State government, and a variety of other unconventional "tactics" both within and outside of traditional electoral politics (Lipsky, 1968; Gricar and Brown, 1981). Although action can be taken by individuals, the exercise of substantial power depends critically on the emergent individual interests coalescing into organised action to pursue their collective interests (Olsen, 1971). Only in the later stages of gentrification were the new middle-class property
interests in a position to electorally threaten political incumbents or take other direct action in electoral politics. Until then they needed to exercise non-electoral influence.

A crucial factor in political action undertaken by the middle-class owners has been their strong incentives and considerable resources for action (Maher, 1985; Dingeman, 1983). Middle-class residents can have distinctive preferences for public goods (Mullins, 1982; Jager, 1986; Datel, 1985). They also have considerable ability to organise and to exercise local political power disproportionate to their numbers (Vidich and Bensman, 1968). Higher levels of education, financial resources, and occupational skills can provide avenues to political success to a political minority because they have the access and abilities to use legal, bureaucratic and media resources. (Steinberger, 1984; Lowe and Goyder, 1983). The wider range of political skills of the middle classes would have been especially important in the early stages of gentrification while the incremental increase in their numbers and the cumulative effect of their actions could be expected to lead to greater direct electoral significance at the local level but not necessarily the State or Federal level.

The last of the conceptual "building blocks" for the thesis concerns the ways in which the kinds of "issues" influence the forms of political action taken by the new middle-class owners over their property interests. Depending on the particular issue at hand, one could well expect different interests to coalesce sometimes in support and other times in opposition to change, with appeals to a variety of ideologies and claims for legitimacy. Although this thesis focus\textsuperscript{es} solely on
local government, the scope councils have to take action without State government involvement also varies considerably depending on the issue at hand. The level of government at which the action is directed plays an important role in understanding the issues addressed and the tactics used.

It is important to remember that although issues of displacement are critical to American analyses of gentrification (Lee and Mergenhagen 1984; Henig, 1984), Australian middle-class owners moving into inner city houses have faced relatively little risk in this area (Burbidge, 1971). Instead, the major questions for action in the Australian context of gentrification pertain to residential "protection" through land use controls from the adverse environmental effects principally of non-residential development and traffic. Another form of action concerns the "promotion" of residential amenity through capital expenditure on such items as parks, tree plantings and footpaths; or services such as street cleaning (Sandercock, 1978). Finally, there is action over the local government rules which affect the right or opportunity of residents to influence municipal decision-making.

In summary, a number of concepts in the existing literature have considerable application in understanding the property-based political action taken by new middle-class owners in inner city areas undergoing gentrification. Of the various property interests in inner areas, owner occupants have especially high stakes in the area because only they gain both use and exchange value from their homes and their communities. Although
owners can improve their home or move to other dwellings, their primary way of influencing neighbourhood quality is through their political influence on the actions of local government. In the initial stages of gentrification middle-class owner occupiers take this action largely through unconventional political tactics because they do not have the electoral strength to exercise power in over the party system. The political structures and local political traditions set the "arena" for these contests, the land uses and class background of the residents help define the interest groups, and the condition of the local environment has a major impact on the issues that are addressed.

Research Objectives and Methods

The primary objective of this thesis has been to provide an exploratory account of the ways in which gentrification may have led to distinctive forms of property-based political action by new middle-class owners in the arena of local government. More specific analysis focusses on the balance between private actions in house improvements through the private market and public actions regarding neighbourhood quality through local government. Within the former, particular attention has been paid to the interests owners develop in public matters of dwelling appearance after undertaking private improvement. Within the latter, particular attention was directed to the distinctive ways in which the middle-class owners pursued their ends individually and collectively during different stages of gentrification and in response to different kinds of property-based issues. Particular emphasis has been given to the resident action groups which proved to be the focal point through which
most of the residents pursued their collective action. The analysis was conducted primarily at the level of geographical areas and social groups, partly due to the substantive focus on neighbourhood problems and collective action, but also due to the severe limits on consistent sources of data over a relatively long period of time.

The time period for the study was the 1960s and the 1970s. For understanding the residential change, analysis of the social and dwelling changes was conducted between the 1961 and 1981 censuses. This starting point just preceded some of the initial indications of gentrification noted by Roseth (1969) in Paddington in the early 1960s. For the political investigations, the analysis continues to 1980 with the September local government elections during which many of the new residential interests succeeded in their bid for local government control. Some attention is also given to residential and political changes earlier in the post war period in that they had an important bearing on the subsequent developments examined in the thesis. The long time scope thus makes it possible to examine how the extent and form of the property-based political action varied both before and at different stages of gentrification.

The geographical scope of the study is set in the inner suburbs of Sydney which have undergone gentrification, all in the municipalities of Leichhardt, Sydney, South Sydney and Woollahra Council (Map 1.1) which are within a four km radius of the central GPO and in the municipalities of Leichhardt, Sydney, South Sydney and Woollahra.
These areas were initially developed in the 19th Century and have a considerable mixture of land uses. The residential dwellings are mostly attached nineteenth century terrace (row) houses, semi-detached houses of the same and slightly later vintage, and a scattering of post war flat developments as seen in Table 1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Types in the Six Study Areas, 1971 (expressed in percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Census, 1971)

In the early post war years, the vast majority of these dwellings were considered suitable only for redevelopment over the coming decades (Cumberland County Council, 1948). By the 1970s, nearly all of the suburbs in this area had undergone some degree of gentrification as indicated by increases in the numbers of owner occupants, high levels of home improvements, and increasing number of residents with professional and other white collar jobs and relatively high levels of education (Kendig, 1979; Davis and Spearritt, 1974; Poulsen and Spearritt, 1981).

The analysis of change in these areas was undertaken at three spatial scales as shown in Map 1.2. The inner city as a whole was defined as the local government areas (current
boundaries) of Sydney, and Leichhardt plus the Paddington part of Woollahra which was part of the enlarged City of Sydney from 1947 to 1968. In 1981, these areas had a population of 79,336 approximately 2.5 percent of the total metropolitan population of 3,204,696.
Changes of local government boundaries in 1968, as shown on the map, complicated the analysis of change over time but also provided opportunities to examine how changing political jurisdictions influenced the local property-based politics.

Suburbs were chosen as the primary unit of physical, social, and political analysis because some census and renovation information is procurable on this basis, newspaper reports identify many issues by suburbs, and, most importantly, resident action groups organize on a suburb basis. At an average size of 13,000 residents, these areas were small enough to detect social changes which are more difficult to examine on a municipal level. The smaller census collectors districts were not used because much of the collective action by residents took place at a larger geographial scale.

The following suburbs were selected for more extensive examination: Annandale, Balmain, Glebe, Newtown, Paddington and Surry Hills (see Map 1.2). As noted below, this selection provided a range of suburbs in terms of mixes of land uses and housing, timing and extent of gentrification, and local government jurisdiction. Not withstanding these differences, Table 1.2 shows that each of these selected suburbs, and the inner city as a whole, have undergone considerable residential change during the 1960s and 1970s, both in absolute terms and relative to broader changes in the metropolitan area as a whole.
Table 1.2: Six Characteristics of Persons in the Six Study Areas, 1961-1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>33.29</td>
<td>56.66</td>
<td>41.19</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>27.24</td>
<td>56.66</td>
<td>43.16</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>29.27</td>
<td>64.70</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>59.67</td>
<td>47.22</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>40.35</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>33.11</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>50.41</td>
<td>70.70</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>25.26</td>
<td>54.56</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the western side of the inner city there were Balmain, Annandale and Glebe with a relatively large proportion of non-terraced housing. Balmain began as a residential suburb with waterfront industry on the harbour and a strong working-class reputation. As can be seen in the following photos many properties had waterfront views which made the area popular for gentrification.
Figures 1.1 and 1.2: Balmain, 1980s
Annandale was nearby, with only a small waterfront but more spaciously planned, with mixed backyard industries and more of a middle-class reputation than Balmain before the Depression. These photos of dwellings in Annandale show the substantial middle-class nature of the area.

Figure 1.3: Annandale, 1980s
Glebe was closer to the CBD, as can be seen in the following photo, with a greater mix of land uses. Like the other areas it was still strongly residential, but had a large number of flats.
On the eastern side of the city was Paddington, one of the first primarily residential 19th century "commuter suburbs" in Sydney. It has a large proportion of terrace houses, and of the six study areas had the least amount of industrial development. As seen in the photos, The suburb is quite hilly with some harbour views from hilltop houses.
Figure 1.6: Paddington, 1980s

Surry Hills is immediately adjacent to the CBD, has a reputation as the "garment district" of Sydney and of the six study areas has the greatest proportion of non-residential land uses, which can be seen in the following photos.
Newtown, a bit to the south, was built as a working-class suburb, and still has a large amount of industrial land uses in the suburb, and was one of the last of the study areas to arouse the
interest of middle-class home purchasers. It was close to the railway line, as evident in these photos.

Figures 1.9 and 1.10: Newtown, 1980s
The six areas reflect a variety of development styles and trends in popularity and thus Paddington and Balmain were chosen as two suburbs which began to change first in the early to mid-sixties, followed by Glebe and Annandale around 1970 and Surry Hills and Newtown by 1975.

A wide variety of sources were employed in this thesis. In examining the changing residential base and property interests, the census (as used by Newman, Annandale and Duxbury, 1986), council building records (as used by Roseth, 1969) and Valuer General's reports were most useful. The census shows changes of owner occupation and some of the social characteristics of owners and residents. Unfortunately none of the critical variables like income, occupation and education have been cross tabulated by length of residence or tenure on a suburb basis, and only tenure and length of residence, tenure and income have been cross tabulated for the four relevant local government areas. Such information could better illustrate the important changes seen in gentrification. The Valuer General's reports provided information on property values although they only begin in 1976. Council building records enumerate the number and value of renovations, and in some instances when compared to the electoral rolls, the occupation of renovators.

The records of relevant municipal councils were the primary basis for examining the changing interests and structures of local government. A review of the council debates and correspondence helped outline shifts in the numbers and kinds of property-related and other issues which residents addressed over
time, as well as the shift in the attitudes of councils towards receiving and responding to these issues.

The changing political tactics by groups was identified from both local government records and records held by the groups, including newsletters. The resident group records allowed analysis of the various ways the groups undertook action, the issues the groups directed their activity to, and the characteristics of the persons involved in the activity (Johnston, 1979). They show the peaks and declines in interest and activity along with changes of the actors, their social background, the interests they represent and the issues they address in the suburbs and municipalities.

Newspapers such as the Sydney Morning Herald and various local newspapers were reviewed for the period as many social scientists recognize them as important links for local communication in suburbs (Jeffres and Dobos, 1984). However, they were not subjected to extensive analysis as primary sources because of the fluctuating basis on which the issues were reported, which likely reflected whether residential issues were considered newsworthy at different times. Similarly, a number of informal interviews were conducted with local planners, politicians, and resident activists in order to gain greater depth of understanding but were again considered too unsystematic to provide primary sources of information.

In summary, a wide range of information sources has been examined systematically in order to explore the inter-relationship between gentrification and property-based politics in inner Sydney municipalities during the 1960s and 1970s. Each
of these sources has distinct limitations as bases for detailed study in themselves. None of them provide definitive information on the complex motives which may have driven particular individuals to particular action, nor do they identify the reasons why particular interests prevailed or failed in specific contests. However, the purpose of this thesis was not to conduct another Australian analysis explaining gentrification (e.g. Logan, 1980), nor to undertake another analysis of local government decision-making (e.g. Painter, 1973; Saunders, 1984). Taken as a whole, however, the various information sources do provide an integrated view of the association between residential change and property-based political action in a range of inner Sydney suburbs undergoing gentrification over the course of two decades.

Chapter Overview

The following chapters examine in more detail particular aspects of gentrification and property-based politics. Chapter Two develops further the pluralist conceptual tools which are applied and developed through the thesis. These include the interests which homeowners and other groups have in their homes and communities, the political resources of the middle classes and other actors, the political arenas in which the contests over property issues occur, and the kinds of traditional and unconventional political tactics which middle-class owners can adopt in promoting or defending their property interests in particular issues which arise for local government.

Chapters Three and Four set the stage for the study period by reviewing the history of inner Sydney in the 1950s and 1960s.
and by identifying those developments which had continuing effects on resident action throughout the late 1960s and 1970s. Chapter Three examines the social and residential changes and Chapter Four examines the private property interests and financial investments which underlie resident-based political action as individual market activities of middle-class residents to improve and distinguish their dwellings through renovation.

Chapter Five examines local government as a political arena and Chapters Six and Seven take two contrasting approaches to residents' political action in that arena. Chapter Six examines the various forms of political voice and action which residents have employed over time to individually or collectively express opinions and try to influence local councils regarding the physical environment and other issues. Chapter Seven examines the membership and actions of resident action groups as they progressed from being small minorities vis a vis larger interests as they became a larger and more electorally significant force.

Chapters Eight and Nine examine the ways in which interest group contests and political activity have varied between different issues. Chapter Eight examines issues of industrial development in the inner city, especially contests between residents trying to defend their local environment against industrial interests, a struggle which was complicated by the State's continuing control over major inner city industrial sites. Chapter Nine's analysis of inner city traffic and parking issues shows the different set of conflicts which arose as residents worked to control the use of their local streets by
non-residents while at the same time trying not to impede their own local use of roads.

Chapter Ten concludes the thesis by summarizing the findings and discussing their implications for local government. It reviews the particular local developments and broader social changes which over several decades saw the rise of middle-class property interests from their status as a small and powerless protest voice to one of electoral significance, and the broadening of local government concerns from narrow property interests to a wide range of environmental and other issues. It discusses the stronger role of middle-class residents on local councils after 1980 and the resulting shift of many local conflicts from the margins of local government into the municipal arena. The conclusions to the thesis show that there is much to be learned from the study of gentrification and local political action, particularly with a comparative yet fairly in-depth study over a substantial period of time.

---

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER ONE

1 There was some displacement, as discussed in the publication of the Centre for Urban Research and Action, The Displaced (1977). However, because of the high levels of homeownership, and the protection of rent control, displacement has not been the major problem in areas of gentrification.
This chapter presents a conceptual overview of property-based political action. First there is a discussion of the importance of property ownership to political action and the particular interest of homeowners in the residential amenity and property value, followed by a discussion of local government as an arena which sets the ground rules for how homeowners can pursue their interests. The nature of minority interests is also examined, with particular attention paid to the resources of middle-class homeowners as minority interests to address different sorts of issues and how the combination of certain issues undertaken by middle-class homeowners in local government can determine the political tactics they use to address their interests.

Residential Interests

Of the various interests concerned with residential property, it is owner occupiers who are interested in both the amenity and property value of their dwellings. Although both tenants and owners have an interest in the amenity of their dwellings, only owner occupiers and landlords are interested in the property value and only owner occupiers are interested in both. Admittedly, although the two are so closely related that determination of one affects the other (Harvey, 1975; Saunders, 1978), there are differences between amenity and property value. Although there is no reason a tenant could not enjoy an equal or
better quality of life in a dwelling than an owner, owners can benefit from higher property value while tenants cannot and owners therefore have a critical financial stake in their dwelling.

Much of Kevin Cox’s work in the past five years has explored the importance of that financial stake in terms of the relationship of homeowner to their house as a commodity, and that analysis can be extended to examine residents’ views of the community as a commodity (Cox, 1981; Cox, 1982a). Cox took the Marxist viewpoint that the commodity relationship of capital purchasing labour’s product for a wage structures all relationship in society. He argued that homeowners are caught in a position where urban developers are seen trying to "appropriate surplus value" and "rent" from homeowners and residents who must in the end, pay the intangible costs of the resulting development -- through loss of aesthetics, increased noise or congestion, or the re-direction of public spending away from residential needs (Cox and McCarthy, 1982). This results in residents viewing their dwellings and local communities as commodities with certain values which can be maintained and improved. Cox’s work is especially useful for his concepts of "separation" and "distinctiveness" which create market value which can be increased through efforts of interested parties, e.g. renovation and resident action. This, he argues is the homeowners attempt to regain some of that surplus value and rent (Cox, 1982a).

Studies have shown that when owners take action on residential issues they do so to improve both amenity and
property value. As Agnew described it, "Given the monetary resources ownership requires, [there is an] interest in preserving the savings invested" (see also Sternleib, 1972 and Harvey, 1978). Understood in these terms, the residential dwelling can be considered an investment or commodity which returns both use and exchange values, or what is referred to here as amenity and property (or market) value.

For anyone living in a dwelling there is an interest in maximizing the use of the dwelling for comfort and safety which is usually discussed in terms of a residents' quality of life. The values of these amenities are closely bound up with the market value of a dwelling however, as seen in instances of renovation. While expanding or modernizing a dwelling might improve the use of the dwelling for its residents, it could also improve the potential sale price, making them closely related factors in "valuing" a dwelling (Seek, 1981). For middle-class owner occupiers who have financial resources with which to renovate dwellings, the potential for increasing amenity theoretically gives them a greater interest in their dwellings.

Owner occupiers have both a legal and financial interest in their dwelling. First, owner occupiers have the legal right to exercise control over their dwelling (subject to the regulations of local government) and can manage the dwelling in ways that maximise the quality of life or amenity for themselves in that dwelling. Secondly, owners also have the financial incentive to improve their property, provided they realize the exchange value of the dwelling at an advantageous time. Both the
right and incentive of owners to improve and manage dwelling fabric is seen in the large number of alterations and additions undertaken by owner occupiers.

Tenants, on the other hand have limited rights in controlling their dwelling and will benefit from the dwelling’s amenity, but not its property value if the dwelling is improved or altered. Indeed, improving a rented dwelling could result in increased rents because of the increased value to the landlord! In instances of tenure security some long term tenants might be willing to spend a few hundred dollars to paint the interior of a dwelling, or even to enclose the balcony of a terrace to create an extra room. Controlling these use values and the overall quality of life in their dwelling, however, is rarely their perogative.

The renovation of a dwelling however, only improves the amenity and value of the dwellings and does not affect some of the larger environmental issues or public goods which can impinge on the life of an owner occupier. It is reasonable then to expect that residents interests will extend to the condition of the nearby community as well (Murfet, 1981).

Residents see communities as having value which can be improved and protected just like a dwelling. Because the local environment can have an important impact on the dwelling residents with an interest in improving the amenity and market value of their dwellings will also have an interest in increasing the amenity and desireability of their communities. Increasing the amenity value of a suburb is often termed community development, and has been undertaken in many suburbs by groups as
varied as the Lions Club, Rotary, Apex, the Chamber of Commerce and resident action groups. The improvement of park and recreation space is a commonly undertaken task along with efforts to increase car parking space near shops, or planting trees. Each improves the value for users of the services in the particular suburbs.

In the inner suburbs these factors have been air quality, noise levels, traffic patterns, visual amenity and personal and property safety (Murfet, 1981; Day and Walmsley, 1978). Each of these can affect the quality of life inside the dwelling as levels of soot, heavy industrial and truck noise, and ugly commercial and residential development invade the doors and windows of dwellings. As well, the quality of life outside the dwelling is affected as such problems are only intensified outdoors, restricting use of garden space and the number of hours of safe and comfortable use of the outdoors.

**Arenas for Pursuing Residential Interests**

These interests in the community, however, cannot be addressed through the private market (unless the owner undertook to move) and must instead be addressed in the public arena of government, and in the cases of local property issues, most often local government (Sharp, 1981; Lowe and Goyder, 1983). Local government serves as an important arena, therefore, as it controls both the private market improvements of residents through building regulation and ordinances, and many public goods and services which residents work to protect or promote.

Also important, local government helps to define the
political legitimacy of many residents and their interests. Although expressing one's voice in local political arenas is not limited by tenure, most local government systems in Australia began with rules and conventions which limited much political activity to locales and to property owners (Power et al., 1981). In the context of political history many political rights were rooted in property ownership and most political institutions would either only recognize the political voice of property owners or would often grant property owners more say than non-property owners (ibid.)

These constraints are based on the concept of persons who hold an "estate or interest." Particularly in local government, but also in other forms of government, there is the long-established understanding that those with an "interest" should have the "right" to vote and take part in the democratic system. In Australian national and state elections for instance, "interest" is determined by one's national citizenship and residence in a defined State and electorate.

In local government in New South Wales (NSW), however, one's "interest" has come to be defined in terms of local residence in a ward or city, and/or one's ownership of property in the municipality (Miles and Bain, 1981). In NSW tenants are considered to be interested parties because they live in the area, and they can express that interest through voting. Homeowners hold an interest by both living in the area and owning property in the area. Persons who live outside the area in which they own property have an interest as property owners in the area which gives them political rights of address too. Property
ownership thus confers legitimate political interest on property owners.

An owners' perception of the dwelling as a commodity with a market value is encouraged and indeed required in many political instances because of the historical development of property ownership and political interest. When addressing property matters in local government in NSW, interested parties have traditionally needed to hold an "estate or interest" when addressing an issue. That is, if a resident wished to receive political attention on a property issue from local government he or she must own property in the area and usually own the property directly affected by the issue they are addressing (Starke, 1966). Thus in local government when objecting to a proposal or complaining of a local problem, activists traditionally object about the reduced "value" they would receive from that property if the problem were to continue. This can be seen when residents cite the threat to their property value when protesting nearby developments.

Political tradition has changed over the years and in the 1980s not as many local councils insist on following the rules of estate and interest. In 1979 the NSW State government changed its planning legislation to allow "third party appeals" (NSW, DEP, 1980). However, even in the recent past, political recognition and what might be called "standing" in the eyes of local government could be denied non-owners or non-proximate owners. The strength, frequency and consequences of this argument when used by local activists and local government will be examined in the six
Because of local government's insistence on objectors' estate or interest when addressing local property matters, there is reason to expect increased political interest in residential issues in areas of increased owner occupation. In areas of gentrification though, it is not necessarily the increased number of owner occupiers which explains the increase in resident action, but the dramatic increase in middle-class homeownership.

Councils which thirty years ago represented a primarily working-class constituency and could make decisions on roads and sewerage "in camera" (Smith, 1976), have been challenged by an increasingly vocal middle-class constituency to address wider social issues, and to inform the constituents about the decision-making and involve them in it. Power showed how the middle-class became interested in local government decisions in Balmain in 1968 (Power, 1969); Wild showed the strength of middle-class interest in the waste dump issue in a small Victorian town in the 1970s (Wild, 1983), and O'Neill showed the same on the open space issue in Leichhardt in the 1980s (O'Neill, 1985). Because of the importance of middle-class owner occupiers in property-related issues, local government is important as a political arena and the amenity and property values of dwelling and community help explain who the interested parties are in residential politics.
Although owner occupiers have the interest in and the right to address residential improvement through renovation in the private market and action in the public sphere what is to say they have the inclination or ability to pursue their interests in improvement? According to the market argument owner occupiers will need sufficient financial resources to undertake renovation. According to the pluralist argument if owner occupiers wish to pursue their interests in the public sphere they will need either sufficient numerical strength or the political resources necessary to influence the political majority. In areas of gentrification home ownership may confer political legitimacy and renovation may increase owners interest in their dwelling but many of the interests of the new middle-class residents put them in opposition to local government policy and the local political majority which requires their use of certain political resources.

Owner occupiers then have the choice of moving, remaining silent, or speaking out as seen when Orbell and Uno (1972) applied Hirschmann's Exit, Voice and Loyalty (1970) concepts to urban neighbourhoods. They showed that if residents participate in groups to improve their residential areas their voice and protest can help improve the area. The exit of residents depletes the neighbourhood of social and political resources and the suburb is not improved. The authors established quite clearly the importance of voice and action outside the representative and market institutions in changing the residential area.

If owners do choose to act and they are in a minority they must rely on influencing the people in power, which requires
resources different from those required in electoral politics or in the private market. One of the most important resources to political minorities or persons pursuing minority interests is the ability to organize (Olsen, 1977). This requires resources which come with education and income, and are important aspects of residents' class background. Morris Axelrod (1965) presented in empirical form the striking relationship between education and income on the one hand and formal group involvement on the other, and attributed it to the ample leisure time, social competence and political expertise of those with more education and income. This was followed by the work of Bell and Force (1965) who showed that group participation was greater in high-status areas than in low status areas. More recent research has confirmed this in areas of gentrification in the U.S. (Nachmias and Palen, 1982; Steinberger, 1984; Smith, 1984; Dingeman, 1983; Maher, 1985) and in the U.K. (Hindess, 1971; Lowe and Goyder, 1983).

Australian research showed the same: higher levels of education not only enable some residents to undertake action, they also provoke interest in participation in decision-making. Miles and Bain described it this way:

> The increasing standard of education of the community is tending to produce a dissatisfaction with remote large scale bureaucracies, is enlarging the wish of the people to be involved in decision-making and is raising their expectations. Local government is likely to emerge over time as the obvious means to promote and encourage citizen participation and meaningful community government (Miles and Bain, 1981:204).

They were referring to increasing standards of education
throughout Australia. Inner city suburbs provide intense microcosms of such change. These inner city suburbs, which when primarily occupied by the working-class had few resident groups, now, with more middle-class residents, have several.

In areas of gentrification the changes in social makeup occur in discreet geographic areas often more rapidly than experienced by the larger population as do the political attitudes. Almost twenty years ago John Power in his article "The New Politics in the Old Suburbs" (1969) pointed out the essential role of the professionals, business executives and "cosmopolitan" types in taking up particular types of political issues in the inner suburbs. Jakubowicz (1975) made it clear in his study of Surry Hills that it was the middle-class residents who articulated the arguments of the whole community, even though they constituted a minor part of that community. Middle-class residents are not only likely to be interested and active, they are likely to pursue their interests in the non-institutional political tradition.

Nachmias and Palen (1982) have provided some of the most useful survey data on these issues. Their study revealed that of the newcomers in an older working-class inner suburb in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, those who joined resident groups were affluent and liberal, and only joined groups identified as "avant garde". This was explained by the residents' positive attitude towards the community which is associated with the public spiritedness mentioned by Vidich and Bensman (1968). Moreover, whether the newcomers joined a residents group or not was strongly correlated with their willingness to act against suburban
threats generally, and whether or not they had renovated their own dwelling.

Willingness to act would reflect the liberal attitude of new residents as well as the affordability in time and money which is part of affluence and which is important to any kind of action whether individual or collective. Renovation of dwelling indicates the increased interest that increased value can bring both through improved investment (market) value and through residents’ increased attachment. In the survey by Nachimas and Palen both dwelling renovation and willingness to act were less common among long-standing working-class residents. The one exception was that established residents who did join resident groups also had a positive attitude about the community. Otherwise, the motives and actions of the working class were found to be different from those of the middle class, with attitude and wealth being important factors influencing action.

It is more than just willingness to act or organize. According to Vidich and Bensman (1968) it is a postwar, middle-class abandonment of traditional political organizations. The authors pinpointed the important role of university-educated professionals, managers, technically trained bureaucrats and employed intellectuals in entering local politics as "ideological and/or party activists", abandoning old-style machine politics and taking up reform politics with a "cultured, clean and civilized" image. They argued that these changes evolved out of larger economic, educational and demographic changes in society:
These changes represent fundamental and perhaps irreversible trends in the very structure of American society. Whether one likes the direction of these trends or not, they cannot be wished away, abolished by law or reversed by going back to the past without doing violence to the emergent society (Vidich and Bensman, 1968:347).

More recent work in the U.K. and the U.S. has shown that the education and income of residents predicts whether they will be active on local issues (Sternberger, 1984) and how successful resident groups will be. Middle-class involvement in voluntary organizations provides high levels of skill and knowledge which underpins the legitimacy and competence of a group (Lowe and Goyder, 1983). Legitimacy and competence are particularly important when interest groups are in a minority position and must rely on and strive to earn the political favour of the majority.

Jakubowicz explained the relationship as he saw it among the new middle-class residents of inner Sydney:

Freed from the day to day insecurity of the manual worker, and from the entrepreneurial responsibility of the traditional bourgeois middle class, they are comparatively secure in their occupations and their lifestyle. Possibly, because survival is no longer their dominant goal, and their incomes are sufficient and increasing, they have the option of dealing with the wider questions that they feel affect them. (Jakubowicz, 1974:336)

Michael Jones attributed the increasing interest in quality of life in the city to the increasing numbers of middle-class residents:
It is only when there is substantial prosperity that people seem prepared to look beyond economics to quality of life issues. Concern with the quality is in many ways a revolt against the consequences of affluence. Increase in incomes makes it possible for us to purchase motor cars which cause air pollution. Similarly, the pressure on recreation space in large cities is a result of our growing leisure time due to affluence (Jones, 1977:31).

Vidich and Bensman related these interests to "contemporary reform politics" which they accurately, albeit somewhat cynically, attributed to being "uprighteous, public spirited, concerned with the general welfare and on the side of angels" (1971).

Pickvance termed it the "elective affinity" between the middle-class and organizational voluntary associations. He argued that the skills which such groups demand and the rewards they offer are particularly attractive to the middle class (Pickvance, 1978). If such assertions are true we would expect to see predominantly middle-class owner occupiers participate in resident groups.

So far an argument has been made that property owners have both a property interest and political right to protect their dwelling value which is determined by the amenity and property value of the dwelling and immediate environment. Local government is an important political arena for local property interests and provides political legitimacy for homeowners to pursue their property interests. Middle-class homeowners take advantage of that legitimacy but when in a minority can use it to undertake political action in a collective manner. The next two questions are: what issues will residents address and how will
they address them?

**Issues for Residential Action**

According to Agnew's argument, residents will address issues which affect the financial value of their dwelling (Agnew, 1981). More recent research has shown that, in areas of gentrification, many middle-class residents value aspects of their inner city community and work to improve and protect them. Cole (1985) showed that middle-class residents enjoyed and wanted to maintain diversity. Datel (1985) showed middle-class residents who were interested in living in an area which had a "sense of place" which they in turn want to protect. This confirms some of Suttles (1972) earlier work when he argued that local residential urban communities are really the purposeful constructs of "territorial" populations with respect to their environment, and not "vestigial remnants of a more fragmented and localized society." That is, people define their own sense of territory, it does not evolve from a larger city or geographic area or historical definition. He argued that social groups will increasingly work to create residential areas where they can have and maintain an "unchallenged version of their beliefs, values and personal presentation."

According to the commodification argument put forward by Cox (1983, 1982c), owner occupiers are interested in distinguishing their dwellings and communities from other dwellings and communities and wish to create value in certain aspects of life in that dwelling or area, such as the community's historic appearance or its proximity to the CBD, Harbour, or
places of work and entertainment. These interests, however, are not universally accepted as valuable. In areas of gentrification, middle-class owner occupiers are, after all, in the minority and the dwelling and community characteristics they wish to make or remain distinctive will not likely be shared by the majority of the local community (Smith, 1984). In the private market new middle-class owner occupiers are free to renovate or alter their dwelling as they please, subject to the controls and standards of local government. In the public sphere though, they must resort to political influence and without the necessary majority, non-institutional political influence. In an interesting way, the new middle-class renovators have resorted to distinctive, unconventional political tactics to gain political value (eg. success) in the same way Cox argues they did in their efforts at dwelling and community improvement. Figure 2.1 shows the range of interests and resources of residents directed to their dwelling and community in the public and private spheres.
## Figure 2.1: Interests and Resources of Resident Action

### INTERESTS PURSUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SPHERE</th>
<th>PRIVATE SPHERE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Building Standards</td>
<td>Gain Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain historic status</td>
<td>Renovate Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate nearby land uses</td>
<td>Improve yard/garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with noise, traffic</td>
<td>Move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fix yard/garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY/ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce noise and air pollution</td>
<td>Maintain diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain control of local decision</td>
<td>Create a &quot;sense of place&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making power</td>
<td>Community &quot;distinctiveness&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get libraries, trees, goods and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve visual amenity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain more open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain recognition as an historic area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce traffic and parking congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create/improve a &quot;sense of place&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESOURCES NEEDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SPHERE</th>
<th>PRIVATE SPHERE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic building</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards and controls</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY/ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Proximate, property-related interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political acumen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to organize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most residents are concerned with protecting or enhancing their residential environment, or as Saunders puts it, "in securing the maximum benefits which can accrue to them through [the] allocative process, and in avoiding the costs" (Saunders, 1979). In his discussion of local urban decisions and conflicts and arenas Robson (1982) specified the three environments of physical, social and resource. I have chosen to substitute political for social. He delineated the physical as a concern with nearby buildings, roads and parks; social as a concern with the social characteristics and compatibility of neighbours; and resource as a concern with the location of, distribution of and access to goods and facilities. Although issues in the social realm are important, few are addressed within local government, the primary focus of this thesis. Because some of the more controversial issues in local government have arisen in areas of political voice and recognition, the political sphere has been chosen as more appropriate.

In a classification of urban social movements Pickvance applied a framework comprising the issues at stake and the social base or population directly affected by the issue. He was particularly interested in the transformation of the social bases and stakes into social forces and urban social movements. Although that transformation is not addressed here his typology of stakes assists in identifying interests in most urban situations (1978, 1985). They were:

---the provision of housing and urban services
---gaining of access to housing and urban services
---gaining of control of housing and urban services and local political institutions
---defense against housing and neighbourhood threats
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The combination of the Robson and Pickvance typologies shows the diversity of urban stakes at issue with residents. However, both can also be seen simply as issues of what Short et al. (1986) termed "stopping and getting". According to Short's research resident groups in Central Berkshire in the United Kingdom, "were concerned to varying degrees with both stopping developments in the physical and social environments and obtaining things for the resource environment" (Short et al., 1986).

A wide scope of residential issues can arise in inner city politics. First there is the determination of residential interest within the physical, resource, and political arenas some of which are in reference to the dwelling and property itself, and some to the surrounding suburban environment. Within this matrix are the particular aspects of amenity and property value either verbally articulated by residents or actively promoted or protected by residents.

There are many potential issues for residents and resident groups. These include high density development, high traffic volume, older dwelling stock, small recreational spaces, high ratios of commercial/industrial land to residential land, conservative municipal councils, lack of municipal attention to certain issues, and lack of public information about council activities and decisions (see Kendig (1979), Kilmartin & Thorns (1978)). More recent surveys by Day and Walmsley (1981) in three inner suburbs of Sydney confirm that the most important problems as perceived by residents were lack of playgrounds and open
space, traffic congestion and difficult parking and environmental pollution.

Fitting these public goods and community amenities into the argument indicates the interests and stakes at issue in resident action. Adding as well, those issues classified by Roddewig (1978) as issues on which resident action groups and unions organized together, the framework provides a useful starting point for analyzing the issues I expect to find emerging in inner Sydney.

---

**Figure 2.2: Residential Issues for Public Action**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of Goods and Services</td>
<td>parks and open space</td>
<td>residents advisory groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Goods and Services</td>
<td>parking spaces</td>
<td>open meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Goods and Services</td>
<td>substandard housing development pollution zoning</td>
<td>participation veto power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation and Defense of Goods and Services</td>
<td>buildings</td>
<td>maintain the status quo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marginal Interests and Pluralism**

These interests should arguably be universal, so that any homeowner of the twentieth century, no matter their background, would share the interests and subsequent residential issues. Mullins (1982) argued on the contrary, as did Cole (1985) and Datel (1985), that many issues concerning quality of life are
specifically middle class, such as a "new inner city ambience" of historic and attractive buildings, specialty shops, exotic restaurants, theatres, cinemas, and cultural festivals. He argued, too, that working-class residents do not have the resources to organize to promote such amenities. According to his argument some of the interests and resources and residential issues should be of particular importance in areas of gentrification.

When newer, middle-class home purchasers move into older, working-class suburbs they are in the minority in the local social and political environment. They are marginal because they are a small group with social characteristics distinctive from those of the majority of established residents, and because they organize minority groups interested in issues of no interest to or in direct opposition to the interests of the established decision-makers (Smith, 1984). In both instances they and their interests are considered "marginal" and not representative of the larger social and political environment.

However, in several instances middle-class owner occupiers are not marginal. For instance in the private market they have the legal right and usually the financial resources to pursue their dwelling interests through dwelling modification and can apply for a building permit and renovate or if they wish, sell the dwelling. In the eyes of local government they have the rights of property ownership and therefore the necessary "estate or interest" to address matters concerning their property. However, they are in the minority in terms of their local
political strength and in terms of the interests they pursue (Dempsey, 1981). Despite their market and political rights they can be pushed to the political margins by the established decision-making authorities and might not succeed in having their interests attended to (Power, 1969). Instead they must try to gain more strength to exert more influence, reform both the interests of the established institutions and the way they make decisions, or pursue their interests outside the established administrative and representative systems, which in this case are the State and local governments.

Other marginal interests have pursued their interests in many forms: class struggle, collective action, protest movements, political action. According to pluralist theory each forms outside the established decision-making institutions, but directs its efforts to the decisions of the institution which affect its interest. Mancur Olson in The Logic of Collective Action (1971) traced the development of political organization around economic interest marginal to the established legislative system as propounded by Commons (1950) and the political analysis of interest groups evolved by Bentley (1908), Truman (1958) and Latham (1952).

Commons (1950) argued that pressure groups came about because the market and elected legislature did not themselves bring about fair results to different groups, and that pressure groups could remove some of these disparities. Latham (1952) agreed, asserting however, that in the end the interests of the larger numbers represented in the market and legislature would win on most issues and not the marginal interests. This presents
a picture of larger, established institutions surrounded on the margins by special interest pressure groups.

Truman (1958), taking the argument even further, posited that as the needs for groups increased, more groups will form to satisfy the need. Thus, if action is needed, groups will organize - if they are not needed, they will not organize. According to Truman's view (similar to Commons) disturbances of suffering, dislocation, unemployment, inflation, and waste would create the needs for action and thus for organization.

More radical expressions of political action were seen in the protest movements of the 1960s and 1970s: civil rights, welfare rights, women's rights, consumer rights. The organizers within these movements rejected some basic assumptions of pluralism because they believed that there was nothing "natural" about the exercise of power (Fainstein and Fainstein, 1974). In their view power was rooted in wealth and the established institutions of society including the major political parties which overwhelmed the power of the franchise and other fragmented interests (Piven and Cloward, 1977).

Nevertheless, many political activists in reform movements of the sixties continued to organize and work through activist groups. However, they agreed that if activist groups with little wealth or institutional power abided by the the rules of the established legal and representative systems, such groups would have little influence on the institutions of wealth and power (Piven and Cloward, 1977). In this way they justified organizing groups outside the representative system and justified their acts
of protest and civil disobedience, that is, their actions taken outside the established legal system. Thus where marginal activist groups might work outside the established representative institutions but within the laws of society, protest activity often worked outside both the representative and legal systems.

Piven and Cloward (1977) defined protest movements in two ways. One described the emergence of protest, the other the practice of protest. When protest emerges, the legitimacy of the "system" and the aspects of the system relevant to the people come into question. People begin to assert "rights" which will eventually necessitate some kind of change. This questioning of the system and the insistence on reform, according to Piven and Cloward, can often only be achieved when persons and groups refuse to take part in the system, work against the systems and sometimes create their own system. This can be seen in acts of secession, and in boycotts of goods and services. After these acts, according to their framework, protestors begin to believe they might succeed outside of the system, and develop a feeling of efficacy which fuels their defiance and determination to continue and presumably their willingness to work outside the legal system as well.

Unlike Truman and others, Piven and Cloward did not limit their definition and examination of action to articulated and conscious intentions of individuals or organizations. Like Bachrach and Baratz (1970) they argued that people can still exercise power and yet fail to organize groups, fail to press their demands from fear, knowledge of their own limitations and abilities, and knowledge of the strength of their opponents.
Authorities can ignore appeals for reform, refuse to act, co-opt leaders and avoid making decisions in the midst of very bitter power struggles. Most power analysts now acknowledge the important, though difficult to measure, role of non-decision making and immeasurable, intangible power-wielding, as well as the importance of people who are not heard and of events which do not take place. In politics this is analysed in the literature on voice, decision and action (for a good, thorough discussion of this issue see Newton (1981)).

**Tactics for Resident Action**

Middle-class owner occupiers pursuing an interest marginal to the local political institution would have both the usual, conventional modes of action available to every homeowner or resident, but also the inclination and ability to form activist groups and become activists. This combination of formal and informal actions on residential issues was examined by Orbell and Uno (1972). They identified seven ways residents voiced their interests:

- work through informal groups
- work through a political party
- vote
- work through formal groups (church, unions, etc.)
- write letters
- talk to powerful people
- consult a lawyer

Cox (1983) in measuring neighbourhood activism, identified these actions: attending neighbourhood meetings, joining neighbourhood groups, signing or organising a petition, telephoning or writing to local political leaders. In their studies of resident action Johnston (1983) included legal action
and O'Brien (1975) considered the Alinsky-like protest strategies of boycotts, demonstrations and civil disobedience.

Initially these actions can be understood as conventional and unconventional as in Figure 2.3.

---

**Figure 2.3: Conventional and Unconventional Resident Action**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional</th>
<th>Unconventional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>political parties</td>
<td>boycotts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>votes/elections</td>
<td>demonstrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informal groups</td>
<td>civil disobedience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letters</td>
<td>meeting disruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>petitions</td>
<td>illegal behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consult a lawyer</td>
<td>sit-ins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disseminating information</td>
<td>traffic stoppages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public meetings</td>
<td>squatting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work-bans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In areas of gentrification there would be on the one hand the interests which are marginal and ignored by established institutions of power, prompting residents to undertake unconventional, protest actions to exert influence. On the other hand, the higher levels of income, education and occupational attainment give middle-class activists the resources necessary to respond to decisions-making bodies with collective action, or professionally prepared proposals for policy alternatives in the same language and form as put forward by the authorities themselves (Lowe and Goyder, 1983). Middle-class residents are therefore in a position where they have a wide range of options in resident action.

Gricar and Brown (1981) termed the unconventional and conventional actions as adversarial or integrative in their analysis of resident groups and conflict. The former they felt emphasized power differences and antagonism while the latter
emphasized interdependence and compromise. The former essentially describes unconventional action, and the latter conventional action. Individual and collective are efforts people can employ themselves or efforts for which they must organize. With these categories a framework of political action inside and outside the bounds of established institutions can be developed.

Figure 2.4: Actions According to Their Nature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVERSARIAL OR PROTEST</th>
<th>INTEGRATIVE OR PLURALIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIVIDUAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult a lawyer</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal attack</td>
<td>Write letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>Sign petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil disobedience</td>
<td>Talk to powerful people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLECTIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boycotts</td>
<td>Informal groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td>Formal groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption</td>
<td>Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil disobedience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So far an argument has been put forward that people holding interests marginal to the relevant decision-making authority will need to undertake collective and sometimes unconventional political action to influence decision-makers. Middle-class owner occupiers have the legitimacy and political rights which come with property ownership, the proclivity and ability to organize and the opportunity to choose between adversarial or integrative action. Whether they choose one sort of political tactic or another is subject to certain circumstances. Saunders states that the the choice of political action is tempered by "rational constraints" (1979) -- the costs individuals are not
prepared to pay such as abandoning certain rules, laws or values. For instance, the risk of jail or fines prevents some from undertaking marginal actions of civil disobedience, shouting at council meetings or blocking traffic with "human chains".

The tactics used to address residential issues are of course further influenced by the targets of the action — whether a local council, State parliament, statutory authority or private business. Each authority makes decisions which can affect residential amenity or the political process which determines residential amenity. However each political body has a different definition of "resident interest" which makes the expression of resident interest marginal to some bodies and on some issues and not to others, making their response to resident interest varied too. This also affects the way residents express their interest to the decision-making body. If a person or a group wished to exert some influence on a municipal council, boycotting a council meeting would accomplish nothing. The councillors have no interest in ensuring that there are many people in the council chamber. Their interest lies in ensuring their constituents' contentment and their own re-election.

In another example, if a group wished to change the practices of a local business, waiting for an election and voting for those supporting the measure would accomplish little. If however, the groups were to boycott the local business and exert electoral pressure to influence the council, the methods and the targets would be more appropriately matched, and the efforts more likely to succeed. Whether adversarial or integrative, individual or collective, tactics used could depend on the issue.
Summary

This conceptual overview highlights the wide-ranging nature of property-based interest in both renovation and resident action. It has shown that although resident action does often operate in the protest tradition against the established institutions of government, it stems essentially from the pluralist tradition of political systems which expects and uses groups to form and operate outside the representative system but within the legal bounds of society.

Resident action is seen as a form of activism based on local property interests which cannot be pursued solely through individual action in the private market, such as moving or improving. Sometimes residents are interested in their dwelling, sometimes their surrounding community. Depending on the tenure and social background of the residents, they will have certain interests and hold certain values for the amenity of their dwelling and community, and their property value. Moreover they will have different resources available to them with which to pursue their interests.

In areas of gentrification the trends in property ownership, dwelling investment, community status and social makeup have been reversed. Many residents view their dwellings as commodities which need to be protected and promoted, but live in areas with many threats to amenity. This suggests an increasing incentive on the part of inner city, middle-class residents to protect their dwellings and communities through a variety of individual, collective, adversarial and integrative tactics.
This chapter has examined the concepts of pluralism and minority opportunities for residents action in the light of the structure of local government in Sydney. I have argued that to understand the nature of residents action in voting, group action and individual action requires consideration of both the social and political position of residents and the political ground rules operating in local government. In analysing the action of residents we need an analysis of how and why they are in a minority position in relation to larger and longer established local interests. Before examining the action they take there must be an account of the political and social history of the urban environment, the specific local government areas, as well as the physical changes and financial investment of residents in dwelling renovation. The next three chapters examine each of those in turn, the social, the political and the physical changes the study areas and their impact on the interests and the resources and arenas for resident action.
"Sydney is like a large tree in the forest: big and green and still growing, but rotten at the heart" SMH, 29/7/47.

CHAPTER THREE: FROM SLUMS TO SUBURBS

The sweeping postwar social and economic changes experienced throughout Australia had major impacts on Sydney and, most particularly, its inner areas. This chapter reviews aspects of the social and political history of inner Sydney beginning in 1947 with its well-established slum stigma through to 1966 and the early stages of gentrification. Establishing these earlier historical conditions is important to understanding the residential and political environments in which the new middle-class residents would be pursuing their property-related interests as they moved into homes in the inner areas. They were to be confronted with dominant working-class and renting residential interests defended by local Labor Party municipal councils against the redevelopment threats proposed by private enterprise and state government.

However, the residential base of this political arena, and the actors and interests within it changed, as home ownership rates rose rapidly over the 1950s but as the residents remained working-class. Emphasis is placed on a chronological account of these developments and their implications for the kinds of political resources and the political actions required of residents in the arena of local government. Part one outlines the physical and social characteristics of postwar Sydney in terms of the residential interests, part two the inner city housing
policies of State and local government, and part four the changing residential interests of the inner city into the 1960s.

Maps 3.1 to 3.6 provide an image of the six suburbs discussed in this thesis, indicating major non-residential land use, street layout and open space.
Map 3.1 Annandale
Map 3.5 Paddington
Map 3.6 Surry Hills
Physically Dilapidated and Socially Scorned

By 1947 the predominant interests in the inner suburbs of Sydney had been working-class and residential for some decades. These interests were strengthened when the State government brought them together by amalgamating some of the existing inner municipalities into two larger council areas, Sydney and Leichhardt. This effectively combined residential and non-residential interests into the same local government areas, resulting in strong electoral support for the Labor Party from the residential interests, and virulent local conflicts because of the still strong, but now minority non-residential interests.

According to census figures the resident interests were working-class and tenant. Most residents rented their homes, lived in houses instead of flats, were Australian-born, and were two to three times more likely to have an industrial job against a white-collar job. The ratio of men to women in the resident workforce was on the average two to one (Table 3.1). The interests of the residents arguably lay in encouraging more and better rental housing, both public and private, and in maintaining the manufacturing employment base of the inner suburbs. Apart from their protection of tenure with rent control, their resources were minimal with few advantages of high income, higher education or social status. Their major political strength rested in their large numbers, which ensured that the Labor Party protected their interests, and was continually re-elected to municipal control.
Table 3.1: Five Characteristics of Persons and Dwellings in the Six Study areas, 1947

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pvt. Dwellings</td>
<td>Flats</td>
<td>Born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNANDALE</td>
<td>75.</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>98.</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALMAIN</td>
<td>72.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>98.</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEBE</td>
<td>90.</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>98.</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWTOWN</td>
<td>88.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>98.</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADDINGTON</td>
<td>89.</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SYDNEY¹</td>
<td>92.</td>
<td>42.</td>
<td>92.</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>36.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ 1947 figures are not available for Surry Hills. However, because it was part of the Sydney Municipality these figures are indicative.
(Source: 1947 Census)

Not all of the inner residential areas began the century with similar working-class reputations. Newtown and Paddington, for instance, were socially distinct from each other as seen in these turn-of-the-century popular depictions from the Evening News (1904), a Sydney newspaper. Newtown, near the rail station, was originally built as a working-class area with mixed land uses, while Paddington, near the higher status Eastern Suburbs was an example of almost exclusive middle-class suburban comfort:
Looking at the position of Newtown on the map, with its magnificent plains of level land, its nearness to a bountiful water supply, and its proximity to a port other than Sydney Harbour - the wide expanse of Botany Bay; considering its being the trunk, so to speak, from which the great railways spread, like arms, far into the interior, what likelier prospect is there than that, in the near future, it will be studded with immense factories, round each of which may be clustered model working mens' residential settlements (Evening News, 1904).

Paddington, however, had a more pleasant prospect:

Taken as a whole, the residents of Paddington appear to attain the Psalmists ideal of a blissful state, and have neither poverty nor great riches. The mansions may be counted, whilst the number of comfortable terrace homes and detached bungalows are immense. Vainly does one look for the one or two roomed tenements and if the mark of the land speculator is very evident in the district, it has not apparently resulted in discomfort to the residents (Evening News, 1904).

By 1947, however, the growing attraction of the middle and outer suburbs, the economic problems of the Depression and the wartime diversion of resources had greatly lowered the value of inner city living and the general quality of life (Spearritt, 1974). These changes had particular impact on the housing stock, with accumulated demand resulting from a hiatus of construction brought on first by depression, then by the redirection of labour and capital to war industry (Spearritt, 1978). The housing shortage was aggravated by the natural increase of population, but also by the population growth in Sydney as workers migrated to the growing job opportunities in war-related industry in the metropolitan area (Logan, 1968).
State Government Policies

The insufficient supply and dilapidated condition of rental housing was aggravated by rent control. Instituted by a non-Labor federal government in 1939 and further strengthened in 1941, rent control allowed the Fair Rents Board to fix dwelling rents in NSW for the wartime period and protected tenants from eviction. After the war, the Board continued to control rents at 1939 levels with increases allowed only to cover increased costs of rates or repairs. Because of the controlled rents and protected tenancies rent control worked to reduce return on investment in rental property. This removed landlords' incentives to invest in maintainence of the controlled dwellings, their incentive to construct new dwellings or purchase others for rental purposes (Spearritt, 1978; Neutze, 1972; Kendig, 1979).

The Cumberland County Planning Scheme Report presented to the state government in 1948 was particularly concerned with correcting the problems of the inner city. As well, it was concerned with the orderly development of the new suburbs, addressing issues of decentralization of employment and services, and the general improvement of planning and zoning decisions in the metropolitan area. The major concerns for the inner city within the report were for its overcrowded and substandard housing. The inadequate social facilities they planned to remedy by rebuilding the inner areas with more "suitable" housing, lower population densities and greatly expanded public amenities (CCC Planning Report, 1948).

The authority was interested in both physical and social
issues. The authors of the report focussed on the extent of personal illness, social deviance and physical deterioration within the inner areas, attributing them to the physical environment and tenant concentration in the areas. After detailing the number of dwellings found with leaking gutters and downpipes, sagging ceilings and rotten floors, on small lots with negligible back gardens, and intrusive industry on the street, the authors noted the high proportion of tenants in the areas and concluded:

The houses which are occupied by owners, though very few, are of far better appearance, demonstrating an interest and pride almost completely lacking in the tenanted houses (CCC Report, 1948:69).

The authors asserted homeownership to be "the most effective safeguard against obsolescence." They were sure that slum clearance and reconstruction, as well as ridding the city of unsafe and unsightly dwellings, would encourage owner-occupation in the inner areas (ibid.).

When the first results of the County's survey of dwelling condition appeared in 1947, the State Housing Minister Clive Evatt lost no time in calling for the demolition and redevelopment of five blocks in Redfern, with further plans for new large blocks of flats in Erskineville and Paddington (SMH, 28/6/47). Former residents were to be rehoused despite the complicated logistics of finding temporary housing and shifting to the new permanent dwellings.

The Sydney Morning Herald termed the process "decanting" (SMH, 28/6/47). The enormity of the "decanting" and housing need was to be a major problem in slum clearance, as one month later,
the Cumberland County Council "rapid field survey" revealed that 40,000 dwellings warranted immediate demolition and a further 77,000 demolition or renovation within the next 25 years (SMH, 29/7/47). According to County Council calculations any new dwelling would require two to three times the current rent (the pre-reconstruction average being 18/-) to be economically feasible. However, the extent and expense of the slum reclamation plans were subjected to the financial constraints and political limitations of various levels of government making their implementation problematic.

Although the housing survey covered the whole Sydney area, the bulk of "blight" was identified in the inner suburbs. As the Sydney Morning Herald reported, finding one metaphor inadequate for the task:

Whole districts have grown old and decrepit in Sydney, just as men do, and the worst housing was found in the earliest settled parts. Or, to borrow a simile from the plant world, Sydney is like a large tree in the forest: big and still green and growing -- but rotten at the heart. (SMH, 29/7/47)

Of the six areas studied in this thesis, the survey concluded that only five percent of dwellings in Annandale, Balmain, Glebe, Newtown and Paddington were worth keeping over the next twenty five years, and three in four dwellings in Paddington warranted immediate demolition. "Obsolete areas in which immediate demolition of buildings is considered necessary" covered all of Paddington, Surry Hills, portions of Balmain, Glebe and Newtown, though little of Annandale (ibid.).
Some of the conditions can best be understood by examining some of the photos of the CCC report. Figure 3.1 shows the postwar conditions of some of the terraces in Paddington. Figure 3.2 shows how compactly developed Paddington was, with the bulk of development residential. There were still some noticeable non-residential developments in its midst.

Figure 3.1: Dilapidated Terraces in Paddington, 1947
(Source: CCC Report, 1948)
In Annandale and Glebe the residential development did not seem as compact, but the development of industry had been even more extensive (Figure 3.3)
Fortunately for the residential interests of the inner city the County Council did not plan to redevelop the inner suburbs at the expense of the residential nature of the areas. Their plans for redevelopment proposed more suitable housing and more suitable residential areas by consolidating land uses and minimizing the mix of incompatible land uses, and did not encourage commercial land use to replace residential space.

Balmain, Redfern, Glebe, Paddington and Annandale possess natural advantages hardly discernible under the blight of present development. Obsoleteness in these areas is due, not to any natural defects in the land but to outdated housing standards and dilapidation, while industrial penetration and lack of open space and other amenities have aggravated the condition (CCC Report, 1948:33).

Inner city residents were fortunate to have the support and
interest of the planning authority. With a slum reputation and working-class social makeup inner city residents had little incentive and few resources with which to pursue their own interests, which could easily have been ignored. In the past they had only the labor local councils to rely on, which traditionally supported resident interests, and in the midst of postwar development plans continued to do so.

Local Government Policies

In the 1940s and 1950s the political issues addressed by the newly constituted councils centred on the battle between residential and commercial interests. Since 1946 the Labor-dominated Sydney City Council had restricted any commercial and industrial development which would cause the loss of housing (SMH, 9/4/47, 15/2/49, 22/4/49). Because of a shortage of Commonwealth and State funds there was delay in implementing the long-heralded slum clearance program. This gave non-residential investors in the city sufficient time to gather the necessary tools to promote their own property interests in the local government arena and to thwart any further residential development in the city. As a Labor Council, the Sydney City Council was dedicated in its platform to a housing policy which would maintain the supply of workers housing and improve their overall condition. Indeed, it could be argued that the Labor Party was so energetic and successful in protecting the interests of inner city residents through the party and elected councils that residents had little need to protect their own interests. The Labor Party’s pro-residential policy in the city worked to preserve both workers’ housing and the constituencies which would
ensure their re-election. Because the working-class interests were the electoral majority in local politics, they had no need to adopt the kinds of political strategies used by the middle-class minorities twenty years later.

The commerce-dominated Civic Reform interest in the city seemed preoccupied with facilitating the commercial and industrial development of the city. Such a policy could improve the city at least from their point of view, through non-residential redevelopment which would also raise the rate base of the city. Also, because non-residential property owners had the right to vote in any municipality in which they owned property, increased commercial ownership and decreased housing supplied a greater proportion of property owners who were likely to support Civic Reform in local elections.

The battle between ratepayers and non-ratepayer residents, and between residential and non-residential interests was fought within an electoral system established by State governments many years before the war. The tradition of a combined property franchise and resident franchise was long standing in Sydney (NSW, Act 33, 1927). Property owners were allowed to vote in every ward in which they owned property while non-property owning residents, known as tenants and lodgers, could vote only in the area in which they lived (NSW, Local Government, Electoral Provisions Act, 1941). Labor and the non-Labor parties protected their respective franchise interests in several State legislative battles, the result being a property owning and residential criterion for voting, and a Labor-dominated Council from 1948 to
1968. The specific implications of these electoral rules in residents' promotion and protection actions in local government will be discussed in the following chapter.

In Surry Hills, a primarily residential area just south of the CBD, the Council refused sixteen development applications between 1946 and 1951 on the grounds they would require the demolition of sixty dwellings, displacing between two and three hundred people (SMH, 31/8/51 and 31/9/51). Representatives of the fifty developers and property owners objected to the residential zoning and stressed the need for suitable land. Such land would have proximity to the city, distribution centres and light service industries and room to expand. Moreover, they claimed than any new dwellings in the area, either public or private would only attract "the sort of people who made slums" (SMH, 31/8/51).

The City Council, on the other hand, stressed the equity aspect and the need to protect residents in Surry Hills from industrial and commercial encroachment:

Why shouldn't the people of Surry Hills have the same protection against encroachment by industry as the residents of Pymble and other suburbs?...There has been a lot of arrant snobbishness talked at this enquiry about the type of people who want to live round the city (SMH, 31/8/51).

In 1955 a similar debate unfolded over Pyrmont to the east of the CBD and Woolloomooloo to the west (Map 3.7).
Map 3.7 Sydney CBD
The Civic Reform aldermen, representing the property owners and developers, accused the Labor Party in control of the council of "freezing" areas as residential, and zoning industrial sites for homes. Civic Reform aldermen and the Sydney Morning Herald explained this as Labor's desire to prevent "the loss of this strong residential vote [which] would reduce Labor's majority on the council and could lead to Labor losing control of the council" (SMH, 5/10/55).

Labor responded quickly and defended the interest of residential areas in a time of housing shortage. It also deprecated the effect of a potential three percent Labor vote loss in a city where the Labor Mayor held his seat by a margin of 27,000 votes (SMH, 8/10/55). Labor argued that industrial zoning of residential areas would encourage landlords to "buy out" tenants they could not evict because they were protected by rent control and force them into an already tight housing market. Never, by their own account, did Labor fear this loss of Labor votes, although the policies implemented certainly stemmed any departing tide. Although the motive is unclear the action was clearly understood and Labor was the proud defender of the city residential interest.

The battle in Newtown over the same issue of industrial and commercial expansion into residential areas sparked the most conspicuous debate over interests. Labor Alderman Wright reported that he had heard Civic Reform Alderman Barley "gloat" about the redirection of the city population with potential loss of dwellings and labour votes, "I do not say he is gloating about the misery of the homeless, but that is the
effect of demolition even if he is not conscious of it" (SMH, 20/5/58). There were numerous examples of residential vs. commercial interests debated in council including 131 Cathedral Street, Woolloomooloo, flats vs. carpark; 102 Eveleigh Street, Redfern, house vs. factory; King Street, Newtown, dwellings vs. shops; Sydney University buildings vs. Darlington homes (SMH, 5/2/57, 7/5/57, 20/5/58, 17/9/58, 26/7/60, 27/7/60, 11/7/61).

In most instances the residential interests were defended by the Labor Party, and the commercial and industrial interests promoted by the Civic Reform group, making them clearly political issues in the partisan definition of the term.

The debate between property-owning and non-property owning interests also centred on the extent of services provided by the Sydney Council. Although such services could be perceived by many as mundane, administrative functions of municipal government they can affect employment opportunities and residential amenities. As such they were debated and defended and taken up as political issues. Civic Reform argued that most services cost the city more money than they raised. Parks, bowling greens, fruit barrow licenses and the large outdoor markets were cited as the prime money wasters, and the prime culprits were seen to be the inner residential areas of Paddington, Newtown and Glebe, along with Alexandria, Redfern and Darlington (SMH, 13/12/55). These areas had been added to the commercial centre in the 1949 amalgamation and the Civic Reform aimed to rid the commercial centre of Sydney of these residential "sponges" of funding. They wanted to cancel the amalgamation and instead form the six
suburbs into an "Outer City Council". This would relieve the remaining property-owning and ratepaying interests of supporting residential perquisites and allow the lowering of City rates (ibid.) As will be seen later their aim was partially fulfilled in the council boundary re-alignment by a Liberal State government in 1968.

Changing Residential Base

Despite the inactivity on the part of State and municipal redevelopment authorities, aspects of inner Sydney residential areas had begun to change for other reasons, and these private market changes were to affect inner Sydney’s development just as thoroughly as the authorities had intended public slum clearance to do. Most important of all was the transformation of the inner areas over a relatively short time from rental to owner occupancy. Although the social backgrounds of the residents still remained working-class, many of the new owners were overseas migrants. Moreover, many of the new migrant and working-class owners were the previously renting tenants. Under the NSW rent control legislation, introduced during the war and continued though regularly weakened over the years, sitting tenants could not be evicted except under unusual circumstances (Vandermark and Harrison, 1972). Even selling the house could not entitle the new or old landlord to evict tenants. Thus with fixed rents and fixed tenants, it was difficult for the landlord to dispose of the dwelling and the best alternative was often to sell it to the tenant. Neutze (1972) has shown in Redfern that prices were so low that tenants had a strong incentive to buy these dwellings even though old and dilapidated. With low prices and vendor
financing dwellings could be completely paid for in a few years, allowing owners to renovate their houses or "trade up" and buy a better house.

The increase in homeownership might not have reversed the slum image in the eyes of outsiders, but it is clear that it helped stem any further dwelling deterioration in the areas. A main cause of deterioration had always been alleged to be the lack of care and interest tenants have in their dwellings, and the lack of interest landlords have in a property with poor returns (CCC Report, 1948). This is argued in the commodification of housing literature too, where owners see the returns from improving both in better use and in better re-sale value. With increasing owner occupation much of this neglect in inner Sydney was stemmed, as noted by the press:

In the midst of decaying terraces in Union Street, Newtown, there is a quite attractive terrace painted grey and blue. And a Dutch family has saved one of Paddington's poorer homes by repairs and paint work.... (SMH, 20/3/56)
Table 3.2: The Percentage of Rented Dwellings in the Six Study Areas, 1933-1954

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>1933</th>
<th>1947</th>
<th>1954</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>75.</td>
<td>75.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>73.</td>
<td>72.</td>
<td>49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>87.</td>
<td>90.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>86.</td>
<td>88.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>87.</td>
<td>89.</td>
<td>80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>na.</td>
<td>na.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: The 1954 figures for Annandale and Balmain are for the local government area of Leichhardt which also included the suburbs of Rozelle and Leichhardt, each with higher proportions of owner occupiers, so this figure is likely high for Annandale and Balmain. The City of Sydney figures includes about fifteen suburbs of the municipality, and is only an approximate indication of the rental share.)

(Source: Census)

Increasing homeownership meant that more residents were interested in their property values as well as the use values of their residential property. Ownership meant that more residents had the right, as well as the financial incentive to improve their dwellings through renovation.

The ethnic mix of the population was the other major change. From 1947 to 1954 proportion of non-British European migrants rose from one to five percent in the Leichhardt Municipality, and eight to ten percent in the Sydney Municipality, as compared to a change from three to five percent percent in the metropolitan area as a whole (1947 and 1954 Census). Although the migrants shared similar working-class occupations and homeowning interests with their Australian counterparts, they had less familiarity with local political institutions and were not a part of the
local political interests. While increasing owner occupation in the inner suburbs did make inner city areas more like their outer suburban neighbours, the increasing migrant component still gave them a "separate" and "different" image from the classic picture of Australian suburban life.

It was increasing "interest" in property maintenance rather than the migrant interests which most greatly affected the inner suburbs. On the one hand migrant "interests" per se were not recognized by political bodies as "political interests", even though the number of migrants had increased. Unlike local government policies of the 1970s, few inner city municipalities established migrant resource centres or recognized other migrant claims for services and aid (Marchant, 1985). Migrants, on the other hand, did little at the time to articulate any stakes or claims through organized migrant groups or through the conventional, established press. Although there were migrant newspapers, and some shops and enterprises that catered almost solely to migrants and allowed expression of migrant interests. But in general both migrants and Australians expected "New Australians" to assimilate, to become part of the social fabric. They were not expected to become politically active, or to establish or protect any special interests. The local and federal political systems ignored them and migrants were left on their own to get on with the business of becoming Australian (Collins, 1982).

In terms of the demolition and reconstruction planned by the Cumberland County Council and State government, there had been little progress since the report had been issued six years
before. There had been some immediate demolition and subsequent flat construction on Cleveland Street, Redfern in 1947/48, followed by small pockets of "reclamation" work in Surry Hills (83 dwellings), Erskineville (78 dwellings), Glebe (72 dwellings), Waterloo (22 dwellings) and Paddington (23 dwellings) (SMH, 21/3/54). Although the government had planned to improve the inner residential areas for existing residents, it had not. Instead with increased owner occupation and renovation residents began to improve their own residential areas.

Resident Interests in the Early Sixties

The persisting working-class constituencies and slum image of the inner areas did not diminish local interest in the local government elections of 1959. The social changes and signs of increasing interest by residents and property owners sparked the Herald to report "many sitting aldermen and councillors facing defeat following the waging of highly organized campaigns by action and vigilante committees and progress associations" (SMH, 5/12/59).

Some of the activism was not as clear cut as the Herald made it sound. For instance, when the Postmaster-General's Department proposed the demolition of forty-six homes in 1958 to build a mail exchange in Redfern, resident response was negligible (SMH, 23/1/61). By January 1961 however, residents had organized themselves, articulated their demands as a group and held regular protest meetings for a year (ibid.). The constituents with interests in preserving the dwellings were small in number, had no visible spokesman nor any visible
organization at all, and yet they had also decided not to rely solely on the Labor Party to protect their interests and instead took action on their own behalf.

In some instances working-class residential interests were also pursued through organized action. In 1960, tenants in nineteen dwellings in Woolloomooloo, a predominantly working-class waterfront suburb, were faced with eviction from their Crown Street homes in preparation for demolition and commercial development (SMH, 7/7/60). The Woolloomooloo Progress Association supported the protest of the tenants with a variety of integrative and protest actions, arranging press conferences, protest meetings, correspondence and deputations to authorities on behalf of the tenants.

By 1961 the image of the inner suburbs was distinctive for its rapid and unpredicted change in social makeup and overall popularity as a place to live and purchase homes. Compared to the metropolitan area, the inner suburbs had a greater proportion of single persons, "new Australians", and persons in manufacturing jobs, but fewer people who worked in finance, property or public service sectors.
Generally, the inner suburbs were ethnic and working-class. Newtown was seen as Greek, Annandale and Leichhardt as Italian, Surry Hills as Maltese and Greek, with other Europeans as well. People born in Britain made up 41 of postwar migrants in the metropolitan population, but only 4 to 10 percent of the population of any of the inner suburbs. Only Waverley, Woollahra, and East Sydney were the exceptions with the British comprising 9, 10 and 11 percent of their respective populations (1961 Census).

As in the rest of the metropolitan area, there were more people in the inner suburbs buying or who owned their own home. Remarkably, the number of owner/purchasers was increasing much faster in the inner suburbs than elsewhere, rising from 27 percent of all households in 1947 to 40 percent in 1954 and 63 percent in 1961 (Kendig, 1979). Increased homeownership meant there were a greater number of persons with residential property interests in inner Sydney, but with minimal resources to pursue...
their interests, as in terms of income or education.

Perhaps because of the low socio-economic status of many homeowners and residents, the rise in owner occupancy did not diminish the "slum" image of the inner areas. In a 1961 survey in which Sydney residents ranked all Sydney suburbs for status, most people judged "inner city" as equivalent to "low status" (Congalton, 1961). The bottom ten percent was dominated by the inner suburbs, including Annandale, Balmain, Glebe, Newtown, Paddington and Surry Hills. The top five suburbs were Vaucluse, Point Piper, Darling Point and Bellevue Hill, all in the eastern suburbs, and Pymble in the northern suburbs.

Although there was an increasing the variety of interests in the inner city, most resident interests were still protected by the Labor Party. Although Labor Party policy was to defend residential areas against commercial and industrial expansion and build more workers’ housing the results had been fairly mixed. As Kendig has outlined in more detail, private developers and state authorities demolished dwellings for other purposes encroached upon residential areas to the disadvantage of residents (Kendig, 1979). In some areas where housing was not lost, it was mixed with commercial and industrial uses which would have diminished the quality of life available in the dwelling and greater environment. Although local government wished to preserve the housing, it was limited in what it could do, especially when the State government owned so much inner city land and local government powers were so limited.

The interests of the inner residential areas and inner city residents were changing however. The shift from rental
residential to owner-occupied residential was an important transformation of inner city residential interests, and it caught the Labor party unawares. For fifty years the Labor Party had protected the interests of people who lived and worked in the inner city and it had done so within the party branches, the party organization and when in control, the larger political arenas. For the first half of the twentieth century this had also meant protecting the interests, for the most part, of people who wanted an increased supply of cheap rental housing, a continuation of rent control and local employment. The postwar years however, saw more residents interested in the issues of homeownership, and with the political right to address issues which affected their "interest or estate."

By 1962 it had become clear that the State Labor government's planning policies were not those of the Cumberland County Council. According to Harrison (1972) most state departments consulted or ignored the County Council as they saw fit, circumventing their planning controls in some instances and allowing oil refineries and residential developments in areas the Council had intended for open space. The State government stemmed any further interference in its planning decisions by abolishing the CCC in 1963 and bringing planning under the control of the State Planning Authority (SPA). It shelved the residential plans initiated by the Cumberland County Council. Although the new SPA adapted some of their goals, if inner city residents wanted their interests protected it would be accomplished through local government and not State planning. In the inner Sydney area
"local government" largely meant the Labor Party, which was so entrenched its aldermen could not easily recognize the significance the tenant to owner and working-class to middle-class shifts would have on their constituents' interests and resources and thus on their own priorities and political fortunes.

The 1966 census figures showed that residents with property interests were increasing but the social interests were still working-class. There were increased rates of homeownership but the status of the Sydney and Leichhardt municipalities were still disproportionately working-class and ethnic as compared to the whole of the metropolitan area (Table 3.4). Although middle-class home purchasers were moving into some inner city dwellings they were still a small proportion of the incumbent population. Where 22 percent of the population of the whole metropolitan area had been born outside Australia, thirty-four percent of the City of Sydney's residents and twenty-nine percent of Leichhardt's residents were foreign-born. Where five percent of the metropolitan population had a tertiary degree, that was true of two percent of Leichhardt's population. With Sydney University in its jurisdiction, seven percent of the persons living in the Sydney local government area actually had a tertiary degree. Compared to the metropolitan area a greater share of Leichhardt's and Sydney's population were in the workforce, and more than twice as many were in working-class occupations, and many more were pensioners (1966 Census).
Table 3.4: Population Characteristics in Sydney and Leichhardt, 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pct. of Workforce</th>
<th>Pct. of Workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas Born</td>
<td>European Born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sydney</td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROPOLITAN AREA</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: 1966 Census)

By the mid-1960s the residential base of the city had changed enough that political interests and property interests could no longer assume they were working with the same working-class tenant population of slum dwellers they had targeted in 1948. The changed residential base would require changed political priorities on the part of both State and local government.

Summary

This chapter has examined the first twenty years of postwar changes in inner Sydney in terms of the shifts in some of the actors and interests concerned with resident issues. Just after the war most inner suburbs suffered from an established slum image. Many of the deteriorated dwellings housed working-class tenants whose main political defense lay with their strong support of the Labor Party, incumbent in both the inner municipalities and the State government.

From 1950 to 1965 the residential interests of the inner city shifted dramatically as rates of homeownership rose and
overseas migrants moved into the inner suburbs. Not only were many of the working-class residents no longer interested in tenant issues because they were homeowners, they had the legal right and financial incentive to pursue their own dwelling interests. Because most migrants were not active in political parties and most working-class residents were represented by the Labor Party, they pursued some of their dwelling interests through dwelling improvement.

By 1965/66 when there was evidence of some interest by middle-class home purchasers in inner city dwellings, the Labor Party had been in municipal control for nearly twenty years. However, many new purchasers stood outside Labor politics and policies and tried to use their own political strength to achieve their aims. Their strength did not lie in their numbers, however, as they were a minority. Instead the new residents used their educational and occupational skills and their status as homeowners and renovators to organize and pursue their often innovative interests in dwelling distinction and political participation. The next chapter pursues this in more detail.

Endnotes to Chapter Three

1 A table of property prices, average weekly earnings and the CPI changes for 1957 to 1976 are in Appendix One.

2 The importance of middle-class backgrounds and skills has been recognized more by those interests without the skills perhaps than by the middleclass groups themselves. In a report on environmental quality in South Sydney (1974) the committee reported the difficulty of organizing political action in South Sydney because it was a community of migrants, the aged and residents with basic educational skills. There was a lack of
verbal and writing experience, leaders from the larger political environment, and time or energy due to competing demands of work, families, etc. As well, many residents found the concept of participation difficult to appreciate and take on as a desirable goal (South Sydney Community Aid Environment Committee, 1974).
In the mid to late sixties increased demand for inner city dwellings from middle-class purchasers brought major changes to the local governments of inner Sydney. The result was an increased number of residents interested in improving the 19th century dwellings and environments of the inner city, and with the resources necessary for accomplishing both. This chapter examines the factors in the residential property market and the social changes which led to increased interest by middle-class residents. It shows that those areas where the middle-class purchased homes early also experienced early peaks of renovation, and higher average expenditure per dwelling on renovation, although the number and average expenditure increased in all areas over the 1960s and 1970s. The market and social changes are examined first, followed by the expenditure on and physical changes resulting from renovation.

The Residential Property Market in Inner Sydney

In the late sixties the increasing competition for land accessible to the inner city lead to subsequent rises in house prices particularly in the inner suburbs. Some of the price rises resulted from increased competition for land by public authorities such as the NSW Department of Main Roads (DMR) Sydney University and NSW Housing Commission with their own plans
for dwelling resumption, demolition and redevelopment (SMH, 22/3/60; 27/7/60). Some of the rise in prices reflected the improvement of dwellings through the maintenance investment of homeowners and their dwelling renovation (Kendig, 1979).

Although rising values were beneficial to those owning dwellings at the time, those who wished to purchase housing in the late sixties and seventies had to pay higher prices. According to Kendig (1979), house prices and interest rates rose more quickly than earnings throughout the metropolitan area (see Appendix One). Because of their age and condition and the threats of resumption for road widening, industrial development or flat development, dwellings were less popular with the middle-class, but more costly than dwellings other areas. Nevertheless their value rose quickly as shown in Figures 4.1 and 4.2.

The graphs show prices during a period later than that now under discussion. Nevertheless the position of the inner suburbs on the graphs in 1976 could indicate the general price status of the suburbs for the previous ten years as well. Despite the rises, the prices of houses in Glebe, Balmain and Paddington were quite reasonable when compared to the average price of houses in all inner suburbs. Thus, although house prices in Balmain, Paddington and Newtown did not rise as high as the inner average, they did increase.
Figure 4.1: Prices of Separate Houses in Sydney's Inner Suburbs, 1976-1983 (000's in 1976 dollars)

(Source: Valuer General)

Figure 4.2: Prices of Separate Houses in Sydney's Regions, 1976-1983 (000's in 1976 dollars)

(Inner is within 0-6 km of the Sydney GPO; Middle is within 6 to 25 km and Outer from 25 km)
As house prices and interest rates rose the cost of becoming a homeowner increased relative to earnings throughout Sydney. Aspiring first homebuyers and others looking for housing had two options. They could either rent for longer periods and in cheaper areas, or purchase in suburbs with low prices. In the inner areas, the ratio of rental to owner occupied housing was twice as high in the suburbs further out, and in certain inner suburbs the prices of houses half that of dwellings elsewhere (Fig. 4.1), making certain inner suburbs attractive as places in which to find low-cost accommodation, whether rented or purchased.

The residential property market of inner Sydney had elements which attracted homebuyers. Dwelling prices were rising, which made for good investment, but were not as expensive as elsewhere, which made them affordable. Some of the houses had been well maintained which made them more attractive for purchasers. Many however, were threatened by public resumption which caused owners to take a close interest in the major political decisions concerning their property.

The Middle-Class Population in the Inner City

Inner Sydney was also experiencing many of the larger social changes of Australian society. The post war baby boom children came of age between 1961 and 1981, entering the housing market and contributing to suburban growth. Between 1961 and 1981 the number of 20 to 34 year olds increased from 20 to 25 percent of the metropolitan population (Figs. 4.3 and 4.4). There were more overseas-born residents, rising from 20 to 26 percent from 1961 to 1981 and the percentage of the workforce in white-collar occupations rose from 10 to 18 percent (Figs. 4.5 and 4.6).
Figure 4.3: Percentage of Persons Aged 20 to 34 in Annandale, Balmain and Glebe, 1947, 1971-1981

(Source: Census)

Figure 4.4: Percentage of Persons Aged 20 to 34 in Newtown, Paddington and Surry Hills, 1947, 1971-1981

(Source: Census)
Figure 4.5: Percentage of Employed Residents in White-Collar Occupations in Annandale, Balmain and Glebe, 1947, 1971-1981

(Source: Census)

(White-collar includes census occupation categories of professional, administrative, clerical and sales. Blue-collar are all others.)

Figure 4.6: Percentage of Employed Residents in White-Collar Occupations in Newtown, Paddington and Surry Hills, 1947, 1971-1981

(Source: Census)

(see note for fig. 4.5)
Owner occupation rose throughout Sydney, with important increased in the formerly tenanted suburbs of the inner city (Figure 4.7).

Figure 4.7: Percentage of Owner Occupied Dwellings in the Six Areas and the Metropolitan Area, 1947, 1971-1981

As well, residents with tertiary qualifications rose from six in 1971 to nine percent in 1981.
Table 4.1: Percentage of Residents in the Workforce with Tertiary Qualifications, 1971-1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

METROPOLITAN AREA

6.0 9.0

(Source: 1971 and 1981 Census)

With a tightening housing market in the late 1960s and 1970s, these social changes had a considerable impact on the types of homebuyers interested in purchasing dwellings in the inner city and the types of dwellings any first homebuyer could afford. The number of years of average earnings needed to buy an average house in Sydney had risen during the sixties (Appendix 1), placing some formerly affordable dwellings and suburbs out of the reach of first homebuyers. However, the educational and employment opportunities of the sixties were improving the earning capacities of the baby boom cohort, creating greater demand for homeownership, especially on the part of the middle-class. Moreover, the shifting social and cultural interests of the 1960s augmented the popularity of increasingly valuable dwellings in "unique and interesting" suburbs close to work and recreation.

There were attractions for this cohort in city living, including the rejection of "establishment" values symbolized for some in suburban life, the embracing of individual, non-
conformist life styles and the opportunity to participate in recently popularized interests of local history, cultural diversity and conservation of the environment (Cole, 1985; Datel, 1985). These popularly articulated interests match the distinctive and unique aspects of inner city residential life which help distinguish older dwellings and suburbs from the ordinary, "everyday" and more conventional aspects of suburban living.

By 1981 there were more residents with property interests and the skills necessary for political activity. There were a large number of home purchasers and owners who had moved into their dwellings between 1976 and 1981 and many more residents had tertiary degrees, professional and administrative occupations. Table 4.2 shows the proportion of movers between 1976 and 1981 and the larger proportions of purchasers who moved in the inner LGAs compared to the other tenures. While forty percent of households throughout Sydney moved between 1976 and 1981, mobility was higher in each of the four inner LGAs. While twelve percent of outright owners in metropolitan Sydney moved over the same period, smaller proportions in the inner suburbs moved. And more purchasers in the four LGAs moved between 1976 and 1981 then had purchasers throughout the metropolitan area. By 1981 the inner suburbs had a much larger than expected percentage of residents with tertiary qualifications, many of whom no doubt, were the purchasers who had moved in since 1976 (Table 4.2).
Table 4.2: Movers as a Percentage of Total Household Heads, 1976-1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Household Heads</th>
<th>% of Owners Who Moved</th>
<th>% of Purchasers Who Moved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>49.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sydney</td>
<td>60.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollahra</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROPOLITAN</td>
<td>41.</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>48.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: 1981 Census Crosstab 10080)

Not only did many residents have professional skills and education, many also were young professionals with incomes which allowed continued spending on dwelling improvement. For all age groups in rented dwellings, the proportion of household heads with professional, managerial or administrative occupations was higher in the inner suburbs than in the metropolitan area as a whole. Among "young" household heads (aged 15-34) the percentage in those occupations and renting was even higher.
Table 4.3: Percentage of All Private Tenants and Private Tenants Aged 15-34 According to Occupation in Four Local Government Areas, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leichhardt All 15-34</th>
<th>Sydney All 15-34</th>
<th>South Sydney All 15-34</th>
<th>Woollahra All 15-34</th>
<th>Metro Area All 15-34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>20.26%</td>
<td>15.19%</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
<td>20.25%</td>
<td>14.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial/Administrative</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Sales</td>
<td>22.25%</td>
<td>23.15%</td>
<td>15.16%</td>
<td>27.36%</td>
<td>19.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport/Communications</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td>27.20%</td>
<td>21.16%</td>
<td>36.29%</td>
<td>10.31%</td>
<td>29.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Sport/Recreation</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>16.15%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.12%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL IN WORKFORCE</td>
<td>6677</td>
<td>8305</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>7485</td>
<td>189995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages do not=100 as Farmers, Fishermen, Armed Services, other and not stated have been excluded.)

(SOURCE: 1981 Census Crosstab 10030)

A disproportionate share of young purchasers lived in terrace houses (Table 4.4). These were distinctive and historic but required renovation. Householders aged 20-40 were more strongly represented among purchasers of terraces than any other dwelling type in all four areas, and among purchasers of semi-detached dwellings in Leichhardt and South Sydney.

Where in the Leichhardt population purchasers were 51 percent of all household heads, they were 63 percent of household heads in terrace dwellings. The reverse was true in South Sydney where there was not as much evidence of gentrification. There, 50 percent of all household heads were purchasers, but only 42 percent of terrace dwellers were. Terraces were clearly one of the most popular dwelling for purchasers aged 20-40 in the four
inner local government areas.

Table 4.4: Percentage of Purchasers Living in Certain Dwelling Types in Four Local Government Areas, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Separate Dwellings</th>
<th>Semi-Detached</th>
<th>Terrace</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>46.</td>
<td>56.</td>
<td>63.</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td>51.</td>
<td>51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td>57.</td>
<td>54.</td>
<td>53.</td>
<td>53.</td>
<td>53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sydney</td>
<td>53.</td>
<td>54.</td>
<td>42.</td>
<td>53.</td>
<td>50.</td>
<td>50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollahra</td>
<td>36.</td>
<td>47.</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td>35.</td>
<td>35.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: 1981 Census Crosstab 10024)

Because of increased property prices and the young adult stage of most home purchaser, those households purchasing homes would likely have higher median incomes than those who owned or were renting their homes. This is borne out in inner Sydney in the figures in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Median Household Incomes of Tenure Types in Four Local Government Areas, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>Purchasers</th>
<th>Private Tenants</th>
<th>All Tenures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>$10-12,000</td>
<td>$22,000+</td>
<td>$15-18,000</td>
<td>$12-15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>$10-12,000</td>
<td>$18-22,000</td>
<td>$10-12,000</td>
<td>$10-12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sydney</td>
<td>$10-12,000</td>
<td>$18-22,000</td>
<td>$10-12,000</td>
<td>$10-12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollahra</td>
<td>$18-22,000</td>
<td>$22,000+</td>
<td>$15-18,000</td>
<td>$18-22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>$15-18,000</td>
<td>$22,000+</td>
<td>$18-22,000</td>
<td>$18-22,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: 1981 Census Crosstab 10023)

More interesting, however, was the number of high income people living in terraces. Table 4.6 shows that more than the expected share of high income households ($26,000+) lived in terrace houses. This was more so in Leichhardt and Sydney than
in South Sydney or Woollahra. This would be explained in South Sydney by the fact that gentrification is still occurring, and in Woollahra by the much more expensive housing available in separate houses in the Eastern Suburbs such as Bellevue Hill, and Vaucluse.

Table 4.6: Households with Annual Incomes >$26,000 According to Dwelling Type, in Four Local Government Areas, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Separate Dwellings</th>
<th>Semi-Detached</th>
<th>Terrace</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>Total Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>44.</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sydney</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollahra</td>
<td>60.</td>
<td>42.</td>
<td>41.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>42.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inner Six LGAs 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Separate Dwellings</th>
<th>Semi-Detached</th>
<th>Terrace</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Flats</th>
<th>Total Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>26.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 These include Sydney, South Sydney, Woollahra, Leichhardt, Randwick, Marrickville and Waverley. See Map 1.2 for reference.
(Source: 1981 Census Crosstab 10049

Taken together these census indicators show an increasing number of young, professionals with relatively high incomes renting and purchasing terrace houses in the inner city. This evidence points to a skilled, articulate group of residents with the financial and personal resources to pursue their interests in older, historic dwellings in the inner city.

Despite the increases in owner occupation, private renting was still an important tenure in the inner city. Not all of the private tenants were of long-standing and some tenants were protected by rent control. Landlords could see opportunities for return from renovating dwellings and renting them at the more
expensive end of the rental market. Thus in Paddington, which, as will be seen later, experienced intensive renovation activity in the 1960s and 1970s, were 51 percent of the dwellings still privately rented in 1971. Because of its convenience and relative affordability it shared with North Sydney and Glebe the reputation of housing young, unmarried people who, because of their stage in the life cycle, lived in rented accommodation. Increasing owner-occupation might have diminished the important role of the inner city in providing tenanted accommodation for many status groups but its role was still important.

The renting population is not examined closely because they did not have property-owning interests or rights. They are, however, important among inner city residents, especially among young adults. Young people of the postwar cohort who had little income but who trained and studied in the inner suburbs formed part of what could be termed the latent demand for inner city dwellings. Whatever their family background, students, nurses, teachers, newly-employed clerks, even if they did not have a middle-class background, were gaining a middle-class education and the possibility of a middle-class career. Early in their training or career, however, most had only modest incomes. Forced by low incomes to live in cheap accommodation near work or school, many lived in the suburbs surrounding the universities, technical colleges, teacher colleges and hospitals. When they became qualified and took on middle-class jobs and earned sufficient income to choose their place of accommodation, many chose to stay in the suburbs and some to return to the suburbs they had lived in as students, only as home purchasers instead of
tenants.

The Glebe Society News Bulletin provides some interesting profiles of such people. One Glebe Society member "first got to know a little of Glebe as a student ten or so years ago; returned here to live with wife and two children two and a half years ago after a sojourn in Fiji and another in Cremorne" (GSN, 3/72). There were former students (GSN 5/72) and others looking for cheap accommodation as students though later living in the area as an accountant (GSN, 8/72), economist (GSN, 1/73) or lecturer (GSN, 2/72).

Not all affordable dwellings in the inner city were terraces or cottages. There were flats throughout the inner suburbs, often built on fairly small blocks, providing inexpensive accommodation and in some cases views of the Harbour or city. However, they are not examined closely here because owners spent little on renovation. An owner could not alter or extend a flat the way he/she could a house, and flats did not as easily provide the historic and unique aspect of inner city life promoted by estate agents and sought after by many purchasers. Although there were many flats in the inner suburbs, few contributed to the "unique and separate" image older terrace housing could conjure up. As two members of the Glebe Society articulated it: "Sydney will remember the 70s as the decade we used up all the grass. Private homes once provided reasonable areas of grass but our tendency is to tear down these homes, build units and put cement drives where lanes used to be" (GSN, 4/72), or what another Society member termed the "Red brick terror" (GSN, 1/71). Such attitudes were
not favourable to flat development or flat living.

These combinations of housing type, age and income of purchasers to created a housing demand of first homebuyers interested in inner city living. Old dwelling stock could be purchased by young educated persons earning secure, middle, incomes. Because of its age and condition, the stock required renovation for comfortable habitation. In a buoyant housing market even with renovation costs, such dwellings could be easily sold for more than they cost the owner to buy and renovate. With such conditions the inner suburbs became popular, or "trendy" as the press termed it, for home purchase by home buyers and increasingly for property investment.

Two striking changes are of particular interest in the inner suburbs. Firstly, although the indicators of upward mobility reflected the same pattern as in other suburbs and the metropolitan area as a whole, such trends marked a reversal for the inner suburbs. As well, the trends in the six areas of concern here were more rapid than experienced in most parts of the metropolitan area. Thus while owner-occupation and income and educational levels were rising everywhere, in the inner suburbs the direction of these indicators were reversing and increasing more rapidly than elsewhere.

The impact of these changes might not have been as important if the new residents had moved into dwellings and suburbs which they thought required minimal improvement or political attention. Instead many of the new purchasers bought dwellings which did not satisfy all their needs or aesthetic desires. Because many of the new residents had the financial resources and market
incentive to improve their dwellings they chose this method to accommodate their dwelling preferences. This next section explores some of those preferences and the section following the actual improvers and improvements.

Preferences for Inner-city Dwellings

The increased demand for inner city houses was discussed above in terms of increased popularity of older, often charming dwellings, and proximity to jobs and services. This section examines how and why inner city residents lived in their 19th century dwellings and how they made them comfortable and marketable. Roseth’s survey covers the early years of Paddington renovation, Murfet and Thorne resident preferences in Sydney, and Cole and Datel preferences for the inner city generally.

John Roseth's study of Paddington showed that Paddington residents considered their suburb a unique area both in terms of its physical appearance and its convenient location (Roseth, 1969). Both Murfet and Thorne provided expanded examinations of characteristics important to residents, and confirmed Roseth’s finding. In research on the assessment of residential areas in Sydney Robert Murfet’s survey results showed the aspects of residential life considered important by residents and how they differ from suburb to suburb (Murfet, 1981). Ross Thorne et al. (1983) surveyed both residents of medium density housing and young people aged 18-39 to discover their dwelling preferences. Both of these are useful in putting together a picture of why people chose to live in older dwellings in inner suburbs in the 1970s.
Murfet’s survey of residents throughout the Sydney metropolitan area asked what they considered to be the most important aspects of a residential area, and then analysed the answers within a few suburbs. Throughout the city, the most important aspects of residential areas were ranked in order:

1-trees  3-nearness to city  5-housing quality
2-degree of crowdedness  4-age  6-nearness to water

From this Murfet concluded: "People tend to favour a location where they have easy access to the city centre, yet are not so close that they feel crowded, without sufficient space for such things as trees and greenery." (Murfet, 1981:191)

By comparison, the Balmain residents of Murfet’s survey saw the most important aspects of the residential area differently:

1-nearness to water  3-degree of crowdedness  5-variety
2-trees  4-nearness to city  6-house quality  7-cost

The suburb’s nearness to water, variety, and cost were more important to them, than to residents in the total sample. Both the proximity to the harbour and the variety were distinctive aspects of use value, and affected cost.

The surveys of Thorne et al. (1983) showed the consumption preferences of young people from a sample of nearly a thousand. Eighteen to thirty-nine year olds in Sydney wished to live in dwellings which were central, near to transport, and shops, with water surroundings and a quiet environment. And of those surveyed who were living in a terrace at the time (which meant they lived somewhere in the inner area) most were single or couples without children and preferred dwellings which were insulated from outside noise, had large rooms with light and air
and minimal awareness of the proximity of neighbours (Thorne et al., 1983:186).

These housing characteristics could rarely be found in a single dwelling. Those which were near water and visually distinctive were costly, while those which were near the city often suffered from traffic and industrial noise. Those which were affordable and near the water were 19th century attached dwellings which had common walls with the neighbours, often with small dark rooms connected by a single central corridor and on busy streets — just as they had been built in the 19th century. Differences between what residents wanted and what they could actually afford has been called locational stress (Priemus, 1986). From this perspective, dwelling renovation and political activity aimed at improving the local environment are seen as logical measures to minimise that stress.

Although there are some common dwelling characteristics almost all residents would want — indoor toilets, modern kitchens and extra indoor space — there are others that are particularly common among the middle-class residents of gentrified areas. For instance, Cole (1985) found that the majority of respondents in three gentrified parts of Melbourne had a sense of belonging and identification in their suburbs because they felt free-er to express themselves as individuals where they lived than elsewhere. In other words, they felt free-er to express what they regarded as character and distinction in these suburbs.

In another study, Robin Datel (1985) concluded that the sense of place and community for the middle-class in older,
working-class areas was provided mainly by the architectural features and historic ambiance of the suburb. Both of these studies show that while preferences for inner city dwellings and urban features could attract the interest of homebuyers, many such dwellings needed improvement not only to meet 20th century middle-class demands for comfortable living, but also to meet many of the emotional demands for distinctive, out-of-the ordinary living which Cole found to be important to many inner city middle-class residents.

For those who wished to live near the city and who did not wish to pay a great deal for their housing, 19th century terrace and semi-detached dwellings in the inner suburbs provided a reasonable compromise and a way to minimize locational stress. Not only were welling prices lower, the dwellings themselves were historic and considered to have character, distinctions unavailable in other suburbs and dwelling types.

One aspect of home purchase in the inner suburbs did not differ from ordinary home purchase, regardless of the age or quality of the dwelling, or the use value derived from it, and that was the importance of the property value of the dwelling. Economists and others have examined the "entrepreneurial" capacity of homeowners to gain from the house price rises that occurred in various historical periods and places (Farmer and Barrell, 1981). Property values can be increased in several ways. The dwelling or site can be "improved" through renovations and additions, which may or may not increase the value by much as or more than their cost. The environment in which the dwelling
stands can also become more attractive and valuable with improvements to nearby dwellings, or because demand increases for particular suburbs, nineteenth century dwellings or inner city life generally. The result will be an increase in exchange value at no cost to the owner, except perhaps the cost of political action to improve the environment.

In the inner suburbs of Sydney, all of these changes became increasingly important as levels of homeownership increased: the demand for inner city houses increased over those years, and to a certain extent the values and prices of those houses increased as well. In the 1970s, additions to and renovations of inner suburban dwellings produced a level of residential construction not seen since the early days of the development of the suburbs.

In summary, by the 1960s middle-class home purchasers showed an increased interest in the distinctiveness and reasonable cost of inner Sydney dwellings. Both the enjoyment of the dwelling and its value could be improved through increased investment in alteration and addition. The next section examines the level and nature of the increased expenditure on and value of dwellings in the six areas from 1961 to 1980.

Renovations in the Six Areas

Renovation of dwellings increased from 1963 to 1980, reflecting residents' efforts to increase both the amenity and property value. The evidence is drawn from just over 9500 applications for approval of alterations or additions (A/As) to dwellings in the six study areas from 1963 to 1980, of which a one third sample constitutes the data base for this work.¹ The evidence shows more houses renovated in areas experiencing more
middle-class homeownership, increased middle-class participation and higher expenditure per renovation. As the areas became more middle-class there were more residents with greater financial and personal interest in their dwellings. These figures are related to the overall dwelling stock in the six areas to indicate the ratio of renovation applications to dwellings (Table 4.7).

The low frequency of renovations in some of the suburbs could be explained by their concentrations of flats which are seldom renovated in ways that require council approval. A comparison of dwelling renovations to non-flat dwellings in each suburb provides a more realistic picture of the renovation to dwelling ratio.

Table 4.7: Ratio of Renovations to Non-Flat Dwellings in the Six Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Total Applications for Renovation 1963-1980</th>
<th>Renovations per 100 Non-Flat Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>2925</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9513</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: The dwelling figures are occupied private dwellings in 1971 chosen as a mid-point between 1961 and 1980). (Source: Census, 1971; Council records)

These data show the greater frequency of renovations in Paddington and Balmain, followed by Annandale, Glebe and Surry Hills with very similar frequencies and Newtown still
comparatively small. These rankings broadly reflect the timing and degree of social change seen in the areas as shown in earlier chapters with earlier change in Balmain and Paddington, followed by Annandale and Glebe and then Surry Hills and Newtown.

When the renovations are examined from year to year these patterns are seen again. There was an overall increase in the number of renovations and a consequent increase in amenity and property value, with evidence too of increased A/A expenditure in different suburbs at different times (Figs. 4.8 and 4.9).

The largest numbers of renovations were in Paddington, followed by Balmain. The other suburbs showed expected variations too, with Glebe and Surry Hills showing very similar trends until the upturn in Glebe after 1977. Annandale experienced a high level early from 1965 to 1968 but remained lowest next to Newtown until a very active post-1976 increase. Newtown had an early and active start which is not repeated until 1978.

Each year additional owners were increasing their financial and personal investment in their homes through renovation. Both the amenity and property values were increasing, and they were changing too, as discussed below.
Figure 4.8: Renovation Applications, 1963-1980
Annandale, Balmain and Glebe

Figure 4.9: Renovation Applications, 1963-1980
Newtown, Paddington and Surry Hills

(Source: Council Records)
Greater Investments in Dwelling Renovation

Not only did more owners work to improve the condition of their dwelling, its usefulness and appearance, but each year the overall amount of money spent by residents in their renovations increased. Three year moving averages "even out" the more extreme annual fluctuations and are shown in figures 4.10 and 4.11. Paddington residents had clearly spent most, a lead not challenged until Surry Hills began to increase from 1968 to 1971, and Balmain from 1970 to 1976. The other three suburbs had fairly similar levels of investment, led by Glebe in most years, followed by Annandale, and then Newtown.

This shows a pattern and ranking of suburban change different from that suggested in the earlier figures measuring the number of renovation applications in each suburb. While Balmain had more renovation applications than Surry Hills (Figures 4.8 and 4.9), the average spent on each was lower.
Figure 4.10: Three Year Moving Averages of Renovation Cost Per Dwelling in Annandale, Balmain & Glebe, 1964-1978 (all $ = 1980)

(Source: Council Records)

Figure 4.11: Three Year Moving Averages of Renovation Cost Per Dwelling in Newtown, Paddington and Surry Hills, 1964-1978, (all $ = 1980)

(Source: Council Records)
By 1980 there had been several important changes in patterns of renovation within the six suburbs. Many more residents had made the personal and financial effort to improve the amenity and property value of their dwelling. As a result of these renovations and changes in demand the dwellings in the six areas were more valuable. Although the expenditure increased in all areas, it varied from suburb to suburb. There had been higher renovation investment in Paddington and Balmain and lower investment in Surry Hills and Newtown. The interest of residents in their dwellings had certainly increased, but who were the renovators?

**Types of Renovators**

Those owners who renovated were less frequently migrant households and more frequently middle-class in occupation. Middle-class Australian-born households were increasingly common in these suburbs, but among the renovators they were even more common than among the population as a whole.

The renovators were classified by finding the applicant's name in the building registers and identifying their occupation in the electoral roll. The migrant status of the applicant, unfortunately, could only be assessed by the non-English European origin of the name. These methods of determining class or migrant status are not accurate, but they provide an indication of the effect of social change on the expenditure in the areas.

Occupations could be determined for a sample of renovators (sample size = 446). From 1963 to 1967 all renovators in all the six suburbs had blue-collar occupations. Balmain was the only exception with a few white-collar renovators in 1965. The names
and occupations from 1971 to 1973 show that in all areas, more renovations were undertaken by middle-class homeowners with white-collar participation most striking in Paddington and Balmain. By 1979/80 the participation of working-class renovators had declined dramatically. The increasing personal and financial investment in the six areas had been undertaken by homeowners with white-collar occupations, and presumably the social backgrounds, political interests and skills of the middle-class as well.

Using 1971 as a mid-point of the twenty years, Table 4.8 shows that middle-class residents were more than proportionately involved in renovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.8: Residents and Renovators with White-Collar Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage with White-Collar Occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(White-collar occupations are defined as professional, administrative, clerical and sales as used in the census.)
(Source: Census, 1971; Council Records; NSW Electoral Rolls)

As well, the involvement of migrants from non-English speaking backgrounds decreased over the twenty years more dramatically than did proportion of the local populations. This is seen in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9: Non-British Migrants in the Population Compared to their Participation in Renovation in the Six Areas, 1971 - 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pct. of Population</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pct. of Renovators with non-British Surnames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-British Overseas Born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Census and Council records)

Working-class, migrant households who were least likely to promote or protect their increased use and exchange values through political activity were a declining proportion of inner city homeowners and renovators. The increasing expenditure on renovation in inner city dwellings was largely due to non-migrant owners who would be expected to have a greater capacity for resident action.

Moreover, the investment made by households with non-English European backgrounds were on the whole smaller than those made by households with Anglo-Saxon backgrounds (Table 4.10). Not only were fewer migrant households involved in dwelling improvement, their financial stake was smaller too. On a suburb basis for the whole twenty years, comparisons show consistently lower average and median levels of investment per dwelling for renovators with non-British names.
Table 4.10: Comparison of Migrant and Non-Migrant Renovation Costs per Dwelling, 1963-1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Migrant</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Migrant</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>No. of Cases</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>(in $)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(in $)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3018</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>3897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3342</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>5196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2969</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>4852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>4179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>37579</td>
<td>15335</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>82137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>6579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Council records.)

Type of Renovations

Evidence of the completed renovations could indicate more clearly the importance of distinctiveness or utility as an incentive for alterations and additions. Unfortunately the available data on the types of renovation undertaken did not indicate much in the way of resident interest or investment as not all the "unique" and distinctive characteristics of housing accomplished by modification could be analyzed with this renovation data. Most renovations undertaken by homeowners did not require council approval, and those which did were not necessarily described in the building register. Those which were described are generally the smaller renovations such as garages, laundries, verandah enclosures and carports. The uses of these renovations were not remarkable for the "different" stylistic or physical contributions to the dwelling nor is it obvious how they serve to distinguish a dwelling from its environment.

The information on types of alterations and additions does show that many were the smaller, more "mundane" renovations.
mentioned above. From 1970 to 1980 average amounts spent per renovation increased, the frequency of the smaller renovations decreased and the descriptions of the alterations and additions in the building register fell to nil. From this one can only speculate that the later renovations were of a more substantial physical and stylistic nature.

In summary the analysis of the applications for dwelling alteration and addition from 1963 to 1980 show the increasing efforts of middle-class homeowners to improve their dwellings through renovation in the six areas, and the heightened interest residents held in their dwellings. The increasing participation of middle-class owners and landlords and the decreasing participation of working-class Australians and migrants of non-British backgrounds were more dramatic than similar changes in the populations of each area and confirm the increasing interest and value held by middle-class households in inner city dwellings.

When the six suburbs are compared to each other, clear trends of change can be seen. Balmain and Paddington led in the number of renovations among non-flat dwellings, and showed the earliest peaks in both the number of renovations and the average amount spent on each, followed by Annandale and Glebe, Surry Hills and Newtown. Although the participation of the middle-class renovators was higher than their share of the local population in all the areas, the migrant participation varied: higher than expected levels in all areas in 1971, in all areas save Paddington and Surry Hills in 1976. By 1981 migrant participation was
higher than the migrant share of the local population only in Annandale and Glebe with the level of migrant expenditure consistently lower than that of non-migrants in all areas. The increased number of residents with "estate and interest" and increased property value had significant consequences in terms of residents' more general interest in protecting and promoting the distinctiveness of their dwellings, which is addressed next. Middle-Class Pursuit of Renovation Issues

Examinations of property interest discussed in Chapter Two supported the argument that some homeowners with an estate or interest will work to protect or promote those interests. Residents did this using dwelling interest as political leverage, addressing issues of community aesthetics and property value. Resident interests stemmed from their homeownership, renovation investment and the uncommon, distinctive qualities of the dwellings. Homeownership conferred the legal right of political address because of owners' estate or interest, but the investment of renovation gave some owners a greater financial interest in issues concerning their property and personal interest in the character of their dwelling. Homeowners sometimes used this increased interest and value as political leverage expressing a hope that if homeownership conferred the right of political address in regard to their property, perhaps increased dwelling investment would confer some additional political recognition or other political return. This example from the Leichhardt Municipality illustrates the point.

Thirteen residents petitioned the Council in March 1972 to plant trees on their street, stating:
Since most of us are endeavouring to update and improve our homes at considerable private expense, we feel that Council's assistance in the form of tree or shrub planting would not only give the tenants of the street encouragement but also enhance its appearance (Link, 8/3/72).

They reported to council their recent purchase of property in the street in company with the majority of residents on the street who were newcomers to the area. In the residents' eyes their financial interest in the street expressed through purchase and renovation investment entitled them to special consideration by council. Although many residents encouraged council to undertake visual and physical improvements with the same underlying motive, few were stated as baldly.²

With the increased attempts to manage dwelling fabric, as it were, came an increased interest by residents in managing the visual quality of other residents' renovations. Residents still expressed interest in the more "structural" aspects of nearby renovation and development in order to ensure that new developments included the specified amount of frontage, neighbour's access to direct sunlight and other aspects which could be regulated by council. More than that, many residents and resident groups began to express interest in matters unregulated by building codes and more concerned with visual matters which could enhance or detract from the unusual historic appearance such as verandah enclosures and exterior painting (WC, 4/8/71), landscaping (Link, 31/3/71) and restoration and renovation styles (Link, 20/10/71). Although some of these efforts were part of a larger municipal movement for preservation
zoning (as in Paddington and Glebe) many were ad hoc expressions of a new aesthetic interest motivated by increased levels of local renovation.

This co-incidence of ad hoc expressions of aesthetic interest at the time of increasing renovation activity has several explanations. Because there were more and more renovations in each area, more and more residents were affected by the visual and physical impact of nearby alterations and additions, thereby increasing the number of people interested in renovations. As well, the State government legally endorsed this expanded interest during the 1970s as it slowly gave residents more and more right of complaint and appeal about nearby developments and alterations and additions (WC, 5/8/70; Link, 22/12/75; NSW, DEP, 1980). More residents were interested and had been given the freedom to express that interest.

The increasing renovation activity also came about at a time of general increasing interest in community restoration and preservation and attempts to improve the general visual amenity of inner suburbs. Because some alterations and additions did have an impact on visual amenity many efforts were directed at controlling certain types of renovations. For instance, neither a verandah enclosure nor a house painted bright blue and green could be objected to for any reason other than aesthetic. With the increasing interest in aesthetic values and a recognition that visual amenity can take away from the general enjoyment or use value of living in a distinctive community, residents became interested in controlling local aesthetics. Residents in Paddington complained of another resident's glass verandah doors
as they did not conform to restoration guidelines (WC, 14/2/73). The Paddington Society recommended that the Woollahra Council ban verandah enclosures because they "disrupt the streetscape", suggested that owners paint the exterior of their houses to match neighbouring houses (WC, 4/8/71) and urged residents to replace their 6'x 2' galvanized iron mail boxes because they were "unworthy of Paddington following its new status of recognition by the National Trust" (PSN, 11/76).

Interest in aesthetic distinctiveness was also interpreted in terms of financial return. When Paddington pub owners painted the Royal Hotel at Five Ways bright green and yellow Paddington Society members commented on both the aesthetic and financial value of the effort. Some pointed to the "garish colours used for seedy buildings", "the happy expression of the historically illiterate" while another recommended harmony of colour because "some notable examples by groups of individual homeowners have paid off handsomely in all respects" (PSN 11/74). The latter is an allusion to increased value as well as increased amenity.3

Most renovations were referred to in terms of their effect on the local landscape. The Balmain Association urged members to practice "good manners" of restoration because they lived in tightly settled areas (BAN, 11/72). On this and issues of verandah enclosures, high opaque fences and "chipping back" plastered brick walls (WC, 4/8/71) the resident groups acknowledged they could do little to enforce their aesthetic preferences: "Aesthetic quality cannot be written into building regulations and you can do nothing about the appearance of these
buildings" (Link, 31/3/71).

However, the aesthetic issues were sometimes hidden class issues as the newer, often middle-class residents and the older, often working-class residents frequently disagreed on the dwelling modifications to be undertaken (GSN, 5/80). In 1974 Woollahra Council ALP aldermen Warnecke and O'Grady sought to prevent the addition of an upstairs room at 89 Windsor Street. Warnecke lived near the objectors who were elderly people living next door to the applicant and both he and O'Grady wished to "look after the older people in Paddington and lean a bit that way" (WC, 6/2/74). Their efforts on behalf of the older residents who had lived there for more than 60 years failed. There were also reports of newer residents offering to paint the exterior of their neighbour's dwellings to improve the appearance of the adjacent dwellings and streetscape (Wilson, p.c.).

In Newtown where working-class and migrant renovation was more common than elsewhere, residents were a bit more aware of the class-related problems of dwelling renovations. The Newtown/Erskineville Committee raised a general issue of inexpensive versus authentic renovations in July 1980. The committee's concern lay in the "unsympathetic" nature of aluminium windows in timber dwellings which "will seriously damage the fabric of the Conservation areas" and set a "precedence for other renovations to follow" (SSCM 23/7/80). Not wishing to halt necessary improvements by pensioners and yet not wanting to encourage what they considered cheap and ugly solutions to the problem, the committee asked South Sydney Council to consider subsidizing more sympathetic improvements or
offering low-interest loans to potential dwelling improvers, but to no avail. In each instance the increasing aesthetic interest of new residents was both a generator and product of the distinctive visual characteristics which residents valued, tried to accomplish in their dwellings through renovation and tried to encourage in nearby dwellings through political pressure.

Summary

The increased owner occupation by the middle classes and their subsequent expenditure on renovation is clear, however it happened in stages with some suburbs experiencing gentrification more markedly and earlier than others. By 1981 a disproportionate share of the inner city residents were recent purchasers, young, professional, had university qualifications, lived in terraces and semi-detached dwellings, and had higher than average incomes. What had been suitable and desirable dwellings when built in the nineteenth century were outdated and inadequate dwellings according to Australian standards of the late twentieth century. However, the distinctive background and appearance of the dwellings appealed to many middle-class home purchasers. Their resources of income, occupation, and education allowed them to modernize the older, inner city dwellings, accommodate their housing needs in a distinctive way, and improve the potential market value of the dwelling.

In the initial part of the twenty year period examined here efforts at improving inner city dwellings were small and generally undertaken by Australian working-class and migrant homeowners. As the inner areas became popular with middle-class
purchasers the number of renovations increased, the amount spent per renovation increased and the middle-class participation in renovation increased out of proportion to their share of the local population. The result was twofold, an overall increase of residents with "estate and interest", more valuable properties owned by residents with the skills to protect and promote them in the political arena, and the development of residents' more specific interest in addressing the visual and aesthetic impacts of other residents' alterations. The political arenas in which these interests and new political efforts were addressed are examined in detail in the next chapter.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER FOUR

1 The details of the data collection and analysis are available in Appendix Two.

2 Other illustrations include residents in Paddington asking Council to regulate a smash repairs shop. Because residents had improved their dwellings they asked Council to ensure that their efforts were not "in vain" (WCM, 11/12/72). Other Paddington residents complained against dwelling alterations: "This area is quickly becoming devoid of the grace and charm such houses can lend to the area when restored to their original design which is in keeping with the hopes and aims of the very worthy Paddington Society" (WCM, 9/2/76).

3 Other Paddington objections to A/As because of aesthetics were lodged in 19/1/70, 12/4/76 (WCM).
...it is clearly a negation of the spirit and purpose of local government to set up the belief that political interests have a place in local government or for any group to use the partisan political loyalties of the people to obtain seats at the council table. (Bluett’s Local Government Handbook, 1975)

The previous chapter examined the changed social image and market position of the inner Sydney residential areas from the mid-sixties to the late seventies. There was evidence of more residential actors with higher levels of investment from higher property values and renovation. Issues concerning residential property and amenity were seen to be important and were pursued by residents, especially in terms of the distinctiveness of certain aspects of the older dwellings and their environments.

This chapter reviews the responsibilities of local government in New South Wales and then examines residents' interests particularly in inner Sydney's traditionally Labor municipalities undergoing gentrification. In these suburbs the Labor Party had traditionally protected resident, usually working-class, tenant interests, but the new middle-class residents promoted different interests. They were more interested in local government decisions which would enhance the residential "uniqueness" of their dwellings and suburbs and consequently improve their market values. These and other interests, and the groups which promoted them, were marginal to those of the established social and political institutions of those inner suburbs. The result in some instances was conflict over the
types of interests local government should cater for, and in other instances conflict over the control of decision-making in local government. Residents had two options when trying to exert influence on local government. With their legitimacy as ratepayers and their political abilities associated with high levels of education and income, new middle-class residents tried to pursue their interests through the "integrative" tactic of elections. However, as a small minority they were forced to resort to more adversarial, protest tactics outside the "ALP machine" which was not receptive to their views. Crucial to these actions was the organization of groups which promoted their own candidates for election and undertook more disruptive actions to make their views known. Part one sets the context of the role of local government in New South Wales, part two the social and political changes in inner Sydney's local government areas and part three the effect of these changes in the four municipal areas from 1961 to 1980.

Local Government Responsibilities

State legislation in New South Wales has defined local government's jurisdiction through various acts of Parliament (Parker, 1978; Larcombe, 1978), but most recently and comprehensively by the Local Government Act of 1919 and its various amendments. This Act sets out the functions of local government in regard to public health, community facilities, buildings and housing, public roads, public utilities, town and country planning, parking, land acquisition and various other facilities and services such as public wharves, cemeteries,
drinking fountains and advertisement hoardings.¹

Because of the very local nature of these responsibilities Painter (1974) and others (Spann, 1979) have depicted local government as an unimportant arena with interests, actors and stakes of little political consequence: "Aldermen are mostly concerned with the administration or enforcement of regulations with decisions involving relatively small amounts of expenditure on highly localised facilities" (Painter, 1973). With such a description it is no wonder Purdie, another local government analyst could comment in 1976:

Local government in Australia is not a robust and vigorous institution whose bustling enterprise has aroused and held the interests of the average man. On the contrary its activities hardly seem to cause a ripple on the tide of human affairs (Purdie, 1976:ix).

Councils have no power to make their own by-laws or ordinances and can only ask the State Department and Minister for Local Government to amend or provide the desired ordinance. However, some councils do take the liberty of "responding to community demands completely beyond the terms of the Act" (Miles and Bains, 1981:156), although limited revenue does limit many to the conventional responsibilities of local government.

Each of the responsibilities of local government listed above could impinge on residential interest. Some, though are explicitly property matters, including town planning, buildings and housing, streets and footpaths. Such responsibilities can directly affect the use and exchange values of residential properties in the municipality while other activities can have little effect at all. Provision and care of cemeteries,
lifesaving clubs, social services or libraries, for instance, might not arouse as much interest.

Expressing Residential Interests

Local government is also constrained by State legislation in the way in which residents can legitimately express their interests. One way is through the franchise, the other through address. The franchise is widely defined with some important distinctions: a voter must be at least 18 years of age and an Australian citizen or British subject, who can then be either a property owner, a rate paying lessee of rateable land, a resident occupier, or a nominee of a body corporate which either owns or leases rateable property in the area (Miles and Bains, 1981). By these definitions some non-resident property owners have voting rights but do not have strictly "resident" interests, Tenants can be non-property owning residents with a completely different set of interests.

Residents and property-owners also have a legal right to address local government directly and individually on matters in which the person holds an "interest or estate". This requirement for an "interest or estate" is founded in English common law which generally required that any person bringing legal suit or generally addressing a legal or administrative matter to government, either own property or have some "interest or estate" which would in some way be adversely affected by the decision or policy at hand (ALJR, 1980; NSW EP&A Act, 1979). This is similar to some historic franchise definitions in Great Britain and the United States which originally limited voting to
property owners. Owners were considered to have some "interest or estate" in electing representatives who would be legislating matters affecting their property.

The necessity of holding an "interest or estate" is significant to local government in NSW. For many years the interests which residents could legitimately express to local councils were limited to their own property interests. The common law requirement affected many local and State planning definitions of objector and of legitimate "standing" in the eyes of local councils, planning tribunals and property courts. For the period examined here, 1961 to 1980, a resident could only legitimately object to council’s decision or another residents action if the objector owned property immediately adjacent to the property against which the complaint was lodged. For instance, if a backyard panel-beater began to operate on a residential street, only adjoining owners would be considered to hold a sufficient "estate or interest" in the matter to object to the local council. In the wider political arena, pertinent to this thesis, when the Balmain Association objected to aspects of the Leichhardt Council’s 1968 town plan, council was not obliged to consider their objections because the Association had "no estate or interest" as a property owner (BAN, 8/69). Even if the Association had owned property in the municipality, council would only have been required to consider those matters with immediate effect or in close proximity to the piece of property.

Until the passage of the Environment, Planning and Assessment Act in 1979, residents could be limited in the objections they made. They could be required to couch all
planning objections and other complaints and comments to council and to the State Planning Authority in terms of the financial injury to their property values and the other general injuries to the enjoyment and use of their property (NSW. EP&A Act, 1979).

Although many local governments did not insist that residents constrain their views at all times to their dwelling and community, many residents continued to do so. Paddington alderman George Warnecke decided against lodging an objection against Paddington road widening plans because he thought only Jersey road residents were eligible to (PSN, 12/68). The Paddington Society urged residents near a noisy pub to object to the pub’s licence renewal because they had proximate, property-related interests other Paddington residents did not have (PSN, 5/69).

If councils were strict in insisting on property interests it could have an important impact on the political rights of address for tenants and resident groups. Neither owned property, and both could be denied access to address council on property matters.

Councils have usually insisted that residents have property and proximity interests before their claims or protests will be taken seriously. In 1972 123 residents made written submissions to Sydney Council in response to the exhibited plan for South Paddington. Council noted that 41 were from non-residents or non-owners and decided not to consider them (So. Padd. Action Plan, 1972). In 1974 Leichhardt Council aldermen Smart and Wyner responded to two petitions in a similar way, noting that neither
appeared genuine, with sixty names of people who they did not know (Link, 14/2/74).

Residents faced with these municipal procedures were compelled to defend their interests in terms of their property as a commodity with use and exchange values which could be affected by the immediate environment. Resident interests were not often regarded as including a general common interest such as overall environmental amenity or enjoyment. Instead they were expressed only as an interest in the commodity value of their individual property.

Even those residents with a legitimate interest often complained that they were given inadequate notice about proposed developments. The State Labor government gradually responded to this pressure and from 1971 State Cabinet required councils to advertise all home unit and flat development proposals to give nearby property owners fourteen days to object (NSW, Dept of Loc. Govt., 1972). If council disapproved a development application and the developer appealed to the State Land and Valuation Court, the nearby property owners would have a right to appear at the hearing (BAN, 2/70). Before this change, only the developer was given the right of hearing. By 1979 the new State Environmental Planning and Assessment Act removed the property ownership requirement of objectors. However, in most of the period covered in this thesis, estate or interest were legally required before an individual could challenge local government decisions.

With such an historical and political background it is unsurprising that most residents confined their requests and objections to matters directly affecting their property. As will
be seen in later chapters, resident interests as addressed to
council concentrated on issues of footpaths, streets, abandoned
cars and nearby rubbish, no doubt because they were important to
residents, but also because the legal system required them to
address all issues in terms of the effect on their property.\(^3\)

Resident groups, per se, were seen to have no estate or
interest at all. Instead they were seen to represent some fuzzy,
undefined public interest, or a wide variety of individual
interests. Without owning property as a proprietary, most groups
had no legal right of appeal or objection in the eyes of local
government and other planning authorities. With the wider
interpretations of resident rights of address and objection, and
greater interest by resident groups local government became
an increasingly important arena for action by residents.

Miles and Bains (1981) portray local government as an
important political arena in NSW. They suggest that many
residents have changed their attitude and instead see their local
council as their "front line protection" against larger outside
authorities and bodies and their own involvement as essential.
Although Miles and Bains do not make this point, it is apparent
that the former protection available to residents from political
parties and local party branches was perceived to be inadequate
or not forthcoming at all. Moreover, as noted by Parkin (1982)
but articulated best by Miles and Bains (1981):

The increasing standard of education of the community is tending to produce a
dissatisfaction with remote large-scale bureaucracies, is enlarging the wish of the people to be involved in decision making and is raising their expectations. Local
government is likely to emerge over time as the obvious means to promote and encourage citizen participation and meaningful community government. This process could well happen, regardless of general attitudes of the Commonwealth or State Governments (Miles and Bains, 1981:204-205).

At the same time that residents found greater reason to directly address issues debated in local government, many inner city municipalities have experienced a rapid influx of people with the education, political skills and property interest to pursue such issues. The result was an increased middle-class residential base, an increased property-owning residential base and an increased level of residential political interest in local government affairs from 1961 to 1980 in inner Sydney.

Traditional Inner City Interests

In inner Sydney there were a variety of traditional residential interests, some based on former suburban boundaries, some on traditional party practices. It is important to remember that each of the areas of study in this thesis, other than Surry Hills, was a municipality in its own right until 1948 when many smaller councils were amalgamated into larger ones. What were from 1961 to 1980 the Sydney, Leichhardt, South Sydney and Woollahra municipalities were, before 1948, seventeen separate municipalities. By 1960 residents and aldermen in each of the suburbs still identified more with their former municipal image than their larger, more recent municipality (Painter, 1973). Figure 5.1 sets out the former and contemporary municipalities.
New Residential Actors and Interests

By the mid-1960s the higher levels of home ownership, property prices and renovation investment meant that resident interests were shifting from the traditional tenant, working-class base. More and more residents were discovering that issues of concern to them were not necessarily always articulated as concerns of the local Labor Party. This did not make residential issues any less political, but it did shift the burden of defensive action onto residents and non-electoral politics if they wished to maintain or improve their residential amenity. The two earliest examples of this are in the mid-1960s in Woolloomooloo and Paddington. These two conflicts show how residents learned to fight their own political battles and how they decided to do so.

These two conflicts also reflect the differences between the residential issues of the past and the residential issues of
the future. The Woolloomooloo conflict reflected the traditional working-class Labor interest in maintaining housing supply and workers' "rights" to affordable housing, while the Paddington conflict reflects the income middle-class demand for improvements in residential amenity and the "right" to live in residential districts unpolluted by industrial and commercial encroachment. The two conflicts were simultaneous and spurred by the same planning scheme which sought to eliminate ten "non-conforming residential" areas situated in the midst of industrial zoned areas including Pyrmont, Woolloomooloo and Paddington.

In Woolloomooloo residents feared commercial and high-rise residential expansion into the traditionally working-class residential area because of past threats of housing loss and resulting displacement and homelessness (SMH, 7/7/60). However, there was a new element of doubt because enquiries by the local progress association into the redevelopment plans were ignored by the City Council, the State Planning Authority and the Labor Party. Despite Labor's electoral strength, and its longstanding pro-residential policy residents could not gain the vocal support of Labor officials on council. Where before working-class residents could depend on local Labor representatives for a political voice and some influence on council or in State Parliament on their behalf, residents had been left to their own devices and for the first time were left to defend their own interests. As the local progress association pointed out, residents had to depend on themselves:
Unless these people are prepared to struggle in organized and determined fashion, they may find their properties resumed in order to be handed over to multi-millionaire developers who will no doubt pull down the existing homes and erect in their place modern and hideously expensive flats and properties well out of our financial reach (SMH, 12/9/64).

Where political contests were previously fought by political parties on the council, there were signs that residents and resident groups would be fighting on their own in the municipal arena.

Residents had two options. They could either approach council through the conventional, institutional modes of action, declaring their interest or estate and addressing it, or they could undertake unconventional modes of action either sidestepping or violating the institutional rules of address. In the Woolloomooloo example, if residents wished to pursue a successful institutional approach they would have needed an "estate or interest" in the issues at hand. With few owner occupiers and fewer still with the financial resources to mount a legal, property-based objection to the threatened development, success was unlikely. Adversarial action was not discussed publicly as an option. Fortunately for the tenants, the redevelopment plans were not carried through and the issue was moot.

Paddington residents also wished to protect their residential environment but on behalf of owner occupiers and a new set of educated, articulate residents. Twenty-four residents of Goodhope Street, Paddington, led by John Thompson, an Australian Broadcasting Commission (ABC) broadcaster and later the founder of the Paddington Society, claimed that industry had "secured a
foothold" in their street and asked their two local aldermen to look into the matter (SCM, 1/11/63). The residents’ concern, like those of the residents of Woolloomooloo, was that the Sydney Council had neglected the area and allowed industrial intrusion. The Paddington residents too, found they could not rely on their aldermen and instead had to take up their own cause. As a property owner on Goodhope Street however, Thompson could claim a property interest in the matter, and its possible effects on his property value. Instead, Thompson’s argument rested on the unique social and physical nature of Paddington, truly setting it apart from any "ordinary" residential area in the inner city. Describing the suburb as "a little like London’s Chelsea" (SMH, 28/4/64), he went on to cite the artists, writers, painters, sculptors and professional people moving into the area as well as "A fine working class community...and a colourful collection of New Australians who combined to give Paddington a unique blend of residents" (ibid.).

Equally important, and above all a first in terms of political interests of the inner city, was the architectural style of the suburb. For the first time it was articulated as an asset rather than a defect. Thompson credited Goodhope Street with having a unique architectural charm and houses noted by the National Trust, "It is pretty, it is unusual, and it is typical of many which are now being retained as interest in the area grows" (ibid.). Thompson painted a very different picture from that offered by the Cumberland County Council fifteen years earlier in their condemnation of Paddington’s substandard housing, its poor
design, construction, street layout, siting, health and amenities (CCC, 1948).

The Marginal Nature of Residential Self-Defense

These new ideas and the new ways in which they were expressed were important for a variety of reasons. The new residents were in a minority, articulated new and sometimes innovative interests, and seemed incompatible with the local municipal structure. These factors served to further encourage more action by residents on their own behalf, and more action of an unconventional nature, which engendered most of the resident action of the next fifteen years.

It is important to remember that the residents expressing the new interests were small in number and certainly in the mid-1960s were insignificant in any electoral sense. There had been increases in the number of middle-class residents from 1960 to 1970 but even as late as 1981 university-educated, middle income homeowners were not in the majority in any inner city suburb. It was also clear that many of the newer residential interests would not be catered for by local Labor politicians. According to traditional Labor practice, houses were valuable because they provided affordable and available shelter to inner city workers, and when owned, provided workers with economic security (Jakubowicz, 1974). However, according to the Paddington Society and other resident groups representing newer middle-class residential interests, older houses houses could also contribute to residential amenity with "architectural integrity" and "historic significance" and should be preserved and restored. Issues of historic distinction were not publicly acknowledged as
important by the inner city ALP branches in the mid-1960s.

It is clear from the actions taken by residents in the local
government arena that many new middle-class residents were
frustrated. They wanted to support new issues but had no
influence because they were in a minority position within the
traditionally Labor-dominated municipalities. Because some
councils and ALP interests were unsympathetic to the new
residents and often insisted that they have clearcut property
interests before acting on their complaint or objection, many
residents took action to either circumvent or oppose council
decisions.

One possible tactic was to undertake fairly traditional
action as an individual, writing letters and talking with
aldermen. Another was to organize direct action, as advocated by
many later protest groups. "Everyone's Handbook for Everyday
Action" was published in 1975 and encouraged readers to take part
in marches, occupation of offices, street blockades, sit-ins,
squatting, lock-ins, picketing and legal action to accomplish
their goals.

A related tactic was the organization of resident groups.
Thompson did this in Paddington and instigated the first meeting
of the Paddington Society in August 1964 with aims to preserve
the historic character of the suburb. By mid-1965 it was joined
by the Balmain Association, formed in the inner western
waterfront suburb famous as the birthplace of the Australian
Labor Party (ALP). The Balmain Association also upheld the
architectural integrity and historic significance of its suburb.
A threat of demolition of an historic "Watch House" and the proposed development of a container terminal on Balmain's waterfront precipitated a small group of residents to try to sidestep and oppose these decisions by organizing an association of resident interests. Twelve months later the group boasted two hundred members (BAN, 8/66).

Residents were innovative also in the local issues they addressed. Some were broader than the traditional local government issues and complainants often had no proximate or property-related interest in the issues they raised. Residents addressed problems relating to planning schemes (Leichhardt Planning Scheme, 1968), large industrial developments (Morts Bay Containers), and commercial enterprises even if they did not live near them. Yet because the residents were small in number and often did not have the necessary estate or interest, council could minimize the issues and ignore the residents.

The new interests were not only tangential to traditional Labor Party interests. As will be seen later, some were in direct contradiction to Labor policy. It was one thing to value amenity but if it could only be achieved at the cost of Labor's goal to accommodate commercial and industrial enterprises which provided jobs and tax revenue there would be conflict. It was one thing to value low-density housing but if that was to be at the cost of Labor's goal of more intensive housing provision there would be conflict.

Frustrated with their marginal position many residents also began to question how local governments made their decisions. They challenged councils to encourage resident participation and
consultation when making decisions (Hampton and Pike, 1974). This questioning was not supported by municipal councils and in many instances made them even more antagonistic to the newer interests (BAN, 8/69; SSCM, 1/8/73). Residents expressing their property interests to local government were confronted with a political system which insisted that interests be expressed in terms of use and exchange values and that they be expressed through their municipal representatives. If aldermen were unsympathetic, the residents were pushed to the political margins, resulting in an antagonistic relationship between residents and local government. These are the conflicts evident in Sydney by the mid-sixties when inner city municipal boundaries were re-arranged by the Liberal government.

Local Government Becomes a Political Football

Residents were increasingly vocal about their interests at the time of the NSW State election in May 1965, in which Liberal leader Robert Askin ousted Labor Premier J. B. Renshaw. Labor had been in power in the NSW State government since 1941. For twenty-four years Labor had set the tone of State policies towards urban development and Sydney City Council policy towards residential issues. The Labor Council and State Labor government had clearly set out the pro-residential policies even if they had not always strictly adhered to them. The State Labor government had amalgamated councils and changed the inner Sydney council boundaries in 1947 to ensure a Labor-dominated Sydney Council. The Labor majority continued to limit commercial and industrial expansion to the CBD to avoid the loss of dwellings, while
maintaining the rate base by encouraging development of the city centre and by striking a higher than average rate for CBD properties (Alexander, 1979).

When the conservative coalition won State office in 1965, the new Premier Askin was interested in returning the Sydney City Council to a Civic Reform leadership sympathetic to non-residential development. He had plans to relax the controls placed on development, and to create a city which would benefit the larger ratepaying interests instead of the resident, predominantly tenant interests (Sandercock, 1977). This change in political interest coincided with growing resident interest in urban policy. It is in this environment of change, new interest and activism in the inner suburbs that the new conservative State government began to exert its political strength and to change the inner municipal areas and the political groundrules to its political advantage.

Within a week of taking office, Askin ordered a public inquiry into the ward system of the Sydney City Council, signalling the end to Labor's eighteen year hold of the City Council. The Civic Reform group, until then the minority group on council, had consistently complained that the CBD area, known as the Gipps ward, contributed sixty percent of the City's revenue, but only elected a quarter of the aldermen (SMH, 13/2/55). Two and a half years after taking office, Askin dismissed the Sydney Council and appointed three commissioners who redrew the municipal boundaries. They took three residential sections of the city and apportioned them to three adjacent municipalities, and took nearly all of the Northcott ward, and
formed it into the South Sydney Municipality. As Sandercock points out:

The new council (Sydney City Council) then created, controlled one of the smallest city areas in the world, confined largely to the commercial centre. This enabled the right wing Civic Reform Association (CRA) to gain a majority in the 1969 elections. But in the meantime the business minded city commissioners in the twenty two months of their rule approved $300 million worth of development applications on a ten to one floor space index whereas the planners were urging a six to one index (Sandercock, 1977:197).

The break up of the inner residential areas and the resulting success of Civic Reform meant more than the release of Labor's hold on the council and the acceleration of development approval in the city. Civic Reform's success also meant that any State Government plans for Sydney's development would be easily approved by the council. Essentially, the interests promoted by Askin's government were going to be the same interests as those promoted by the council, and they were going to be sharply different from those of some resident groups in the inner city.

Conflict was not limited to Labor and non-Labor interests. During the days of the State Labor government there had been many political conflicts between the State Labor government and local Labor residents over residential issues. It was a State Labor government which initially planned the high-density redevelopment of the Rocks and Woolloomooloo (SMH, 7/7/60). It was a State Labor government which planned industrial development for Mort Bay and White Bay in Balmain, and which allowed Sydney University to demolish homes and expand into Darlington. It was a Labor
government which planned the road and freeway system taken over by Liberal Premier Askin. Labor ideology did not prevent Labor governments from working against some interests of Labor residents and homeowners of the inner city.

By 1969, however, with a conservative State government and conservative municipal council in Sydney, there were no longer even any ideological bars to accelerated development. By the late 1960s there were redefined arenas of local government, vocal minority groups which expressed new interests which were both different from and in some cases antagonistic to the established social and political institutions. This next section discusses the new resident interests apropos of the newly defined municipalities.

Woollahra

In the 1968 re-organization of Sydney the Woollahra Municipality inherited the eighty percent of Paddington which lies north of Oxford Street. The remainder stayed in the Sydney municipality (see Map 1.2). Woollahra was a high status, mostly residential area contiguous to the concentrated busyness of the City of Sydney. The suburbs of Double Bay, Rose Bay, Bellevue Hill and Vaucluse had been represented by a conservative council and a Liberal party State member for many years. The municipality had suffered little deterioration or overcrowding in the Depression or during the war and had not had to consider the needs of a concentrated working-class constituency. In the 1968 re-alignment of local government boundaries, Woollahra found itself the political heir to Paddington, a suburb mostly working-
class and tenanted, but with a growing number of middle-class homeowners. Plans to widen Jersey Road and Nield Avenue also earmarked Paddington for redevelopment with major thoroughfares.

To prepare for Paddington's incorporation into the municipality in 1968 the council established a "Paddington subcommittee". According to the council minutes the subcommittee spent most of its time meeting with members of the Paddington Society as the Society took pains to spell out to its new council its planning priorities for Paddington (WCM, Jan-June, 1968). The Society was interested in preserving Paddington as an historic area and in having that special preservation enforced by planning policy. The Woollahra Council aldermen and planners showed no antagonism to the idea, although several years were to follow before it reached fruition.

After amalgamation the Paddington aldermen George Wamecke, James O'Grady and Tony White were the only ALP members of the Woollahra Council. As such they were relatively ineffectual in their municipal efforts. The Paddington Society in many ways had a warmer reception and were more successful with the council as a whole than they were with their local aldermen. (PSN, 2/70; 6/70; 11/70;). Each of the Paddington aldermen had been at some point a Paddington Society member, but each still represented the old, established majority interests of the working-class residents. The issue of Christmas work for pensioners illustrates the differences between the Paddington Society, Woollahra Council and the Paddington aldermen.

As part of the Sydney municipality, Paddington pensioners, like pensioners throughout the council area, were given the
opportunity to earn money through Christmas employment financed by the Council. At the time of amalgamation Woollahra made it clear the practice would not continue in Paddington (WC, 25/9/68). In response, one thousand persons petitioned council to reverse its decision and the Paddington aldermen made heated speeches on behalf of the pensioners (WCM, 23/9/68). The efforts were unsuccessful, but more importantly, this discussion was almost wholly ignored by the Paddington Society. The Society was not at all interested in this major political issue, the first addressed on behalf of Paddington's residents in its new municipal setting. Because the Society's particular interest was in environmental quality this "welfare" issue was of marginal interest to the Society, although the Society did soon after form a special welfare group to assess the needs of the aged and needy people of Paddington (PSN, 7/68). Its disinterest in the pensioner issue appears deliberate in this light.

The Woollahra Council, however, did not ignore or oppose the Paddington Society interests. Indeed, aldermen outside of Paddington viewed the Society much more favourably than did its aldermen. The Society's preservation plan illustrates this. In 1969 the Paddington Society formed its own planning preservation subcommittee to draw up a preservation plan for Paddington, inviting Woollahra Council to participate. The council responded by inviting progress reports, encouraging the Society's planning efforts, and in some cases seeking the Society's views in relation to relevant development proposals (PSN, 10/69). When the Society released what was then called the 2(g) Report
Woollahra’s Mayor was full of praise for the "skilled work" offered "on an 'honorary basis'", and encouraged residents' own suggestions and comments on the report. He concluded by stressing aspects of the area's distinctiveness, market value and the efforts council could undertake to encourage that:

Already, the improved popularity of living in Paddington has been reflected in significantly greater residential land values. With good planning and good implementation, Paddington should become one of the most desirable residential districts in the inner metropolitan area (PSN, 1/71).

Although the Paddington aldermen might consider the Society's interests insignificant and incompatible to theirs, the Woollahra Council obviously embraced them as important. But council's support could not ensure Paddington Society success, as the events of the 1971 election indicate.

The 1971 Election

In 1971 the Paddington Society decided to run candidates for local government election. The Society had been increasingly frustrated by what it saw as the ineffectual attention of the Paddington aldermen. By 1971 it was in a strong position to support candidates. It had gained a large group membership and strong general community support. The local property-based issues of the Paddington Society would fare better in the ward-based elections than in any at large election. As well, the middle-class occupations and educational backgrounds of the Society members were also advantageous.

However, the Society had a tradition and reputation for
acting outside of "politics" and for remaining unaffiliated in elections (PSN, 6/68). How could it retain its "apolitical" stance if it were to run candidates in an election? To resolve the potential contradiction the Society put itself forward as actively opposing the "political" aspect of local government by opposing the candidacy of any party-supported candidate, but especially of any incumbent ALP candidate.

In May 1971 the Society decided to align itself with local government candidates standing for the election in four months time, especially candidates "sympathetic to our aims and who will work to the adoption of our Plan [for preservation]" (PSN, 6/71). The Society's decision to stand candidates in contradiction to the Society's constitution exemplified the extent to which members were willing to go to protect what they saw as a unique and valuable community.

In July the Society had found three candidates: Maggie Prill, a resident activist; Tim Read, a film editor; and Keith Cottier, an architect. Labor was represented by Tony White, a long standing Woollahra alderman who lived outside Paddington, George Warnecke the veteran Paddington alderman, and Jim O'Grady who had been a Paddington ALP alderman under the Sydney Council administration.

The ALP campaign attacked the non-Labor majority on council and the Paddington Society. Rates, they claimed, had risen in some cases 200 percent since Paddington joined the Woollahra Municipality, due to the "anti-Labor" majority on council, "Who", they alleged, "support and hold membership of the
Paddington Society" (WC, 25/8/71). They promised they would continue to fight against rate increases if re-elected. Moreover, they would "not tolerate attempts by any newly-formed group to dictate to Paddington households what colour their homes should be, or how many people should live in them" (ibid.). They painted the Paddington Society plan for the area as one which would ban boarding houses and balcony enclosures as well as "less expensive improvements and alterations resulting in rents spiralling beyond the means of existing tenants" (WC, 8/9/71). In summary they presented their platform as continued opposition to rate rises or any conditions which might raise rents and in continued protection of the interests of "not just a minority who have only in recent years discovered the area" (ibid.). "Vote Labor - Keep out the backlane bureaucrats" was their slogan (WC, 15/9/71).

Paddington Society candidates extolled the unique aspects of Paddington, criticized the past performance of the Labor aldermen and distanced themselves from the traditional partisan aspect of local government in Paddington. According to the candidates, Paddington was a "unique environment"; not a mere suburb but "a way of life" (WC, 15/9/71). The incumbent aldermen, they argued, did not recognize and promote that distinctiveness and the Paddington Society had been left on its own to manage the environment by opposing development and demolition plans targeted to their suburb: "Paddington is not an ordinary suburb and it needs the services of aldermen who appreciate that fact" (PSN, 9/71).

They also couched the same sentiment in political
terms: "The Paddington Society is not anti-Labor. But we think Labor has done a lousy job in Paddington" (WC, 15/9/71). Paddington Society candidates went to great efforts to dissociate themselves from all groups and parties, hoping thus to distance themselves from "politics". "We believe that Local Government should be non-political. There is plenty of scope for the politicians in State and Federal spheres. Local Government must concern itself with people not with politics" (WC, 8/9/71). In their eyes, local politics was "different" from State and Federal politics, to be valued for flexibility and lack of ideology. This made issues and decisions much more manageable—unconstrained by a "party line".

The Paddington Society team lost by approximately 180 votes (PSN, 10/71), although it gained 46 percent of the vote, "the largest proportion ever obtained in the ward for a non-Labor team" (ibid.). Despite the loss the Society President John Cooney expressed interest in supporting candidates in the next election. But by the time of the 1974 election the Society retreated to a position of providing information on candidates and encouraging informed voting by its members. After a comparatively quiet election in 1974, the three incumbent ALP aldermen were re-elected.

In Paddington the interests of new residents were more consistent with those of the municipality as a whole but incompatible with the interests of the local aldermen and many of their fellow constituents. Paddington residents seemed to share the general municipal interest in distinguished residential areas
and in the role of resident groups in helping local government bring that about. Considering their upwardly mobile social and economic status, the new residents of Paddington were fortunate to be part of a high status municipality because the council shared many of their interests. New residents in Annandale, Balmain and Glebe were less fortunate and found themselves in a less sympathetic environment.

**Leichhardt**

In the municipal boundary changes Leichhardt gained the suburb of Glebe. Unlike Paddington in Woollahra, Glebe and the Leichhardt Municipality were more like each other. As with the remainder of the municipality Glebe was largely residential, but it was mostly tenanted (65% in 1971) with commercial and industrial land uses throughout the suburb. The other suburbs of the municipality were not as heavily tenanted, nor as close to the city. Nevertheless, Glebe was still much like them, sharing a similarly large residential component interspersed with commercial and industrial land uses.

Glebe was also similar because it had a traditional working-class social component and Australian Labor Party political background. In Paddington the traditional ALP aldermen were in the minority and had found Woollahra Council an unsympathetic, almost antagonistic municipal setting. With Glebe however, the ALP Glebe aldermen joined an ALP Leichhardt Council. Partly because the Glebe aldermen shared with the Leichhardt aldermen similar inner city working-class backgrounds, but mostly because they shared the ideology and goals of the ALP, the Glebe aldermen were more in step with the processes and aims of their new council.
and were not in the uncomfortable, minority position experienced by the Paddington aldermen in Woollahra.

With a longstanding ALP-controlled council, Leichhardt practised a traditional policy of caucus decision-making. All ALP members met together before every council meeting and debated and made their decisions in caucus and then voted in the public council meeting according to the earlier caucus decisions. This left little room for discussion or variation in the public meetings of the whole council and gave non-ALP members no opportunity to contribute to the decision-making (Johnston, 1979). Moreover, an unwritten rule of ward responsibility seemed to operate, so that decisions relating to an issue within a particular ward were initiated and decided by only the ward aldermen, and no other (Painter, 1973). For instance, a development application for a block of flats in Annandale would have been considered a decision only to be made by the Annandale aldermen. The interest of anyone outside the ward was considered irrelevant to the decision.

These aspects of party politics were not denied by Leichhardt aldermen, nor criticized or censured by residents or the local press for many years. Most working-class ALP voters had their interests protected and promoted by such practices, and were the beneficiaries of this political system.
New Resident Interests

By the mid-sixties however, the Leichhardt Municipality had increasing numbers of new middle-class residents with interests different from those of the local council, first in Balmain, and later in Glebe and Annandale. Because these new residents held interests incompatible with those of the status quo they could not pursue them using traditional representative tactics and instead organized and articulated them outside the institution of local government.

One of the earliest decisions to arouse the ire of new residents was Leichhardt Council's approval in 1965 of container storage development at White Bay in Balmain, a proposal originally initiated by the State government. This decision, along with plans to demolish an historic Balmain "Watch House", prompted dissatisfied residents to organize a Balmain Association in defense of the residential and historic amenity of the suburb (Senate hearings, 1968). Protests by individual residents and the Balmain Association were addressed to the local council but dismissed by council on the grounds that the Association and many of the residents objecting had no "estate or interest" in the matter at hand (BAN, 8/69).

Balmain residents continued to address local planning issues when the local planning scheme was exhibited in 1968. During discussion of the plan the debate concerning "estate and interest" became much more explicit. The Balmain Association made a formal submission to the council in booklet form "Objections to the Leichhardt Planning Scheme" (Balmain Assn., 1968). It was very similar to the Paddington Society's
preservation report in that it was professionally prepared solely through the voluntary efforts of Association members, attesting to the value of the contribution of professionally trained and interested members.

Unlike the Paddington Report, however, the Balmain Association's report was not sympathetically received by council. Council insisted that all objectors have a pecuniary interest in the particular piece of land about which they were objecting (BAN, 8/69). Although the Minister for Local Government and State Planning Authority planners stated that the council could receive the objections if they chose to, the council chose not to. In defiance of public opinion if insisted that residents with objections have a property-related "interest or estate".

Balmain's new resident interests were met by a political situation rather different from that confronting residents in Glebe and Annandale. Balmain's aldermen, Izzy Wyner and Nick Origlass strongly supported the new resident interests, despite their own working-class backgrounds and interests. Origlass and Wyner had reputations as political mavericks, taking on the role of municipal activists on behalf of their own personal views and the interests of their constituents. Both of them had a particular reputation for raising motions far beyond the jurisdiction of local government. In the past they had offered motions in regards to apartheid in South Africa (LCM, 12/4/60), the abolition of the NSW Upper House (LCM, 14/2/61), the presence of Russian troops in Czechoslovakia (LCM 27/8/68), and condemnation of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Plant accident in
the United States (LCM, 17/4/79). Both men had been instrumental in trying to encourage council to listen to resident views and to encourage participation in decision-making.

Despite the support of these aldermen the interests of new residents were still in the minority in the municipality. The new residential interests were unsuccessful in gaining any seats on the council other than ensuring the re-election of incumbents Origlass and Wyner in the 1968 municipal election. However, municipal reform and some of the new resident interests did enjoy some support in Glebe and Annandale where residents formed action groups in 1969 and 1970 respectively. These groups were in turn marginal to their local interests as articulated by their local aldermen, and were accused by them of being "political" (Link, 25/9/68) in other instances "gangs of larrikins" (GSN, 3/71).

The 1971 Election

The basic conflicts of interests, combined with more specific ones over flat development (AAN, 3/71), demolition of historic houses (AAN, 7/70), the provision of municipal libraries (BAN, 10/69) frustrated the new resident groups. Council would not support their goals of preservation, amenity and participation. As a result members within each group, as in the Paddington Society, discussed the option of standing candidates in the 1971 local government election (GSN, 3/71; AAN, 6/71). The new resident groups found themselves in the same contradictory political situation as had the Paddington Society when it considered possible involvement in local elections. How could they challenge the incumbent council which they considered unsympathetic while maintaining their non-political positions?
How could these groups act in a political arena without becoming political? They had tried participating in the conventional aspects of institutional government by writing letters and petitions and lobbying council and had been thwarted. They had tried adversarial tactics of disruption and they had sidestepped local government in appealing to the State government, with varying amounts of success. However, they had not overcome their minority status in the municipality.

To overcome their marginality each of the resident groups decided against standing candidates in their respective wards. Instead they supported plans for council turnover and the election of new members more sympathetic to their aims. Unlike the Paddington Society, no group wished to stand an "association ticket" per se, and instead sought a compromise between party and resident politics.

The Glebe Society solicited members' opinions on how the society should act in the September elections presenting both the advantages and disadvantages of standing Society candidates, supporting independents or supporting the sitting aldermen (GSN, 3/71). Three months later the Society decided not to support the current aldermen, but to "welcome" the formation of an opposing municipality-wide ticket, the "Campaign for a Better Council", also known as the "CBC". It was represented in Glebe by Glebe Society member Eric Sandblom, and David Young who joined the Society in September after his election (GSN, 6/71).

The Annandale Association was much more reserved in its electoral involvement. Before the election the Association was
willing only to remind residents to register to vote and to provide newsletter space for campaign statements by all candidates, trying to avoid any political statements of its own (AAN, 8/71). Both "CBC" candidates for the Annandale ward, Roy Waterson and Ethel May were Annandale Association members, but both lived in Balmain.

In Balmain the incumbent aldermen Origlass and Wyner stood and were elected as "Labor Independents" with little specific support from the Balmain Association per se. There is, however, evidence that many Balmain Association members supported the candidates (BAN, 8/71)^4. Several other "CBC" candidates within the other wards, McMans in Lilyfield, and Bray and Tow in Rozelle, were all members of one of the aforementioned groups, though receiving little outright support from any group. Most associations seemed interested in maintaining their non-political stance including non-involvement in electoral politics, even of the local and supposedly non-party variety.

Members of the CBC ticket each had their own election issues, many specific to their own ward. But each also were opposed in principle to expressway plans, industry, and flat development, and instead proposed enlarged parks and open space and supported an open-style, participatory process of council decision-making (BAN, 8/71). In response the incumbent ALP Mayor reversed council policy only days before the election, appealing to local residents for their participation and interest in council decisions:
The problems of pollution and environmental control, for example, and the planning and building factors which relate to them, now impose some very complex responsibilities on Council. For this reason our doors are wide open to experts and specialists who have useful opinions to express on any of these issues. These are opportunities for the ordinary citizen who feels strongly on community issues such as these, to come forward and serve on advisory committees. We welcome them. The powers and functions of the local council and its decisions nowadays affect everyone in the municipality, whether they are property owners or not (Link, 8/9/71).

The words of the Mayor appealed to the interests of the newer residents as expressed by the resident groups, but contradicted the past and even recent policy of the council. Considering his attitude to resident interests when eventually re-elected in 1974, there is good reason to doubt the sincerity of his intentions anyway.

The ALP's last minute reversal of policy in the Leichhardt local election campaign was to no avail. Of the twelve "independent" CBC candidates who stood, eight were elected. Of them, five were resident action group members, although they were not formally sponsored by any group (BAN, 8/71). Thus in Leichhardt there was a close but unstated relationship between local electoral politics and resident groups; unlike in the campaign in Paddington where the relationship between new residents groups and electoral politics was direct and undisputed. The resident groups in the Leichhardt Municipality did not perceive the stakes high enough to warrant going against the various rules of group organization prohibiting "electoral" involvement and remained on the electoral sidelines instead.
This attempt to separate resident action from electoral politics however, did not stem any potential controversy or make the position of the groups any less political — at least in the eyes of the traditional local Labor Party. There were post-election moves by the Balmain ALP branch to make members of what they called "civic groups" ineligible for ALP membership: "Our members have pledged themselves not to belong to such organizations since the formation of the Party in 1891" (Link, 16/2/72). Balmain Association President Bill Haesler was quick to defined the "non-aligned" policy of the group and the innovative way in which resident groups could overcome party political bias: "The Association has always prided itself on being able to discuss in a non-party political atmosphere the affairs of local government with ex-aldermen and current aldermen" (Link, 2/2/72). Yet, in the same statement Haesler acknowledged the close relationship between the ALP and the Balmain Association: "If you were to take a census of the membership of any of the civic groups in the area you would find that over 50 percent would be Labor supported and this probably will disillusion many members of the civic groups" (ibid.). The attempts of resident groups to separate resident politics from party politics had not succeeded.
Post-Election Interests

The new independent council in Leichhardt undertook many of the procedural reforms suggested by the resident action groups. At the first meeting council papers were made available to the press, committee meetings were opened to the public and the public was invited to tea at the end of council meetings. Council dispensed with uniformed council officers, decided to prepare a public manual on municipal accounting procedures, and called for a public co-sponsored meeting to protest the State plans for nearby freeway construction (Link, 13/10/71). The atmosphere was to be much more open and participatory than with the former ALP-dominated council, and it looked as if many of the goals of the residents groups were to be achieved.

The independents were only in office for one term. In the 1974 election each residents group continued to encourage members to vote for candidates who would allow the recently instituted local municipal reforms to continue, (AAN, 9/74; BAN, 8/74; GSN, 9/74) thus implicitly endorsing the sitting and challenging independents. However, gentrification had not advanced far enough to make new, middle-class home purchasers an electoral majority. This, along with other factors, including disagreements among the independents and a re-vitalized and strengthened ALP contributed to the independent coalition losing its majority in the 1974 election and by the time of the 1977 local government election most groups stopped endorsing candidates.

The conservative ALP council reverted to the procedures which excluded residents and put them and their interests on the
political periphery. The council abolished all committees with resident members, no longer allowed questions from the floor, insisted on written submissions at all times and replaced frequent public meetings with infrequent referenda (Glebe, 3/10/74; Link, 3/10/74, 27/2/75).

Of the six suburbs in Leichhardt, Balmain continued to express its desire for a distinctive municipality, even if that meant "separation" and "independence" from the remainder of the municipality. Balmain, unlike Annandale and Glebe, was in an incompatible position within the municipality. Like the other areas it had a large number of new, middle-class renovators, however, there were more in Balmain than in other parts of the Leichhardt Municipality, and it had more sympathetic aldermen representing the suburb. These factors moved residents to petition the NSW Minister for Local Government to reconstitute the Balmain Council so that "town planning and other matters affecting the amenity of the area are placed in the hands of the persons affected" (BAN, 6/77, 7/77). The petition received support from 90 percent of Balmain's eligible voters (4500 signatures) but still the effort failed. The Government Boundaries Commission, considering local government boundaries and amalgamations at the time, did not agree to the request and Balmain was left in the Leichhardt Council (BAN, 2/78).

The Annandale Association, Glebe Society and Balmain Association had a very different relationship with local government than did the Paddington Society. During the period examined here the Leichhardt Council remained unsympathetic with
the interests of new residents and the resident groups. The residents' success in wresting municipal control from 1971 to 1973 did not improve relations. Battles over zoning requirements, efforts of new interests to reduce residential densities and reform the general planning schemes were fruitless because the residents remained a minority in opposition. Council maintained control and residents' interests as expressed by the groups were continually frustrated by what they considered Leichhardt Council's unsympathetic attitude towards the new resident interests (BAN, 12/77; AAN, 3/76; GSN, 5/79).

In Annandale and Glebe the 1974, 1977 and 1980 elections stirred up little group enthusiasm. The respective resident groups were content to publish each candidate's platform statement and thus contribute to informed voting. The marriage of party political activity and overt residential defense had been fleeting within these three RAGs in Leichhardt as it had been in Paddington. In some instances the groups were undergoing an overall decline in activity and leadership. As well the number of new residents expressing the new interests was still small in comparison to the strength of the older, more longstanding interests. The new interests were still marginal and irrelevant to the ALP. Only in the 1980 election after gentrification had progressed further did resident interests independent of the ALP have any more success in gaining municipal office.
City of Sydney

The 1968 reorganization of municipal boundaries succeeded in stripping the city of many residential areas. As a result, council was dominated by the commercial and industrial interests of the city and was physically limited to jurisdiction within a two km radius of the Sydney GPO. In effect, resident interests had been marginalized. In Paddington and Leichhardt it was the new middle-class resident interests which were marginal, in Sydney it was resident interests of any sort.

With the voting constituency primarily non-residential property owners, the Sydney Council proceeded to produce a "strategic" town plan. It was released in July 1971 and approved by council the following month with plans to redevelop the two historic residential areas of the Rocks and Woolloomooloo, as well as to increase the floor-to-site (floor space) ratio of buildings in the city, encouraging commercial growth and development in the city (COS., 1971).

The plan was criticized by the ALP and local resident groups for encouraging overdevelopment without addressing the economic and transport problems further growth would engender and which they argued would be at the expense of current residents of the city (COS, 1977). Although the council still retained the ward system of election, residents lost the traditional Labor majority voice on council which had defended their interests. Residents then had an even greater incentive to organize, articulate and defend their own interest with the collapse of the longstanding party protection. Aspects of independent action had been tried in the Woolloomooloo Progress Association and in the Paddington
Society. In post-1968 Sydney, however, the minority role of an increased number of new, middle-class residents and the impinging development forecast in the Strategic Plan made resident action even more imperative to Sydney residents than to Leichhardt and Paddington residents. By 1971 resident action was accepted enough by local residents and promoted sufficiently by many new residents that there were resident groups in Ultimo, Pyrmont, the Rocks, and Surry Hills and by 1973 two active groups in Woolloomooloo, Darlinghurst, and Victoria Street, Kings Cross (Link, 3/3/71; COS, 1971).

It was not as feasible for RAGs to run their own "independent" candidates or tickets in Sydney. Unlike Woollahra and the suburbs of Leichhardt, the Council wards of Sydney were not heavily residential and few suburbs were council wards in their own right as was the case in the other areas. For instance, Fitzroy Ward in Sydney represented Kings Cross and Elizabeth Bay; Flinders represented South Paddington and South Surry Hills; Phillip represented Ultimo, Pyrmont and Chippendale; Macquarie, North Surry Hills and Woolloomooloo; and Gipps Ward the Rocks and the CBD. Few groups could muster the resources of the Paddington Society. None had the advantage of Annandale, Balmain, Glebe and Paddington with entire wards consisting of one historically defined and mostly residential suburb. Without the resources and residential wards the probability of a successful pro-residential "independent" municipal ticket in Sydney was small.

Resident interests in the City of Sydney were distinctive in
a different way than those in Woollahra and Leichhardt. Although resident groups did operate in many areas, they were not the local residential bulwark or focus of local energy as the groups in Leichhardt and Paddington were. Compared to Paddington, Annandale, Glebe and Balmain, Sydney's inner suburbs had attracted less popular attention and renovation investment. Some of the suburbs had been threatened by freeways (Woolloomooloo and Ultimo) and redevelopment (Woolloomooloo and the Rocks). Surry Hills, had only piecemeal, ad hoc threats of redevelopment and residents dealt instead with what seemed ordinary local government issues of streets, rubbish and planning. North Newtown however was threatened with dwelling demolition for extensions to the Sydney Teachers College which moved residents to organize the North Newtown Action Group in protest (SMH, 21/3/73). They joined a group established not long before, the Planning Association of Newtown, (SCM, 17/4/73). However, in the period under study here none had as vocal or visible role in local government decisions as the previously examined groups.

In some City of Sydney suburbs some resident activists did stand as "independent" local government candidates, but not on resident action tickets or as part of a resident coalition. Nita McRae, an independent and member of the Rocks RAG challenged the incumbent ALP candidate Tony Bradford in the 1977 election (SMH, 3/8/77). University lecturer and former President of the Pyrmont/Ultimo RAG Independent Michael Matthews won a council seat in the 1980 election. In these situations resident action groups were in less of a contradictory position than were the
groups in Paddington and Leichhardt. They were not solely responsible for the campaigning and support of a candidate and generally remained unassociated with any political involvement. The candidates were likely to be sympathetic to but not directly aligned with resident action. As independents however, they were rarely elected. For the period studied here the political arena of local government in the City of Sydney remained in the hands of party politics and beyond the grasp of resident action.

In summary, Paddington residential interests were opposed to those of Paddington's local aldermen but generally supported by the Woollahra Council. In Leichhardt residential interests in some areas were incompatible with those in other parts of the municipality and with the ALP-controlled council, and in Sydney residents interests did not have any municipal representation until 1980. South Sydney was different yet again.

South Sydney

This was a local government area newly created in 1968, by a Liberal state government which wished to prise control of the CBD away from the ALP. The new municipality had a disparate mix of residential, commercial and industrial land uses. This thesis is particularly concerned with Newtown because it was the most residential of those areas outside of Redfern. The 1968 amalgamation split Newtown among three municipalities. Like Paddington it was divided down the centre of its main thoroughfare with two fifths of the suburb apportioned to the Marrickville local government area, two fifths to the South Sydney LGA and the remaining one fifth kept in the City of Sydney.
As a planner of the day remarked,

It [the newly formed South Sydney municipality] is full of problems. It should have a substantial income, but it has no community of interest. There are a few people down at Rosebery, a lot up at the Newtown end and a great amount of industry in between. (SMH, 27/9/67)

The Sydney and South Sydney shares of Newtown are the focus of attention here.

From the council's beginning in 1968 the South Sydney Council was known to be a conservative, working-class Labor political arena. The conflicts of the council resulted from its attempts to maintain the working-class residential nature of the municipality, and its services, while also encouraging industrial and commercial development. Some Newtown residents began to express interests not only in residential issues of no interest to the council, but in major political issues which went against local tradition and were antagonistic to council. One of the first concerned "piecing Newtown back together" by lobbying State government to re-form and re-place the three way divided suburb into one suburb to be administered by one municipal authority (SCM, 1969-1971). That was not accomplished until the 1980s. In the meantime some Newtown residents continued to disagree with council policy and process. With no boundary re-alignment in sight, residents reconciled themselves to their marginal position and instead some began to address their interests directly to council rather than through their aldermen.

Resident groups were more likely to express interest in property matters than were individual residents. On the Sydney
side of Newtown there were the two resident groups mentioned earlier. In the South Sydney local government area the South Sydney Action Group was active in trying to halt the State Housing Commission from resuming and demolishing terrace houses in Waterloo for high rise public flat construction (So. Sydney Community Aid, 1974). However, there is no evidence of their activity in Newtown issues. Instead their interest focussed on general issues of council practice.

From its inception, South Sydney municipal activities were controversial, and highly charged. Unlike the other municipal areas examined here, South Sydney was formed at a time of increasing resident action and resident interest in municipal affairs. However, none of the suburbs experienced as much of an increase in investment or rising market values had Balmain and Paddington. With fewer middle-class, educated, high income home purchasers and renovators, fewer residents had the incentive or the resources to pursue property interests on the local government level. Those who were active focussed on the unique and distinctive aspects of local life, especially the politics of municipal authority. There were particularly angry and vitriolic council meetings in which residents mocked and attacked council (SSCM, 1973-1975). With less investment to protect, residents had less incentive to take part in the conventional institutional procedures, and with antagonistic response from the new council they had more incentive to thwart and challenge the institutions than to ignore or sidestep them.

Moreover, with the late and slow-paced interest by middle-class homebuyers in Newtown dwellings, and subsequent renovation
activity, the new middle-class homebuyers were more marginal in an electoral sense than in any of the other suburbs examined earlier. Signs of renovation interest and resident action had begun in Paddington and Balmain as early as 1964 and 1965. In those areas resident action had gained sufficient strength in numbers and public interest that resident groups could undertake a serious challenge to the incumbent local government candidates in the 1971 election. In Newtown the new resident interests did not gain sufficient electoral strength to undertake a similar challenge until the 1980 election.

Summary

This chapter has drawn together evidence on the changes to local government in inner Sydney since 1961 including the boundary changes, new resident interests, the different ways they were received by local government, and resident responses to local government practice. These have been systematically examined over the twenty year period to establish the importance of local and historical definitions of when resident interests are innovative or incompatible compared to municipal interests and when they are not.

The evidence indicated that there has been an overall change in each municipality with local government gradually recognizing non-proximate, non-property related issues raised by residents and the desire of residents to contribute to municipal decision-making. Each of these changes came about at different times in different local government areas because of the relative amount and pace of residential change in each suburb, the
relative similarity of interests between the suburb and the municipality, and the success of resident interests to elect municipal representatives. Paddington was moved into a municipality sympathetic to many resident interests, but was represented by unsympathetic aldermen for several years. New, middle-class residents in Annandale, Balmain and Glebe found their council unsympathetic to their interests until they gained municipal control from 1971 to 1974, but were in the same position again from 1974 to 1980. Surry Hills and Newtown were in similar minority positions in their respective municipalities, with the new, middle-class residents resorting more often to protest action. These various actions are examined in detail in Chapters 6 and 7, but serve here initially to establish the importance of local government’s role as an arena for resident interests.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER FIVE

1 A table of local government responsibilities in NSW is available in Appendix Three.

2 From Starke’s *Town and Country Planning in NSW* (1966):

   estate=any estate or interests charge, right, title, claim, demand, lieu or incumbrance in law or in equity. In essence, land and its incidents must be involved, and not merely some personal or contractual right not touching the land.

3 Appendix Four is an excerpt from the Annual Report (1973) of the Leichhardt Council Health Administration Section with details of the types of complaints council often received.

4 Comments like "This election is the most important we have had so far and if people who refuse to recognize this feeling of the Municipality gain power there will be no Balmain worth fighting for by the 1974 Municipal election" (BAN 8/71) makes this bias clear.
"I wish you to know that not once have
I been actively offered the opportunity
of expressing my requirements..."
--Paddington resident of nine years,
to Woollahra Council, June 1979.

The previous chapter showed the changes in local government as inner Sydney municipalities shifted boundaries and began to recognize the new resident interest and participation. The new, middle-class residents struggled with local government issues while trying to remain apolitical but 1961 to 1980 proved to be a period in which residents increasingly recognized local government as a political arena in which they could act particularly in relation to property matters.

This chapter contributes further to the understanding of residents in gentrifying areas addressing local government. Evidence from the letters and petitions shows that residents addressed traditional property issues through conventional, traditional avenues. However, the new middle-class renovators were marginal to the traditional constituencies of the inner municipalities and they raised new issues. As small minorities in the traditional, ALP municipalities, they often had to address the issues without the support of the local representative system. In their efforts to influence and inform decision-making, residents often used adversarial, collective modes of address.
Part one of this analysis examines the traditional patterns of address through letters and petitions, including the issues raised and the social class of those residents. From that evidence it was possible to analyze whether or not the level of these actions rose along with gentrification, as one might expect. Part two examines the extent of new resident interests which went beyond the traditional "local" interest of local government, and the traditional Labor Party interests. This included some of the infrequent adversarial efforts residents used to convey their interests to council.

The evidence of resident interests publicly expressed to councils was drawn primarily from the minutes of council meetings and business. For the four councils of interest here, that included 1600 sets of minutes and papers from 1961 to 1980. Minutes of council meetings included a precis of correspondence for each meeting, which listed the letters and petitions received from residents, the name of the person who sent it, and the matter addressed in it. The pieces of correspondence constitute the bulk of the evidence referred to in this chapter as "letters and petitions". When reviewing the records of the different councils it seems that councils may have differed in the assiduousness with which they reported receiving these letters and petitions, because there are fewer in the Woollahra and Sydney Council records. However, council staff maintained that this variation stemmed from fewer residents in those municipalities who directed correspondence to council, not from any neglect in council reporting them. The South Sydney Council, however, did stop reporting for several years (1974-1977).
incoming correspondence, along with questions without notice and other elements of council minutes important to this analysis. Some of the lower levels of participation by Newtown residents can be attributed to this.

The other important sources for resident interest publicly expressed to council are the minutes of council meetings, which noted any disturbance of the meeting by spectators, interjectors or councillors. These reports, along with media reports of demonstrations outside council meetings and other unconventional actions by residents provide the remainder of the evidence used here to discuss the nature of resident action addressed to inner city municipal councils.

Both council minutes and media reports can vary over time and according to the suburb. Council minutes invariable downplay and understate conflict, as they report all activity in a formal, bureaucratic style of presentation. Some newspapers heighten and overstate the conflict by presenting it in a journalistic style and both these styles must be understood when interpreting events. The Leichhardt Municipality had the most consistent and detailed media accounts of council business in the local paper The Link, while news apropos of Newtown or Surry Hills was often overshadowed by more important developments in the CBD, as reported in the Sydney Morning Herald, nor as consistently reported as Paddington news was in the Wentworth Courier.

There are other less public actions available to residents, including lobbying, illegal actions of bribery, voting fraud and
corruption (Painter, 1973; Nicholson, 1981), and other ways of addressing municipal issues outside the council arena, such as party branch meetings (Jakubowicz, 1968). None however come within the scope of this thesis as outlined in the Introduction. It is the public expression of interest within the municipal arena which is addressed here.

The Introduction also defined as outside of the scope of this thesis detailed discussion of the implementation or outcome of local government decisions, the effect of the resident action on specific issues, policies or decisions. Adequate discussion of these aspects would require a greater focus on the way municipal councils made their decisions, while the focus here remains on the contribution residents tried to make on those decisions.

As well, unless the residents group or local media reported the outcome of a particular issue, it was difficult to determine the outcome from council records or media reports. Once an issue was referred to a committee or council officer for action it was often removed from the public eye and its bureaucratic became difficult to trace.

**Historical Patterns of Conventional Political Expression**

As introduced in Chapter Two, there have been traditional inner city interests, and traditional ways of expressing that interest in the predominantly working-class, Labor inner suburbs. Evidence in Chapters Three and Five showed that in post war Sydney residents used mostly conventional efforts of address to local government. On the whole the postwar Labor councils of the inner suburbs represented the interests of residents and there
was little for residents to take further action besides voting in local government elections. Where councils did not represent residents' interests residents did act on their own behalf, sometimes in an adversarial way, as was seen in some of the examples of Woolloomooloo in 1960 and Redfern in 1961 in Chapter Three (SMH, 23/1/61 and 7/7/60).

Until the mid-1960s there were few council or media reports of residents publicly addressing council on local issues. Instead most residents expressed their political interest and participated in municipal activities by voting for councillors. Those who did express their local interests to council publicly did so through ad hoc efforts to preserve the status quo and the amenity of their immediate environment (Painter, 1973). This included letters to council officers notifying them of rubbish which needed to be collected, or of local industry which needed to be regulated because it was noisy.

If residents did not wish to leave the administration of the municipality solely to the aldermen and council officers they had two means of public address beyond the ballot box. First there were the integrative tools of letters and petitions which "integrated" the resident into the existing political system. If residents undertook conventional action in the public sphere it usually entailed letters or petitions to council or municipal staff. In turn the aldermen had two integrative means of publicly responding to issues raised by residents: within debate, or through questions with or without notice. This chapter focusses on the residents' own public attempts to address council, although the
public actions of councillors are discussed where relevant. Second, there were a variety of adversarial, protest actions such as boycotts, demonstrations and civil disobedience. These would logically be of most use for residents when they were not in a position to carry a majority vote, or to influence their elected representatives.

The integrative and adversarial actions were both individual and collective. Letters were generally from one or two people and considered individual, while petitions seemed to include three or more people and are considered collective. Among adversarial actions there were few that were individual. Although the potential for individual adversarial action should be as wide as for any other, adversarial action was more likely taken by several people together.

The increasing size of the educated, middle-class home purchasing population in these areas brought important changes to the local political systems, especially in challenging the representativeness of council members and their definition of progress. As seen in the previous chapter many new residents did not accept the established image or amenity of these suburbs. Instead they began to promote their own definitions of progress in terms of residential pre-eminence, quality of life, as well as streets clear of rubbish and abandoned cars. Where many traditional inner city councils measured progress in the increased industrial and commercial revenue and were not too concerned about increased traffic and other environmental consequences (Link, 10/3/76), new residents increasingly defined progress as quiet and safe residential streets, valuing safety
above customer traffic. Where most residents had earlier valued progress mainly as streets clear of litter and leaves (LCM, 27/9/60), residents increasingly saw trees as a valuable contribution to residential quality of life despite the cost of maintaining them (LCM, 8/3/72).

As Painter has shown in his examination of local government in Sydney, the result was conflict of interest between new and old interests, with many new residents taking the opportunities to make their views known and to participate in the municipal decision-making and policy formation (Painter, 1973). With wider trends towards participation and consultation and the social and political skills of the new middle-class, residents also began to measure progress in their own participation in the decision-making and in the opportunities they were given to speak their mind.

The next section examines evidence of public, resident action addressed to municipal councils and what they reveal of the issues addressed by residents to council, the form they took and their variation over time. Particular attention is paid to the nature of the issues and the modes of address undertaken by residents.

**Integrative Political Expression in the Six Suburbs**

Many residents chose to express their interests to council through the traditional means of writing letters and petitions. The four municipalities of Leichhardt, Sydney, South Sydney and Woollahra witnessed a growth and subsequent decline in the political action of both individual residents and resident action
groups in these terms between 1961 and 1980.

The evidence available from the municipal council records is composed of about 1000 letters and petitions directed to the four councils from residents of the six study areas. Of them 40 percent (384) were letters and 60 percent (601) petitions. Twenty four percent (245) were sent by an organized group of some sort. Letters and petitions have similarly uneven annual frequencies across the years, suggesting that neither letters nor petitions played a special role in any particular issue or any particular year. The exception is 1980 when Paddington residents flooded Woollahra Council with petitions objecting to the proposed "PATSYM" traffic system, as discussed in Chapter Nine.

Although the letters and petitions were different in that the former were individual and the latter collective, they are treated together in many of the analytic sections. Because they were both written and thus integrative they are similar, and can be considered together, although in some instances their collective and individual natures are distinguished in the analysis.

Of the letters and petitions, 11 percent were from Annandale, 29 percent from Balmain, 13 percent Glebe, 6 percent Newtown, 28 percent Paddington and 13 percent Surry Hills (100 had no identifiable address and were not included in the analysis). When the total number from each suburb is compared to the number of dwellings in each area in 1971 the ratios show the comparative rates of household participation, as seen in Table 6.1. Balmain clearly had the highest participation with 57 letters or petitions per 1000 households, followed by Annandale and Paddington with similar ratios, Glebe, and then Surry Hills.
and Newtown. Those suburbs with the most active resident groups were also those with the most active residents altogether, linking the more individual, ad hoc activity to the collective, more organized activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb:</th>
<th>Letters/Petitions</th>
<th>Dwellings</th>
<th>per 1000 Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3171</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>5330</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5938</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4105</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>7247</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>7751</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Suburbs</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>35658</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1971 dwelling count is used as a mid-point)
(Source: 1971 Census; Council Records)

When the total number of letters and petitions are grouped into five year periods it is possible to discern some trends, as seen in Table 6.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five year period</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>Annandale</th>
<th>Balmain</th>
<th>Glebe</th>
<th>Newtown</th>
<th>Paddington</th>
<th>Surry Hills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961-65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n= 998 117 306 132 61 264 118
(Source: Council records; 1971 Census dwelling count)
Overall, the level of letters and petitions grew, peaked in 1971-1975, and fell again, reflecting both the particular situation of inner Sydney, but also the general period effect of changes in social and political attitudes in Australia, seen in the Green Bans of the Builders Labourers Federation, the freeway protests in Melbourne and Brisbane, and the anti-Vietman demonstrations more common in the early 1970s.

Within inner Sydney it is clear that Newtown was more active than the average of all suburbs (column 1) in the earlier years from 1961 to 1965, although not as high as in the more gentrified areas of Balmain and Paddington. Newtown, however, which experienced the least amount of gentrification, and experienced it the latest, was the only area which did not increase in political activity. Newtown’s early activity is less explicable unless related to the higher than average renovation activity occurring at the same time (see figure 9 in Chapter 4).

In most instances the high levels of action were instigated by environmental threats. In Leichhardt all three suburbs had high levels of resident correspondence to council. Balmain’s early peak coincided with plans for container wharf and chemical storage development, explored later in Chapter Eight. Annandale, Balmain and Glebe all had high levels of resident action from 1971 to 1975 during which there were two council elections and a gazetted town plan which would have instigated much interest. Paddington’s heightened activity in the late seventies was due to a new traffic system in 1980 vigourously debated by residents and council. In Surry Hills however, there were not as many major threats and the political activity increased more slowly, never
reaching the levels it did in the suburbs with the higher amounts of renovation investment and middle-class home purchase.

The relationship between social class and political activity can also be seen. A sample of occupations of letter and petition writers in all six suburbs was gained from comparing names of signatories to their electoral roll entries. The result showed the higher participation of blue-collar residents earlier in the period and the inverse relationship for white-collar residents over the twenty year period. Table 6.3 shows the number of letters and petitions for which the writer's occupation could be determined from the electoral roll and how a white-collar residents were more likely to use the collective tool of petitions than were working-class, blue-collar residents. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period:</th>
<th>White-Collar Letter Writers</th>
<th>White-Collar Petition Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>(No.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1965</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1970</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1975</td>
<td>61.</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1980</td>
<td>88.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.</td>
<td>84 (n=138)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Council records; Electoral rolls)

Petitions were more likely written by middle-class residents, and more likely later in the period under study. The relationship between class and letter-writing was less clear cut, although it seemed more likely to be undertaken by working-class persons with
no explicable variation over the years. Petition writing and organizing of signatures can be a more complicated process than writing a letter. It can require the organizer to spend time meeting with other residents and presenting the argument behind the petition to recruit supporters. As suggested in Chapter Two, more middle-class persons would arguably have the interests and resources necessary to undertake such efforts and would be more likely to organize petitions.

However, working-class residents did organize petitions, especially early in the period before many middle-class residents had moved into these areas. As there were fewer working-class residents over the years, there were also fewer working-class petition writers. Overall though, because of the educational and occupational resources, and the increased property incentive, writing and organizing petitions was more a middle-class political tool, and over the years an increasingly middle-class tool.

As seen in Table 6.4, 55 percent of the written actions of individuals and groups directed to council were of an "opposition" nature, objecting to a current state of affairs, whether a noisy neighbour or a planning scheme. Balmain had the largest number, likely explained by its antagonistic relationship with council and the container terminal development which council supported and to which residents were vehemently opposed. A small seven percent were of a "supportive" nature, commending council for some action which had been taken or some position held by council. It seems residents used integrative means of address to express negative views more than positive or neutral views.
Although many expressed opposition, it is interesting to see that they were still addressed in a conventional, integrative fashion. Even though the views expressed were negative, the means used to express them were not.

Table 6.4 shows that residents in Balmain and Paddington were the most vocal in almost all aspects, followed by Annandale and Glebe. These were the suburbs with some major developments planned soon after the formation of their respective resident groups, which instigated much action. They were also the suburbs with the largest amount of gentrification and dwelling renovation, increasing both the resources and incentives of residents to act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Petitions</th>
<th>Sent by a Group</th>
<th>As an Objection</th>
<th>As Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Suburbs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>284</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Council Records)

When examined in terms of overall participation, participation across time and types of participation there was a clear ranking of levels of activism directed by residents to their local councils. The suburbs with higher levels of early investment and established resident groups were also the most
active when using the conventional, political tools of letters and petitions addressed to council. Paddington and Balmain led, followed by Glebe and Annandale, followed by Newtown and Surry Hills. This is very similar to the ranking of resident action group formation and activity and also similar to the staging and pace of middle-class house purchase and renovation examined earlier.

Issues Raised Before Council in the Six Study Areas

Within the 988 letters and petitions, residents raised approximately 1240 issues. Table 6.5 identifies and ranks the seventeen distinct issues according to their percentage frequency.

The importance of proximate, imminent issues stands out as does the physical and visible nature of the more frequently addressed issues. These include nearby rubbish and abandoned cars, traffic and parking, the impact of industry in residential areas, and the desire for more, larger and better maintained parks and trees; all issues traditionally the responsibility of local government. Residents used traditional, conventional means to address traditional, conventional issues.

As seen in table 6.5, there were differences between the suburbs. Industry was not articulated as a problem in Annandale and Glebe as often as it was elsewhere, nor was traffic and parking in Surry Hills. This is not surprising as land use plans show that the amount of industry in Annandale and Glebe was relatively small compared to the levels in Balmain and elsewhere.

In Surry Hills however, traffic and parking were two of the most important issues but not as widely addressed as in the other
suburbs. This is not because of the lack of an issue—traffic and parking had always been a problem (Surry Hills Action Plan, 1974). There was high through-traffic use of major thoroughfares in the suburb making the nature of the traffic and parking issues intrinsically different in Surry Hills than in Balmain and Paddington. Where Paddington and Balmain had some major changes in traffic and parking rules due to changed traffic systems and industrial use, Surry Hills' problem was an ever-present irritation which elicited few attempts at change, perhaps because it was seen as so insoluble.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas:</th>
<th>ALL AREAS</th>
<th>ANNAN</th>
<th>DALE</th>
<th>MAIN</th>
<th>GLEBE</th>
<th>NEW-TOWN</th>
<th>PADDING</th>
<th>SURRY HILLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rubbish/cars abandoned</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trees/parks</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footpaths/streets</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoning</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nearby alterations</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>75.</td>
<td>77.</td>
<td>63.</td>
<td>82.</td>
<td>79.</td>
<td>81.</td>
<td>81.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL ISSUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjacent dw. neighbour</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social issues</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation consultation</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other issues*</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PCT.</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*includes rates, crime, local fairs, local history and general information. Rounding of percentages may have resulted in some totals not=100%)
(Source: Council Records.)
As outlined in Chapter Two, most owners were found to have similar objective interests in property matters. When examined in terms of the stakes and arenas, residents addressed council concerning issues of "control" over the physical environment. "Provision", "access" and "preservation" of the physical environment were also addressed, along with similar issues in the political environment.

Although the framework allowed for a wide variety of residential issues within the jurisdiction of local government, the evidence shows that residents addressed their councils almost solely on substantive, physical issues. They did address issues of the political process, but only in a minimal way. Despite the wide range of issues within the jurisdiction of local government, when residents addressed local government through conventional, integrative means they limited themselves to conventional, traditional issues.
Issues Beyond Traditional Estate or Interest

Despite the large number of interests addressed to local amenity and property values, residents also raised issues unrelated to the traditional interpretation of those values and often in ways unrelated to the traditional means of addressing them. According to local government tradition local councils have only had responsibility for issues within their own municipality or spatial jurisdiction. Moreover, local government tradition meant that many councils only recognized the interests of residents who held an estate or interest in the matter they were addressing.

Most residents acting as individuals on their own behalf took the logical and feasible option of working to affect their
own immediate environment instead of the larger suburban area. Individuals and small groups of residents limited the issues they addressed to council to the nearby property-related issues of tree planting, nearby pollution or development, or the condition of footpaths and streets, all of which constituted over fifty percent of the issues individuals and small groups addressed.

Residents who addressed issues in which they did not have an estate or interest were not considered "legitimate" objectors, and although their letters and petitions were received by council, they could be ignored or discounted if council chose to do so. Some councils considered the estate or interest of the signatory essential and often went to great efforts to determine how many signatures on a petition represented local residents and how many represented non-local interests. Those without local interests were considered spurious and ignored, and often used to show that whatever objections had been made were "obviously" trivial. (SSCM, 17/7/74; LCM, 27/8/74; COS, 1972).

Just as some councils often articulated interests outside their own jurisdiction, as seen in Chapter Five, some residents articulated interests outside their property jurisdiction, and beyond the jurisdiction of their local government. Many still addressed issues of local amenity and property value, but began to consider the property of other interested residents and not just their own. Residents were expanding their definition of what could affect their amenity and property value and thereby expanded their interest in issues beyond their legally defined "interest or estate".
One of the most important changes to resident interest has been residents' expanding definition of estate or interest. While the review of letters and petitions showed that proximate issues of footpaths and nearby rubbish still pre-occupied residents, some residents began to address a wider range of issues to their councils. Some were issues which would affect all parts of the suburb such as libraries or flat development codes. Other issues affected only parts of the suburb through road widening or industrial development. On these issues many residents, although unaffected themselves, might object on principle, or because of their expanded definition of "turf" and what they saw as affecting the amenity of their community.

There were 112 issues of this broader nature expressed by residents in the six areas. Most were articulated in a collective manner by an organized group of some ilk, usually a resident group, though sometimes by a local ALP branch (SCM, 9/66; 2/70), a neighbourhood centre or child care centre.

It was after the mid-sixties that the number of interests expressed to local government on broader issues increased dramatically. From 1961 to 1965 there were 12, from 1966 to 1970, 50; from 1971 to 1975, 32; and from 1976 to 1980, 18. Much of this was due to the increased activity of the RAGs which owned no property themselves but which represented the interests of "residents" generally, addressing issues of general policy and planning.

Balmain and Paddington proved exceptions to the expectation that suburb-wide issues are raised only by residents groups. Of the large number of "suburb-wide" issues brought forward to
council, a half or more were initiated by individual residents through letters or petitions, and not by resident groups. Unlike the other areas, these two areas had a larger than expected number of individual residents who were interested and active in issues larger than the area immediately surrounding their dwelling. In Paddington most of those issues concerned traffic and parking changes which affected the whole suburb. Indeed, nine of the petitions were written between April and September 1980 protesting against a new traffic system introduced by the Woollahra Council. Other issues included plans for a swimming pool in the suburb (WCM, 3/64), suburban-wide tree planting schemes (WCM, 10/66, 2/69, 8/79) and general beautification (WCM, 4/77), loss of industry (WCM, 6/69) and the loss of local pensioners benefits at Christmas (WCM, 9/68).

In Balmain, however, the issues were much more diverse, addressing the 1968 planning scheme (LCM, 6/68), use of harbour foreshores (LCM, 8/70), establishment of a youth centre (LCM, 4/74), library (LCM, 7/63) and a historical society (LCM, 11/63). Some also protested the construction of a chemical tank farm on the harbour foreshores (LCM, 6/65 and 12/67). One of the issues which sparked the largest number of signatures and petitions was council plans to end the municipal horse and cart street and gutter cleaning service. Leichhardt Council received nine petitions (totalling 747 signatures) and 14 letters on this matter at one council meeting in 1975. One came from a Sunday School, another from a public school and another from the Annandale Association. (Council noted that four came from non-
residents (LCM, 2/9/75)). Here was an old-fashioned, traditional aspect of municipal life which residents treasured. It added to the "unique" and distinctive image residents valued in their environment, and was the object of much integrative political action. The residents' efforts failed however, and the municipality purchased new equipment to undertake the same task.

Both in Paddington and Balmain, as in Surry Hills, at least 90 percent of the suburb-wide issues addressed by individual residents were initiated after the formation of their respective RAGs. This lends more evidence to the importance of collective action as a spur to individual activity, especially on issues which take residents beyond their immediate vicinity.

The Leichhardt and Sydney Councils provoked much suburb-wide interest because they gazetted several town plans over the years which interested many residents and resident groups beyond their own piece of property. These included the City of Sydney Strategic Plan (1968), Action plans for South Paddington (1974), Surry Hills (1974) and Newtown (1975) and Leichhardt plans in 1968, 1974, 1976, 1979. Open space, industrial development and flat development seemed to be particular issues in which many residents took an interest although few owned property in proximity to much of the land at issue. When hearing objections to the 1968 town plan the Leichhardt Council disregarded the representations of several unions objecting to diminished industrial land zoning because they had no "interest or estate" in the municipality (LCM, 4/6/68).

The development of a container/shipping depot at Morts Bay in Balmain was another instance in which many more objectors than
the affected residents addressed the issue, as more residents than could have lived in proximity to the proposed development objected to it (petitions of 1550 and more, LCM 8/79). The same was true of residents in Surry Hills who objected to a proposed Sydney Mission Hostel in four petitions totalling 472 signatures (SCM, 9/71).

Over the twenty years examined here increased numbers of residents addressed issues beyond their traditional property estate or interest. Most were addressed after gentrification had begun, and after resident groups had formed in their suburbs. Although residents might not have held the traditional estate or interest in the matters they addressed, many of the issues were traditional responsibilities of local government, and most of the residents who addressed them did so in an integrative and conventional way through petitions.

Issues Beyond Traditional Municipal Interest

The residents not only raised larger non-proximate issues in opposition to local political tradition. They also raised new interests which contradicted local municipal practice. Because council control could change with an election, whether an issue was relevant or irrelevant to a council could also change overnight. Where provision of local employment, increased rate revenue and increased residential development might be important interests supported by council, a reversal in a political majority and subsequent council leadership could make such of minor importance to the new council majority. The evidence showed that gentrification played an important role in increasing the
more vocal expressions of interests marginal to the local political traditions.

A review of literature and council minutes and records showed that for a long time many municipal councils in the inner city had a dual role in promoting progress in the area. One responsibility was to maintain the public property and general health of the municipality, the other to increase the rate base and thus the revenue of the municipality (Bluett, 1987, (Stuckey, ed.)). This was accomplished by encouraging commercial and industrial enterprises to operate in the municipality to increase the rate base, by ensuring that the roads and footpaths essential to these enterprises were in useable condition.4

In Labor-controlled working-class municipalities these goals were supplemented with an interest in providing housing and employment for residents (LHAC, 1966). Although the activities were costly, the interests were longstanding and powerful in size and influence. Building council housing for and padding council employment lists with constituents and their family members could be seen both as vote-getters and as socially responsible undertakings in working-class areas where both housing and employment were often difficult to find (Jakubowicz, 1974; Painter, 1973).

With the falling population levels in the older, inner suburbs councils became interested in maintaining the size of the population in order to maintain their electoral support too. Some councils began to encourage flat development and higher density residential development to overcome the effects of the diminishing occupancy rate and average household size (Link,
Along with the traditional municipal issues of physical maintenance, housing, employment, and population growth, flat development became an issue promoted by the more traditional Labor councils.

Over the period examined here both individual residents and resident groups increased their activity and raised more "untraditional" issues. In most instances resident groups supported traditional council activities such as tree planting Paddington in 1966 (SCM 12/10/66) and planning efforts such as the Plan for Paddington which was warmly received by Woollahra Council in 1971 (PSN, 1/71). However, many of the issues addressed by such groups in the six areas from 1961 to 1980 were unrelated to the local political concerns of their councils at the time. Few supported or encouraged their councils in their planning policy or other actions, asking instead for a change of direction to improve the residential amenity through encouraging preservation of historic buildings (LCM, 8/72; SCM, 9/65), and providing open space (LCM, 9/66; 8/71). Inner city councils often viewed these to be at the cost of what they considered more desireable population growth and rate revenue because they discouraged flat development, and industrial development (Link, 10/3/76), while encouraging greater municipal spending for new libraries, tree planting, and acquiring land for open space.

These issues new to inner city municipalities were also raised by individual residents and ad hoc collections of residents represented on petitions. Resident groups had no monopoly on innovative interests unrelated to local political
traditions. Support for libraries (LCM, 7/63), historical societies (LCM 5/11/63), parkland (LCM 11/4/61; SSCM 13/12/76), objections to flat development (SSCM, 8/79); 3/72) or industrial expansion (LCM 8/79) came from individual residents as well as resident groups.

New Issues Unrelated to Property

Residents also raised some new issues unrelated to property matters of amenity or property value. These were issues of social welfare and of municipal participation, consultation and information, related to the contemporary reform politics examined by Vidich and Bensman (1971) in Chapter Two. Before 1970 they were rarely addressed by local residents, but were increasingly valued and articulated by residents from 1971 to 1976, and often by resident action groups. Fifty five percent of the social issues and participation issues of the twenty year period examined here were raised between 1971 and 1976, only five years of the twenty period. Twenty nine percent of such issues were raised from 1965 to 1970 and 16 percent afterwards from 1977 to 1980. The evidence shows that most of the issues directly concerned with matters other than physical maintenance and preservation only became important at the time the inner areas were also undergoing social and physical change and declined as gentrification was more common and resident groups declining in activity. Although the increased number of educated, articulate residents had organized to protect their property interests they also articulated interests unrelated to property.

To the traditionally Labor-controlled councils the new interests in political voice and participation were definitely
marginal. They were seen as a minority view residents and were in opposition to council's interests. Labor councils traditionally made their decisions in caucus, using council meetings as a time to announce their decisions, not discuss them. Labor Mayors invited discussion outside council meetings (BAN, 8/69; SSCM, 1/8/73) but most did not encourage resident participation in council meetings (Painter, 1973). Because resident groups and new middle-class interests raised the issues as minorities their interests were not usually taken into account. As a result, resident groups argued for more opportunities for residents to influence decisions makers.

One of the first efforts of residents to encourage their participation in decision-making was a Paddington Society request to have the Society's objections displayed alongside the locally exhibited City of Sydney Planning Scheme (SCM, 13/4/65). Neither that request nor similar ones of the Balmain Association to Leichhardt Council were successful (LCM, 8/3/66; 14/6/66). After the Glebe Society made written submission to Council on some plans for the Glebe waterfront the Leichhardt Council was willing to commend the Glebe Society "for its interest in the future development of Glebe" (LCM, 20/8/69). However at the same time it denied the Balmain Association opportunities to address the same plan as it pertained to Balmain (BAN, 8/69).

Council could do more than say "no" to residents' requests for participation and consultation. There is evidence that council often ignored requests by tabling letters or petitions without responding (BAN, 8/76). The local press claimed that
some were not tabled at council meetings but held over until the interest in the issue had diminished or was no longer an issue (Glebe, 15/9/71).

Several aspects of the local political situation changed after these initial attempts by resident groups to introduce new council procedures and decision-making processes. In the 1970s interest groups throughout Australia pursued issues of participation which helped make them more acceptable and less unusual as issues (ACOSS, 1974). In Paddington there is evidence that because of the Society's interest in participating in local decisions and the council's willingness for it to take part, the approaches of the Paddington Society to Woollahra became less formal in the seventies. Council did not require letters and petitions but instead invited the Paddington Society to take part in meetings and conversations to convey the Society's interests to the Council (WCF, 365g, 1971). As participation and consultation became more common between the Society and the council there were fewer and fewer instances of letters or petitions received by Council from the Society, and by 1971 the Society and Council seemed to be cooperating on the Paddington Plan in a less formal and more cooperative fashion.

Thus as the number of middle-class homeowners were increasing in Paddington and becoming less of a minority, the Paddington Society seemed to be more of an accepted political actor. Council considered participation and consultation issues less threatening and more acceptable than before. Despite the cooperation, attempts to introduce formal public participation at council meetings through a "public forum" failed (WC, 30/5/79) at
the same time residents complained that they were never consulted on local decisions (WCF, 365g, 6/79). After these failures in changing council procedure residents ceased expressing any interest in matters of participation.

In Leichhardt the independent-controlled council from 1971 to 1973 encouraged resident participation and consultation which precluded much of the imperative need for residents to pressure council on those matters (Hampton and Pike, 1974). However, as Sandercock has pointed out, participation did not supply all the solutions Leichhardt residents and aldermen were looking for. Not all residents took the opportunity to contribute and most of the participants and contributors were middle-class, professional people who had been addressing council for several years already (Sandercock, 1978). The council elected in 1974 was less sympathetic to such interests. Instead of continuing their struggle for municipal reform, the residents abandoned their efforts at encouraging resident participation on the municipal level. With the new council, resident interests had again become incompatible with council interests. As in Woollahra, Leichhardt residents did not articulate such interests again.

In summary, the nearly 1000 letters and petitions addressed to the four municipal councils by residents and groups from 1961 to 1980 show the more frequent use of integrative action among residents. Most of the residents acted to address issues traditionally recognized by local government as relevant to residents' interests in local amenity. Overall, many of the
residents' actions were conventional both in form and substance. However, there were some uncommon issues directed to council through the conventional means of address and these increased at the same time middle-class renovation increased.

**Adversarial Modes of Address**

The other distinctive aspect of resident interest in relation to local government during the 1960s and 1970s was the mode of address undertaken by residents and directed to their councils. So far the integrative methods have been examined. The more unusual methods were the adversarial, protest-oriented action reported in council minutes, local newspapers and resident group newsletters. Although demonstrations, public meetings and angry debates have been part of political history for centuries they were, by the 1970s, still infrequent compared to the conventional means residents used to express interest in political arenas.

In inner Sydney in the 1960s and 1970s the minority position of certain resident groups denied them the municipal representation and influence they wished. The minority position of some individuals and groups left them little option but to adopt "adversarial" or protest-oriented actions to attract council's attention and, residents hoped, wield some influence. This section examines those adversarial actions and analyzes them in each municipality in terms of the nature of the interests they addressed.

Protest action was a useful tool for residents for three reasons. First it served to separate each issue as a "single issue" to make for more efficient or successful management.
Second, protest action also added special emphasis and attracted public attention to the issue. Such action could also serve to alienate the residents from the council, other established institutions, and characterize the residents and their suburbs as "different". Each of these can be seen in the resident action in areas of gentrification.

In Leichhardt residents frequently resorted to adversarial and often disruptive tactics to ensure that their interests were voiced and heard. During debate on the planning scheme to be gazetted in 1968, 100 people with objections to the scheme packed the council gallery, carrying placards and interjecting throughout the meeting (Local Leader, 12/6/68). This was not an instance of making the plan a "single issue", as there were many planning issues involved. Nor was it a case of highlighting the importance of any one suburb over another, as the plan affected all parts of the municipality. The protest over the Leichhardt Plan was more a case of making planning and residential amenity more important issues than any others, so that they would be promoted before industrial or other development.

When Leichhardt Council was discussing whether or not to rescind the motion allowing the container development in Balmain, spectators heckled aldermen and delayed the meeting until 3:30 am (Link, 25/9/68). At other meetings residents sparked heckling by other groups of demonstrators, and prompted an alderman to move for council’s dismissal by the Minister for Local Government (LCM, 30/4/68). Although residents did not succeed in having the motion in regards to the containers rescinded, their noise and
large numbers of participants ensured that the strength of their interest was acknowledged by both the council and the community.

Eight years later residents in Leichhardt were pursuing these tactics with greater force. Fifteen hundred residents attended a stormy council meeting to protest a flat development code which would allow buildings of six storeys (Link, 10/3/76). Several months later 150 demonstrators met for the same reason, breaking through doors of the council chamber to be readmitted to the meeting where the decision was to be made (Link, 4/8/76). Although their success was not immediate, nor solely due to the residents’ protest action, the residents had succeeded in making a single issue of the flat code, and the council did eventually adopt a code more acceptable to these resident interests.

Numerous Sydney Council meetings were closed in the midst of heckling and disruption while council tried to discuss residential issues (though few were apropos of interests in Surry Hills, Newtown or Paddington) (SCM, 1/6/70; 13/7/70). The Sydney Council however seemed more sympathetic than other councils to resident efforts in encouraging public participation in town planning schemes (SCM, 18/12/72), public attendance at council meetings (SCM, 10/2/75), and public availability of council committee papers (SCM, 14/11/77). Although the council was controlled by non-resident interests, it at least had the facade of more progressive, municipal management.

In South Sydney middle-class involvement in the adversarial action was more evident (SSCM, 12/9/73; 26/9/73; 10/10/73; 21/11/73; 20/4/77). Unlike the interests expressed in the other local government areas, most of the adversarial action was
directed to reform of council procedure. The council was more secretive than any other, and preserved more of the traditional conservative ALP practices than any other council. Resident action only served to highlight the peculiar practices of the council above the unusual interests of the residents. A particular middle-class group of activists succeeded in disrupting council business eight weeks running, and at one point were arrested for holding a mock council meeting in the public gallery during a council meeting (SSCM, 12/9/73).

The property interests of Newtown residents directed to the South Sydney Council were not as evident as those displayed by residents in Paddington and Leichhardt. There were many property interests involved in the planned Housing Commission development in Waterloo in the 1970s, but that did not concern residents of Newtown. Instead some residents from Newtown were aroused in defense of their interest in council proceedings and business. Council practice was to refuse residents' requests for questions to be allowed from the gallery (SSCM, 1/8/73), conduct business so that meetings were often only 20 or 30 minutes in length (SSCM, 2/75; 16/6/75; 39/6/75), and often revise council minutes from the verbatim report (SSCM, 9/1/74). For several years council ignored standard local government procedure by refusing to receive questions from aldermen without notice or to report the precis of incoming correspondence (SSCM, 1975-1977). These and other procedural irregularities were the target of the protest rather than council decisions on residential property matters.
On the whole the protest-oriented, adversarial actions undertaken by residents from the six suburbs were directed to property issues (industrial and flat development) except in Newtown in South Sydney where there was a particular interest in council meeting procedure. When residents held interests marginal to those of the council they usually undertook more conventional forms of address when first addressing the issue although sometimes undertaking protest action to also draw council and public attention to their interest. Success in gaining council's favour often depended on a myriad of factors which differed from issue to issue.

The literature reviewed in Chapter Two predicted greater participation by middle-class residents in such activities (Nachmias and Palen, 1982; Steinberger, 1984). The participation of new middle-class homeowners in these efforts is difficult to measure, but many of the protests involved resident groups which were largely middle-class. In South Sydney the Mayor actually named the residents involved in certain demonstrations and all had middle-class occupations (SSCM, 29/8/73). As well, most of the instances within council meetings occurred at the time of or after the heightened increase in middle-class renovation identified earlier, which would increase the likelihood of middle-class participation in those actions.
Summary

This chapter has examined the local political activity of residents in the six study areas, focussing on the public efforts residents used in an attempt to influence council decisions: integrative tools of letters and petitions and adversarial tools of meeting disruption and demonstrations. The evidence from the local papers and the records of the four council revealed several important aspects of the nature of resident action.

Not all middle-class residents were in the same position at the same time. Residents in the suburbs with the larger number of middle-class residents and higher levels of renovation investment used the integrative actions more frequently, with increasing participation by middle-class residents. The promotion of innovative practices and the use of adversarial action also rose with middle-class change, but often depended on the residents' relationship with the municipal council.

Before gentrification began, local residents relied more on letters and less on petitions to convey their views to councils. The use of petitions rose after the more organized collective action began with resident groups and after more middle-class residents had moved into the suburbs. Petitions were more likely written by middle-class residents which makes their increased use with gentrification logical. The use of both letters and petitions rose in the mid-1970s, and fell in the late 1970s because of residents' poor and then improved relationships with municipal councils, the many and then the fewer controversial developments but also because of the general period effect of changes in overall political and social attitudes in Australia.
Where in the early seventies the Federal government encouraged resident participation and the BLF joined residents in protests on urban issues, residents increased their awareness and activity and made their interest manifest on local issues. By 1979/1980 many councils were more sympathetic to resident interests, the resident groups were less active, and the ethos of both local and national attitudes was more conservative and low-key.

As expected, most residents did have similar objective property interests as issues of proximate, property-related matters were addressed more than any other issues. The presence of rubbish and abandoned cars was the most frequently addressed issue overall, followed by traffic and parking issues, the presence of industry and the need for more trees and parks. Although the framework allowed for a wide variety of issues, most of the issues addressed were within the "physical" arena, and most were concerned with the issue of "control" with few concerned with provision, access or preservation.

However, gentrification did change many aspects of local political tradition. When residents did address more locally innovative issues or use more adversarial actions, they did so only after gentrification had begun, and many of the activists were middle-class, or were largely middle-class resident groups. Although precise explanation is not clear, letters and petitions from middle-class residents addressed to council seemed to follow the trends of middle-class home purchasing and renovation.

Resident group activity and the issues they addressed
however, were different. They often reflected the attempts of residents to express themselves in a more attention-getting and distinctive way, which is better related to the growing middle-class constituencies of the inner suburb than to increased renovation investment. The importance of the group activity and its role in resident action is examined next.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER SIX:

1 This is based on approximately 30 meetings per year for two councils from 1961 to 1980 (Sydney and Leichhardt) and two councils from 1968 to 1980 (Woollahra and South Sydney.)

2 Appendix 5 shows the annual figures for petitions from all six areas from 1961 to 1980 and the annual figures for petitions addressed to the State Legislative Assembly as a comparison.

3 In Australia the Federal electoral roll is updated and printed approximately every 18-24 months. Until the early 1980s each entry in the roll included the person’s name, address and occupation. From the 988 letters and petitions a sample of 400 was chosen to be examined in the electoral roll, and 209 persons with the correct address were found, their occupations noted and they are tabulated in Table 6.3.

4 A review of Council Health Administration Reports provides detail for these more general statements and comments.
Chapter Six found that most residents expressed their interests to council in a traditional way. The issues were generally related to nearby property and expressed through conventional means of letter or petition. Some interests went beyond property, and some were expressed in an adversarial fashion many by resident groups. This chapter examines more closely the interests and actions of these groups, and the processes of local political change they instigated.

Four groups were chosen for closer study: the Paddington Society, Balmain Association, Glebe Society and Annandale Association. Although there were other resident groups in the four suburbs, and other suburbs with resident groups, the council records and media reports showed these to be the most active groups in the six areas. All four began by representing minority interests to council, all expressed interest in enhancing their suburbs own distinctive characteristics, and in influencing council to do the same. However, each group differed in size and subsequent strength and the efforts it undertook.

Part one examines the issues and the actions of all groups to set the overall context in which the groups operated, part two focusses on the efforts of each group to distinguish their suburbs from other areas, and the third section on each group's
efforts to influence events and outcomes in their suburbs.

The Background to Resident Activity in Sydney

The pushes of the Rocks and Balmain were roaming gangs of young troublemakers, infamous in their day for their viciousness, but also for their solidarity and often successful ventures. The organized resident groups of the 1960s and 1970s lacked the violent and criminal aspects of their predecessors but shared with them a common interest in the especially distinctive aspects of their local turf which they wanted to defend. Nineteenth century pushes accomplished this by roaming the streets to gather allies, mark out and defend their turf from the invasion of other gangs. The twentieth century variety circulated newsletters and press reports, organized protests and gathered members to protect their turf from outside threats and municipal neglect. Both were marginal to the social and political institutions of their time.

However, the similarities end there. The four resident action groups studied here organized between 1964 and 1970, a time of increased resident action throughout inner Sydney. There had been interest groups in residential areas for many years before then. "Citizen and Ratepayer" associations and "Progress Associations" were the most common. Often the only remaining evidence of their activity lies in centenary books, "Diamond Jubilee" celebrations and publications printed by municipal associations at various anniversaries (Newtown Munic. Co, 1922; Ryan, 1979). Unfortunately the evidence of their activity is negligible except at times of major political decisions and then only occasionally. The Sydney Morning Herald did report the role
of the Balmain, Leichhardt and Annandale Citizen and Ratepayer Associations in the sacking and re-institution of the Leichhardt Council from 1952 to 1956, but did not often report other groups' activities at other times (SMH, 12/18/52; 16/4/53).

In postwar Sydney there was almost no resident group activity in the midst of several important political and planning issues in inner Sydney. Instead the Labor councils protected the interests of the working-class tenant majority. In the Surry Hills example discussed earlier, local industrialists lobbied for industrial expansion in the residential parts of the suburb, which the Labor aldermen argued against, with no support by any resident group (SMH, 31/8/51; 23/8/51). In the example of the Redfern Mail Exchange in 1958 the Herald reported a group of residents who organized to defend their interests against State government initiatives, yet without any identifiable leader or name (SMH, 23/1/61).

In the early 1960s the Woolloomooloo District Progress Association was visible and vocal several times on issues of noise (SCM, 8/62), lighting (SCM, 9/63), general tidiness (SCM, 9/63) and planning (SCM, 4/66). Otherwise, prior to 1967 the only groups which approached any of the councils on residential issues were the Communist Party in Leichhardt (LCM, 2/62) and the ALP in Sydney (Phillip, Pyrmont and Surry Hills (SCM, 8/7/61) branches). The Newtown District Planning Objectors Association (NDPOA) often advertised activities in the local papers but there is no evidence of its success in influencing decision-making.

From the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s, resident groups formed in Sydney, with many in the inner suburbs. Some were
short lived, some narrow in scope (Duke Street RAG in Balmain). Some were encouraged by the activity of other groups (peace groups, Aboriginal groups) directed against other forms of authority and some were discouraged by their lack of resources and understanding (South Sydney Community Aid, 1974). Their cause was aided by the publication of "Everyone's Handbook for Everyday Action" (1975), originating from the Community Action Exchange in Sydney and written by a collection of university-educated social workers (Martin Mowbray), academics (Eva Cox, Rob Mowbray) and future politicians (Robert Tickner). This book both encouraged and informed inner city residents in matters relating to the quality of their living environments.

Resident groups in areas of gentrification addressed a variety of issues, adopting different tactics. What the groups did share in most cases was a minority status that shaped their relationship with State and local government and the political tactics they used to influence local government. The minority status of the groups stemmed from three aspects: their social status, their political goals, and their political tactics.

They were a social minority that did not reflect the historical and contemporary makeup of the suburb. The interests they pursued were often novel compared to those traditionally expressed to local government such as proximate, property-related issues. Their minority status and innovative local interests gave them two alternatives: they could resort to circumvention to try to get around certain obstacles or they could try to reform the decision-making institutions. However, as middle-
class homeowners many resident group members also had resources of education and income and status as property owners and voters. With that status they could also use conventional and integrative tactics of reform or participation within the democratic/legal system. Middle-class resident action groups therefore had both the incentive and the skills to use both integrative and adversarial action, and frequently pursued both.

The data for this chapter was drawn from the records of resident action groups, the municipal councils and the local media. The newsletters of the four groups from 1964 to 1980 numbered 425 altogether, representing 67% of those of the Paddington Society, 73% the Balmain Association, 95% of the Annandale Association, and 89% of the Glebe Society bulletins. The content of the newsletters was generally consistent in all groups over the years. When the content seemed sparse it often reflected a general low-key period for the group, reflecting fewer activities and fewer political actions overall. Other records were consulted when appropriate, however their frequency and availability did vary greatly and were not considered a substantial contribution to the evidence.

A review of group activity and group newsletters revealed a pattern of tactics and methods of social and political activity which helped explain some of the variation in how frequently certain issues were reported. Some activities were undertaken frequently and reported frequently, others were undertaken frequently but left unreported, almost taken for granted. These types of activities can be detected in reports to the society's annual general meeting. Sometimes a person or
committee reported on their activities of the past year, such as attending council meetings, or liaising with other groups, when there had been no previous evidence of the activities having taken place during the year (see for example BAN, 10/79; GSN, 8/79). Other actions were rarely undertaken but always reported when carried out, and others infrequent in both their occurrence and their reporting. These are seen in table 7.1.

Table 7.1: Frequency of Reported and Unreported Activities In Ranked Order Frequent (1) to Infrequent (18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENTLY UNDERTAKEN AND FREQUENTLY REPORTED</th>
<th>FREQUENTLY UNDERTAKEN ALTHOUGH OFTEN UNREPORTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social gathering</td>
<td>11. Attendance at council meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Working bee</td>
<td>12. Meetings with Mayor, aldermen and council officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Joining and supporting other groups</td>
<td>13. Writing to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lectures/guest speakers</td>
<td>14. Writing to or meeting with State officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tours and visits to other places</td>
<td>15. Monitoring the press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizing public meetings</td>
<td>16. Organizing petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Encourage members to write members, or to join and support other groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFREQUENTLY UNDERTAKEN ALTHOUGH OFTEN REPORTED</th>
<th>INFREQUENTLY REPORTED AND INFREQUENTLY UNDERTAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Writing local histories</td>
<td>17. Send telegrams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Preparing submissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: RAG newsletters)

The activities are ranked from the most frequently reported (1) to the least frequently reported (18). Those in the left column are primarily actions which help establish the distinctive and valuable aspects of each group's own organizational activity and the residential environment they lived in, which can help
increase membership growth and participation in the group. Those on the right are primarily actions undertaken to achieve a particular outcome, usually on a political level.

The more frequently reported actions are the participatory actions from which groups can gain strength and a measure of success from the participation of many members. High levels of participation can improve group identity, which is important for the "different" image groups try to maintain. High levels of membership increases financial support, and can maximise the work to be accomplished at working bees and other functions. Moreover, maximum participation can increase the impact of an event in the eyes of the public, the targetted institution and the media, which is important in establishing images of distinctiveness and significance (Huenefeld, 1970).

The attention and support given to other like-minded groups helps reinforce the group's sense of significance -- but on a larger level. A review of resident group newsletters shows that groups share their own sense of purpose and importance with other groups, encouraging a sense of common goals and activities as they join in opposition to many of the same State instrumentalities and municipal councils. This could give each group an improved sense of identity, recognition and improved legitimation on a larger than local level which could boost the confidence of members in fighting larger than local authorities, and which could make an impact on the authorities when dealing with the groups.

The less frequently reported actions are those undertaken by
residents to actually protect or promote what they considered the valuable aspects of their environment. Because these are undertaken by a few on behalf of many others they are understood as "representative actions" as first discussed in Chapter Two. These actions, however, are often only useful in promoting the group’s interests once the particular reputation of the residents’ group has been established. A local government staff member or an elected member would find it difficult to understand the "importance" of a residents group’s strength or interest by meeting an individual group representative without some sort of image or reputation established earlier through participatory events. A group must establish a size and image which can be made manifest, which is then recognized, even if not completely accepted. Once the group establishes its legitimacy a few spokespersons can then represent the interests of many persons (Huenefeld, 1970).

The more frequent activities, although requiring organization, time and skill, are single events, of a "one off" nature requiring less commitment and involvement by fewer members. The less frequent activities such as writing local histories, publishing books on the local issues, preparing planning documents and submissions to government are longer term projects in their germination but when accomplished are widely publicized and displayed by the group.

Those activities and events which are frequent but seldom reported are in turn the nuts and bolts of each groups’ political activism and political legitimation. It would be wrong to assume that because the activities are infrequently mentioned, they are
rarely practised. For each of the groups in this study these political activities were ongoing, which is doubtless why they were so seldom reported. Presidents, secretaries and executive members of committees would most likely be responsible for the frequent, but often unreported political activities of the group. This is true not only because of the centripetal nature of group activity which draws more responsibility to the central few, but also because of the nature of activities undertaken. All of these are representative activities carried out by a few people on behalf of the group as a whole. Although there are instances when it is useful for all members of a RAG to meet with the Mayor, the more logistically feasible, and in most instances the more productive tactic is to elect one or more spokespersons to represent the group as a whole. This is the value of group formation and activity not available to individuals.

The actions of resident groups can then be understood in terms of the framework seen in originally set out in Chapter Two, which categorized actions according to their nature, either individual or collective, adversarial or integrative (Fig. 7.1).
Figure 7.1: Nature of RAG Actions Directed to Political Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVERSARIAL</th>
<th>INTEGRATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>public meetings</td>
<td>social events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protest meetings</td>
<td>tours and visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend council meetings</td>
<td>working bees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand out leaflets</td>
<td>lectures and speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend council meetings</td>
<td>join and support other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>send telegrams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepare submissions/</td>
<td>organize petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>booklets</td>
<td>monitor press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organize petitions</td>
<td>write histories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>publish books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: RAG newsletters)

In summary, although there is evidence of resident action both in the form of neighbourhood gangs and progress associations, the resident action groups of the 1960s and 1970s provided some of the most detailed evidence on organized resident activity. Some events are reported more frequently than others, but can be understood in terms of what the resident group can accomplish through them, whether building up membership or image, or exerting political influence.

Issues Addressed by the Resident Groups

Not all groups addressed the same issues, or did so in the same manner. A review of each groups' newsletters revealed that the groups addressed many of the same issues addressed by individual residents and ad hoc petitioning groups, with some important differences. Thirteen general issues were identified as having been addressed most often by all four groups (Table 7.1). The high frequency of issues concerning physical aspects and
property matters is most clear, with the highest percentage in Paddington, followed by Balmain and Glebe and then Annandale. Although resident groups had scope for a wide variety of issues, and addressed different issues, their prime interest was in issues affecting their residential amenity.

The greater interest in property matters also occurred in the suburbs with the higher levels of renovation investment and social change. Traffic and aesthetics were the most important in Paddington, where there had been the most number of changes in alteration and additions, and where, as will be seen, traffic was a particular problem. Industry and planning were the most important in Balmain, and the two were closely related, as will be pursued in Chapter Nine.

In an unexpected way, social welfare issues were the most frequently addressed issues in Glebe and Annandale. Glebe had more residents in public housing (after the Commonwealth acquired, renovated and rented dwellings in the Glebe Estate in 1974), and in private rental housing than any of the other suburbs. Because of this, the emphasis on social welfare could be seen as the Society addressing first the interests of the suburb as a whole, and then the interests of the Society, which was generally middle-class.

These issues are in contrast to those raised by residents to municipal councils (Chapter Six) both in terms of the issues they addressed and the institutions to which they were addressed. The target of resident action groups included State authorities, elected State representatives, as well as Federal representatives.
This wide variety in turn allowed residents a wide scope of issues to address. When limited to municipal council as seen in the previous chapter, residents limited their major interests to the condition of footpaths and streets, the proliferation of rubbish and abandoned cars, and the need for more parks and trees. However, of all those issues, the groups only addressed issues of parks and trees which was infrequent, and the other physical issues raised by residents to council they did not address at all.

Table 7.2: Issues Addressed by the Four Resident Action Groups, 1964-1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annandale Association</th>
<th>Balmain Association</th>
<th>Glebe Society</th>
<th>Paddington Society</th>
<th>All Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aesthetics</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trees</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parks</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noise/air pollution</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td>55.</td>
<td>48.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;navel gazing&quot;¹</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social welfare</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other groups</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>40.</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>37.</td>
<td>37.</td>
<td>36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elections</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local history</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. of Total</td>
<td>98.</td>
<td>96.</td>
<td>98.</td>
<td>98.</td>
<td>97.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Issues</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages do not total to 100 as some <2% were excluded)
¹"navel gazing" is often reflecting on the progress of the group or the social changes within the suburb.
(Source: RAG newsletters)
Although resident groups were not limited to the municipal arena, the groups addressed many of their issues in the municipal arena and addressed them in terms of the action they wished council to take, especially to determine events or amenities the groups wished to stop or get, protect or promote. That is, most groups addressed issues of action or decision-making, hoping to influence the outcome of events.

Between six and eight percent of issues within each group were not issues of action, but were instead a strange combination of general discussion and some self-reflection along the lines of "what are we doing, do we have any accomplishments and should we continue?" There was no intention for the group or its members to act on these issues, but to be aware of them. This was the case for example when discussing the incidence of burglaries in their suburbs (PSN, 5/70; AAN, 7/73), the poor attendance at meetings (BAN, 9/79; AAN, 6/4), or the activities of other groups (AAN, 6/73; 6/76).

In summary, resident action groups have a variety of targets for their action, but address municipal issues more than any other. Like residents who address municipal council the actions of resident groups are addressed primarily to property issues which can affect the property values and amenities of their dwellings and local communities. However, they are generally the wider issues of planning and aesthetics, rarely raising the more common municipal issues of rubbish or trees.

It is difficult to understand the relationship of resident interests and their changing tactics without examining the
particular circumstances of each group. The next section presents a short profile of each group and then examines the extent to which the groups were both in a minority, and out of favour with local government, and how they operated in those circumstances to pursue their interests in distinctive residential environments, property value and political participation.

**Resident Group Efforts to Establish Distinctiveness**

The Paddington Society was the first of the four groups to form in 1964. Of all the inner suburbs it was the first to undergo both the social change and renovation investment of gentrification. As such its residents had both the resources and incentive earlier than any residents in any other suburb to organize a residents' group. Members began with the initial intention of improving the living conditions and general amenity of the suburb (PSN, 4/67; 9/71) while remaining "non-political", eg. unaligned to any political party (PSN, 6/68). From 1967 to 1969 the Society successfully financed and presented a legal case against road widening and dwelling demolition on several Paddington roads and embarked on an eventually successful campaign to gain historic preservation status. By 1970 it reached its peak membership of over 1000 and in the winter of 1971 agreed to disregard Society tradition and policy by supporting candidates for local government election, who in the end did not gain seats. Although the Society continued to address issues of preservation and planning, membership in 1977 dropped to 314, a pre-1966 level (PSN, 10/77) and some members recommended that the group scale-down and adopt a caretaking role (PSN, 10/77).
The Balmain Association formed in 1965 with residents interested in local amenity issues. Of the suburbs considered here, Balmain was the second most popular suburb, with earlier social change and renovation investment than neighbouring Annandale and Glebe. Shortly after formation the Association members undertook to defend an historic "Watch House" from demolition and to oppose the development of container terminals on the Balmain foreshores (BAN, 8/75). They succeeded in the former, and failed in the latter, which, with the recently exhibited 1968 planning scheme also heightened their interest in issues of resident participation and consultation with municipal government. The State government's plan to develop the large scale container depot and the subsequent municipal town plans for 1974 and 1979 provoked the groups interest in local planning along with interest in a municipal library (BAN, 6/68), the cancellation and subsequent re-institution of ferry service to Circular Quay (BAN, 6/69) and the publication and sale of several local history books (BAN, 12/70). By 1979 the Association had its largest membership with over 500 and yet its lowest participation with leaders threatening to wind up the Association (BAN, 1/79).

The Glebe Society formed in 1969 in opposition to State threats of dwelling demolition and freeway construction in the suburb and to several applications for flat development council was considering at the time (GSN 1/71). Like the other groups Glebe Society members prepared a plan for its suburb arguing for preservation and protection from "unsympathetic" development.
Unlike the other groups, the Glebe Society spent more time and energy on issues of local social welfare, either initiating projects or encouraging the efforts of others. By 1980 the freeway plans had been shelved and the Society reached its peak of 500 members despite signs of apathy and diminished activity by most members (GSN, 5/80).

The Annandale Association was the last of the four groups to organize in 1970. Always the smallest of the groups, it had a peak membership of 223 in 1976 (AAN, 9/76). Of the four suburbs with resident groups examined here it had the lowest population and also had relatively small amounts of social change and renovation investment. Like their neighbours in Glebe the Annandale residents organized to oppose freeways planned through their suburb. The Annandale group also fought to prevent demolition of an historic dwelling of a unique Victorian style known as one of the "Witches Houses" because its' highly pitched roof resembled a steeple or witches hat. This involved the group in other planning issues resulting in the production of a "Plan for Annandale" recommending preservation and low-density residential redevelopment (Annandale Assn, 1971). Compared to the other resident groups the Annandale Association devoted more time and attention to participatory actions of social events, tours and trips. Membership numbers peaked in the late 1970s as membership interests ebbed.

All groups were distinguished by a great variation in reported membership numbers over the years. The smallest was the Annandale Association at its very beginning in February 1970, with 60 members. However, the Annandale Association always
remained the smallest group. The largest group was the Paddington Society, with a peak of 1000 members in March 1976, and low levels both early in 1966 when the Society had just formed, and late in 1977 as membership ebbed. Table 7.3 shows the membership levels over the years.

Table 7.3: Reported Levels of Membership in Four Resident Action Groups, 1966-1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annandale Association</th>
<th>Balmain Association</th>
<th>Glebe Society</th>
<th>Paddington Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mo./Yr</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Mo./Yr</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/66</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/66</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/69</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>12/69</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3/70</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/70</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>7/70</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/70</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4/71</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/71</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8/71</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/73</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4/72</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/75</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6/75</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/76</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>11/76</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/77</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>10/77</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/79</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/80</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: RAG Records)

The groups were also distinguished by the large number of members with white-collar occupations (professional, administrative, sales and clerical as measured by the census) disproportionate to their share of their respective suburb's population. The participation of the middle-class residents was much higher than their participation in the resident action directed to municipal councils seen in the previous chapter.
Organized resident action was clearly more of a middle-class activity, and increasingly so over the years. Table 7.4 shows the occupations of the membership and Table 7.5 the change over time.

Table 7.4: Occupations of Resident Groups from 1966/67-1979/80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations of Resident Groups</th>
<th>Annandale</th>
<th>Balmain</th>
<th>Glebe</th>
<th>Paddington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White-collar</td>
<td>83.</td>
<td>92.</td>
<td>95.</td>
<td>97.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Of the total sample of names was 836, 405 (48%) were on the electoral roll from which the occupations were determined.

Table 7.5: Occupations of RAG members in 4 Selected Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White-collar</td>
<td>87.</td>
<td>90.</td>
<td>93.</td>
<td>96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See notes for Table 7.4)

As first discussed in Chapter Two, resident groups are interested in establishing their respective identities and public images both as a group, and as residents of a suburb. Much of that effort is directed to establishing the unique nature of the group and the suburb the residents live in, trying to make them distinct from other residential areas. They did this in acts of self-promotion and general discussions of the aims and accomplishments of the group. There were several aspects of the group and the suburb which could be distinctive; sometimes it was the physical, other
times the political or resource aspects of the suburb, as outlined in the framework in Chapter Two. This next section discusses those efforts of the groups in those terms.

The Paddington Society

The Paddington Society tried to express the important and unique nature of both the suburb in many ways, stressing the physical and social characteristics of its suburb more than the political or resource characteristics. The Society often reflected on the "Paddington style" (PSN, 6/67; 7/66, 9/2, 10/72, 2/73) of "charming Victorian character" and encouraged others to appreciate the same through tours and inspections (PSN, 10/66; 1/69; 3/76; 9/78). The Society distinguished its suburb from others but especially from more modern suburban developments of one storey, brick veneer dwellings, posing a condescending, rhetorical question "Will anyone ever speak of a Panania style?" (PSN, 6/67). The Paddington Society certainly felt that few would ever value the dwelling style of a 20th century, outer suburban dwelling (Panania is south of Bankstown in Sydney’s western suburbs) as different, charming or unique.

The importance of Paddington’s physical distinction carried into discussion on brick fences (PSN, 6/71), the colour owners should paint their terraces (PSN, 11/73, 1/74), the type of post boxes they should install (PSN, 11/76), the charm of an old gaslight re-installed in front of one Paddington dwelling (PSN, 1/74) and the loss of historic and aesthetic value when owners chipped off their stucco veneers to expose the exterior brickwork (PSN, 7/71). The protection and recognition of these distinctive
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physical characteristics were also the result of much political action as discussed later. However, as seen here, the less political efforts at separation and distinction were just as numerous.

Social character was also promoted by the Paddington Society in various efforts. Some members highlighted the historical aspects of the suburb, and others the more recent artistic and cultural consciousness of new residents. Both were distinctive according to the Paddington Society, and could not be found in any other suburb, and certainly not "Panania." Where else could one find descendents of original residents still living in the suburb (PSN, 3/69)? Where else could a new purchaser move in and find a former residents' 19th century belongings in the attic (PSN, 2/71)? Without them "we might well be another North Sydney, another Greenacre or another Redfern" (PSN, 1/75). These were the distinctive qualities of life in Paddington and the Society held them up for general appreciation.

The other social characteristics valued by the Paddington Society only served to further separate new residents from established residents and the Paddington Society from any other residents group. Art and music were the two characteristics most frequently highlighted for distinguishing Paddington. Famous and less famous artists were mentioned when living in Paddington (PSN, 9/67; 9/78) and the establishment of local art galleries was seen as progress (PSN, 10/66). Often Society meetings and annual general meetings were held in art galleries (PSN6/70, 10/70) and Paddington Society social events included attending performances of La Boheme (PSN, 4/71) and baroque concerts (PSN,
Few venues or activities could have been more foreign to the more traditional working-class residents and pub-oriented social life of Paddington.

In relation to other groups the Society President in 1972 expressed the desired distinction and separation this way:

We have also been accused from time to time, by brother organizations, of selfishness. We accept the rebuke. We are selfish -- for Paddington's sake...Traditionally we maintain independence of action. The interests of Paddington are not necessarily always identical with the interests of any other group (PSN, 10/72).

This distinctiveness manifested itself in a few issues of economic value and the impact of increasing resident interest on the values of Paddington houses. The earliest was the discussion of property values at a Paddington social evening, led by a local estate agent (PSN, 5/68) and again discussed in 1974 when residents began to complain of escalating valuations and subsequent escalating rates (PSN, 1/74).

In an interesting twist, some financial/property aspects of value resulting from increased distinctiveness were articulated as fears of burglaries and local thefts. Following complaints of increasing numbers of burglaries the Society approached its local State member for assistance, while advising residents of the value of dead locks, iron grilles and burglar alarms (PSN, 5/70; 1/73; 3,73). A Society member complained of thieves who stole a large, heavy pot plant from the front verandah commenting "Is it better to leave the outside of terrace houses like in the past, filthy and dirty as some were -- hoping that thieves will pass by the Paddington area?" (PSN, 6/71). As they had seen with
increasing property values and rates, Paddington residents discovered that the separate and distinctive nature which they had encouraged and nurtured could result in undesirable as well as desirable attention to its value.

The "value" of Paddington was most directly stated in the Society's preservation plan in 1970; quoting from Walter Bunning, the Society prided itself on being a "social asset". This led the Society to argue that Paddington had potential earning power as a commodity, a saleable product, an economic resource. Its importance, as the plan states, "rests on the fact that it is an entity, a unique, historic, architectural and topographical area" (Padd. Soc., 1970).

In summary, the Paddington Society did make efforts to distinguish Paddington from any "ordinary" suburb, both in its physical and social attributes. Both, it can be said, were successful as Paddington was recognized by the media (SMH, 7/12/67) and the National Trust (PSN, 9/74) and the Valuer General (NSW, Valuer General, 1982) among others, to have increased its visual and social distinction more than any other inner Sydney suburb.

The Balmain Association

The Balmain Association approached the task of promoting character, distinction and value in a similar but more low key fashion, with an emphasis on "political" distinction not seen in Paddington. Like the Paddington Society, the Balmain Association highlighted the physical and historical distinctiveness of the suburb. It organized house inspections (BAN, 10/71), tours by
outside groups (BAN, 8/68), and invited discussions on house restoration (BAN, 10/71), provided instructions on how to "date a house" (BAN, 1/79; 3/79; 9/79). However, Balmain's position on the peninsula, its Harbour foreshores and its maritime history gave Balmain residents a physical and social history of the community to highlight rather than specific dwellings or streets as was true in Paddington. While the Paddington Society often discussed "unique" dwelling aspects like gaslights or colour-coordinated dwellings, the Balmain Association was more interested in promoting the suburb's role in providing examples of 19th century history in the 20th century (Balmain in Time, (1978); Half a Thousand Acres, (1976)) or in defending the suburb's distinctive horse and cart gutter cleaning service still operating in 1975 (BAN, 9/75).

The Association's efforts to increase social separation and distinctiveness were also more low key than those in Paddington. The Association went out of its way to claim that its goals were not expressions of "elitist values" (BAN, 6/76). Although the Association supported sketch groups (BAN, 10/66) and theatre groups (BAN, 11/76; 3/79) more characteristic of the social interest of new, middle-class residents than the social interests of the older, working-class residents, they were few and relatively unimportant compared to the political distinctiveness the Association highlighted above all.

The Balmain Association began in 1965, and other than during the term of office of the independent council from 1971 to 1974 was almost always in direct opposition to the interests of the Leichhardt Council. Balmain was not only politically distinctive
from the council because of the resident group, the suburb was also represented by the "rebel aldermen" Origlass and Wyner who had been suspended from the ALP in 1968 for voting against a Labor caucus decision. As a result they had been ostracized from many council activities and their antagonistic relationship with the Leichhardt Council only made Balmain politically more distant from the council. The Association labelled the council's recommended town plan "bastardized" (BAN, 8/76), accused the Council of mismanagement (BAN, 4/77) and concluded in 1975, "As time passes Leichhardt Council becomes more repressive and discriminatory than even the most dedicated of pessimists could have hoped for" (BAN, 8/75).

In 1977 the Government Boundaries Commission was deliberating on the feasibility of amalgamating municipalities. The Balmain Association vigorously promoted further "separation" of Balmain by supporting the secession of Balmain from the Leichhardt Municipality and the reconstitution of the Balmain Council (BAN, 6/77). The Association articulated Balmain's distinctiveness in terms of physical and community distance: "Balmain is the eastern section of the municipality of Leichhardt yet, because of its isolation on the peninsula, it shares few community interests with the other wards of Leichhardt, with the exception of Rozelle" (BAN, 5/77). This final attempt at separation failed however. Balmain remained part of the Leichhardt Municipality and the Balmain Association instead continued to promote Balmain issues in the face of municipal opposition.
In summary, the Balmain Association tried to distinguish Balmain from other suburbs. Compared to Paddington most of the efforts directed at visual and social distinctiveness were low key, with more attention paid to political separation. Unlike the Paddington Society, the Balmain Association was joined by two similar, sympathetic resident groups within the Leichhardt Municipality: the Glebe Society and the Annandale Association. For these two groups the aspects of separation were different yet again.

The Glebe Society and the Annandale Association

The Glebe Society and Annandale Association were less vocal and visible in their efforts at physical and social distinctiveness. With the already frequent and visible activities of the Paddington Society and the Balmain Association it could be said that the two younger organizations had less need to convince the public or their local government of the value of the historic and peculiar aspects of their suburbs. This can be seen in the arguments the groups posed against the planned freeway development. Where the Paddington Society had argued that Paddington's unique architectural style should exempt it from dwelling demolition for road widening, the Annandale and Glebe groups used different arguments. Each acknowledged the special historic value of their respective suburbs (GSN, 1/70; AAN, 2/70) but opposed the planned demolition and freeway development not solely to protect the historic and unique dwellings, but to protest the expansion of freeways altogether. What was in Paddington a "Save Paddington" and "Stop the Road Widening" campaign, was in Annandale and Glebe a more general anti-
expressway campaign addressing the longterm interests of the metropolitan area (GSN, 2/71) and promoting alternatives of public transportation (GSN 2/71; AAN, 6/73, 6/74).

Of the two groups the Glebe Society did express views on the distinct background which it felt gave Glebe residents peculiar problems compared to their suburban neighbours. The Society viewed the suburb this way:

As a community Glebe has some strong advantages over the majority of Australia's suburban wasteland. At least there is greater opportunity for contact with others -- small corner shops and pubs provide some focus for people who live nearby; houses that front the footpath and are close together bring people into fairly continuous contact with each other (GSN, 1/72).

However, as will be seen in detail in the discussion on the action undertaken on local issues the Glebe Society saw its particular circumstances as an argument for the Society to address some of the social problems evident in the community. Where the Society wished to establish Glebe's distinctive role as an historic district, the Society also wished to take a part in social issues by supporting local programs of social welfare for pensioners, and local child welfare bodies (GSN, 1/75).

Both the groups in Annandale and Glebe argued that they had special and distinctive characters. Their distinctiveness was more evident in the actions they undertook, as when preparing detailed plans recommending historic preservation (A Plan for Annandale, 1971; Glebe Plan, 1970), seeking support from the National Trust (GSN, 1/71, 8/74, 1/75) and sponsoring history walks (AAN, 4/75; GSN, 4/72). However, even their social events
stressed less the importance of their own art, culture or history, than the history and significance available in other suburbs. However, distinctively middle-class activities such as lectures (AAN, approximately 15 from 3/70-4/78), wine tastings and bottlings (AAN, approx. 4 from 6/70-7/80; GSN, 1/75, 3/78, 4/80) and theatre parties (GSN, 3/70, 4/73, 2/74, 4/78) did serve to distinguish the social interests of group members from the social interests of any part of the working-class, lower income resident population.

Like the Balmain Association the Annandale and Glebe resident groups dealt with the same municipal administration which was usually hostile to their interests. Neither discussed the possibility of complete separation and secession as Balmain residents had and instead stayed active in the pursuit of goals on the local government level. In 1976 the Annandale Association was close to expressing a position similar to Balmain's more militantly separatist one. The Annandale leadership was also frustrated by the antagonistic relationship with the Leichhardt Council but made a characteristically low key response. Instead of pulling out altogether the group decided instead to "opt out" of any controversy or major campaigns in 1976, to instead devote energy to the more "social" side of activities and to fill the year with "nice" events (AAN, 2/76).

In summary, the Annandale Association and the Glebe Society did promote their own distinctive physical and social characteristics. However, the efforts were in most instances understated and implicit compared to those articulated by the Paddington Society and Balmain Association, with none articulated
in terms of property value (as seen in Paddington) and few articulated in terms of the political arena (as seen in Balmain). All four groups represented suburbs with distinguishing physical and historical backgrounds recognized by the National Trust (GSN, 1/75) and enshrined in Heritage Council conservation orders in the late 1970s. All four had been the target of major threats to amenity and all four had been subject to major increases in middle-class interest and investment. Yet the articulation of the distinctive aspects of each varied. The larger, longer established groups had the most clearly articulated and strongly defended interest in aspects of visual amenity and property value and were in suburbs that experienced the greatest social change and renovation investment. This next section examines how the four groups acted to influence decision-makers in their control of the physical, political, social and resources aspects of their environments.

Resident Efforts to Exert Influence and Control

In trying to improve the amenities of its suburb each group began its activities on the political margins of the traditional political institutions, but each also chose to remain on the political margins by undertaking unconventional means of address and by addressing new issues often incompatible to established municipal views. Although there are four groups, they involve only three municipal areas. The first part of this discussion examines the Paddington Society within the City of Sydney and Woollahra Municipalities, and the second part the three groups in Leichhardt: Annandale, Balmain and Glebe.
In the same way that middle-class homeowners and renovators were a social minority and worked to express their image in locally unconventional ways, so they did in the political arena. New middle-class residents worked outside the conventional political system because their voting power was too small to affect elections, their residence had been short term so they carried little influence with established residents and their "anti-party" municipal views keep them out of traditional Labor municipal politics. However, they also chose to pursue their objectives in a marginal way because they were not only in a minority position, they were often in direct opposition to the local tradition of ALP politics and had the resources of education, certain occupational skills and income which made independent political action an available and realistic method of influence.

The Paddington Society

The first major issue addressed by the Paddington Society was one in which they chose to circumvent their local aldermen. To do this they used a combination of representative and participatory tactics which were practised elsewhere though not in Paddington. In the 1960s the State road authority planned to widen Paddington streets, requiring the demolition of 200 Paddington homes. The Sydney Morning Herald reported older residents philosophical about the planned resumptions, believing that it would take a "long time for anything to happen" (SMH, 29/12/67). Three weeks later, 400 Paddington residents met and declared the road plan as injurious (SMH, 19/1/68) and in February Pat Morton the NSW Minister for Local Government and
Highways appointed Walter Bunning to examine the proposals for road widening and construction in Paddington.

Instead of relying on their elected aldermen to represent their interests, the Society raised its own money to hire its own legal counsel, invited Bunning to tour the area, and encouraged testimony of specialists in art and architecture in support of Paddington's preservation (SMH, 15/12/68). Forty four persons appeared before Bunning including seven architects, five residents or proprietors with a stated interest in art or antiques and 27 residents. Of all the interested persons and groups only the Paddington Society was represented by a Queen's Counsel (Bunning, 1968).

The strategy of the Society was a success, and the State government cancelled the plans for road widening, except on Jersey Road where it wished to delay any decision. Because of its professional and legally conventional approach, the Paddington Society had overcome the problems it had as a political and social minority and further preservef the property values and amenities of the Paddington dwellings and environment. Apart from the original public meeting, the Society limited itself to "representative" actions undertaken by a few members on behalf of all the members, steering away from more unconventional participatory actions.

In the spring of 1969 the Society began a new campaign against the widening of Jersey Road (see Map 3.5). What had been a legally conventional but remarkable-for-Paddington effort with the Bunning Inquiry became a legally conventional but purposely
dramatic and participatory effort against the widening of Jersey Road. Again the Society undertook major fundraising, and used legal counsel. Moreover, the talents of Society member Leo Schofield, a public relations expert, allowed the Society to practice political tactics new to Paddington residents and to resident action generally. Full page advertisements in The Australian, car stickers, a rally of nearly 2000 in Jersey Road, which was draped in black for the occasion, drew the participation of many residents and the attention of the media and the government (PSN, 8/69; 7/74).

In this instance the Society successfully combined innovative political tactics with conventional legal tactics to protect its suburb, but also to establish the group's "legitimate" role by addressing the issue in a conventional, integrative fashion. The efforts which helped both halt the road widening and give the group legitimation were made possible by the high incomes which enabled contributions for banners, rallies and advertisements, occupational skills which enabled legal counsel and public relations consultation (gratis), and increased estate and interest through higher levels of owner occupation and renovation investment resulting from gentrification.

This was followed by a completely conventional and representative action in the preparation and presentation to Woollahra Council of a detailed planning document arguing for historic preservation status for Paddington. "Paddington: A Plan for Preservation" (Padd. Soc., 1970) was prepared by eight Paddington Society members of whom two were architects, at no cost, which in 1970 would have cost approximately $20,000 (PSN,
7/74). Although only a few people took part in the activity it represented the interests of the whole Society. However, such representative action would not have been possible unless the members had articulated their interests earlier in the participatory actions of demonstrations, meetings and voting. This too exemplified the fortunate situation of the Paddington Society with the necessary interest and skills to undertake an unusual activity (a professional plan prepared and paid for outside of local government) while using conventional means.

On the municipal level these unusual but conventional activities served to improve the Society's relations with Woollahra Council while exacerbating difficult relations with the local aldermen. Soon after the Bunning Inquiry ended the Woollahra Council invited the Paddington Society to attend meetings of council's local planning scheme committee at which the council's outline plan was discussed and regular progress reports made (WCF, 11/4/69). In May 1971 the council solicited the Society's opinion on certain land use issues in Paddington (residences used as shops; WCM, 10/5/71) before making any decisions and incorporated many of the Society's ideas into the Woollahra Plan for Paddington.

At the same time however, the Society was articulating its frustration with what it saw as the lack of interest and support by the three ALP Paddington aldermen in the interests and activities of the Paddington Society (PSN, 9/71). In response to what they interpreted as being pushed to the political margins by the local aldermen, the Society decided to oppose the aldermen
with its own candidates for elected office.

Again, standing candidates was an uncustomary activity undertaken through conventional channels but which engendered much more antagonism than any of the Society's other actions. Like the Bunning Inquiry and the Jersey Road demonstration, the Paddington Society saw the 1971 election as an exceptional opportunity for the Society to act in defense of its interests, calling for an exceptional response (PSN, 6/71). For the Society the electoral opportunity justified the direct political role in defiance of its constitution and at variance with local political tradition. They had succeeded in making the 1971 election a political event of such significance, and the future of Paddington of such importance that the Society could justify their uncustomary action.

After failing to win office, the Society continued to address issues incompatible with the political interests of various councils, and to the State government, including protests against the development of Moore Park, a large park a few kilometres to the south but outside Paddington (PSN, 5/72; 5/73), the promotion and development of local playgrounds (PSN, 3/72; 9/73), and the development of bus services in the suburb (PSN, 5/72). However, unlike the earlier external and very large threats, none of the issues were directly related to property values or proximate amenities, and attracted little interest by Society members. They were not issues which could stir up the resident interest and participation seen in the road issues, and instead most were dealt with by the Society on behalf of its members.

Only a year after the election effort the Society president John Cooney publicly questioned the goals and purpose of the
Society, reflecting the loss of interest by members in the Society's activities (PSN, 9/72). Next month the new President, Pat Thompson, widow of founding President John Thompson, dedicated 1973 to a year of "quiet enjoyment", further reflecting the general malaise of the Society (PSN, 10/72). This was followed by several comparatively inactive years during which the most important issues seemed to be local traffic and parking problems (PSN 2/73; 6/73). Traffic and parking were contentious issues. On the one hand they were ubiquitous and yet on the other hand they varied greatly from street to street. There was little the Society could do to use this issue to galvanize widespread support. Each traffic problem was in itself separate and unique, very local in its impact and attracting little attention by anyone other than those immediately affected.

The suburb and the Society's role within it was changing, and this was recognized by the group's leadership as it questioned whether the Society should continue with its current leadership and organizational structure (PSN, 10/75; 6/77). The group no longer represented a small minority of residents, as the social makeup of the suburb had changed to more closely reflect the professional, high-income makeup of the Society. Membership in the Paddington Society was no longer an unusual activity. Those two aspects meant that the group no longer had to struggle to establish its role or its image, people knew what the group was and what it did.

The issues addressed by the group were less unusual as residents in other suburbs began to argue for preservation and
resident participation in planning decisions, and as the Woollahra Council began to embrace preservation in its plans (PSN, 9/74). The group could no longer galvanize attention to or participation in many of the local issues because they were no longer as imperative as they had been before.

As well, the nature of the issues had changed. Instead of dwelling demolition and road widening there were emerging issues of traffic and parking. Such issues were difficult to deal with because they did not affect members of the Paddington Society in a similar way, which could have encouraged the Society to address them, nor did they seem as imperative as the zoning protection and dwelling preservation. All these changes help explain the shift of resident interest away from the issues and tactics requiring collective defense of amenity and property values of dwellings and suburbs.

Resident Action Groups in the Leichhardt Municipality

Collective action by resident action groups in the Leichhardt Municipality differed substantially from that of the Paddington Society in Sydney and Woollahra. As shown in Chapter Five the old-guard Labor council was antagonistic to the resident groups. The Balmain Association, Glebe Society and Annandale Association tried to overcome their minority position by using the income and tools available to them through their middle-class membership, but also by taking advantage of their marginal position. Because they were not part of the established, conventional decision-making, they had no status to lose and thus no limits to the unconventional means of political address and the new issues they could address.
From 1965 to mid-1969 the Balmain Association was the only visible residents group in the Leichhardt Municipality. Unlike the Paddington Society however, its unique position gave it no status in the eyes of the municipality or other State authorities. Council often ignored issues important to the Association (BAN 10/68: Millers Wharf, local libraries, the plans for container development, tree planting), because it was not a property owner (BAN, 8/69; LCM 4/6/68). Council insisted that Balmain interests as expressed at public meetings be articulated through the local aldermen (BAN, 6/67), denied requests for tree planting because of lack of funds (BAN, 10/69) and denied requests for copies of council agendas and meeting minutes (LCM 14/4/66, 29/11/66, 3/10/67).

Because certain political avenues had been denied the Association, like many other resident groups, was forced to operate without conventional forms of political address. Instead the group organized protest meetings (BAN, 4/67), demonstrations at Parliament House (BAN, 4/67) and at industrial sites (BAN, 8/67, 4/69), and the distribution of leaflets in peak hour traffic on Victoria Road (BAN, 4/67).

More than any other group however, the Balmain Association encouraged and facilitated the unconventional political activity by its members. Members were urged to stack the council galleries for meetings in support of local issues (BAN 12/67, 2/69, 2/68) and write the local member (BAN 12/69). The Association also paid for advertisements in three local papers encouraging Balmain residents to attend the coming Leichhardt Council meeting to show
their opposition to plans for chemical storage in the suburb (BAN, 2/68).

Although the Association helped to disrupt many Council meetings (Link, 18/6/69), they also used traditional political avenues. The group had sufficient skills within its membership and recognition from certain persons of authority so that it could undertake more integrative, representative action. This took the form of publications (BAN, 6/68), written submissions to the local member (BAN, 2/69) and testimony before the Senate committee on the container industry in Australia (BAN, 6/67). In other ventures they circumvented the established political institutions and initiated their own projects. From 1965 to 1969 this involved the organization of a privately-run children's library in lieu of a municipal library (BAN, 6/68) and research on the history of Balmain's built and social environment (BAN, 10/68; 12/68).

Glebe and Annandale

By February 1970 the Glebe Society (August 1969) and the Annandale Association (February 1970) had joined the Balmain Association in the municipality. The issues they were interested in pursuing and the tactics they used were different from those of Balmain residents. Although working with the same municipal council, the Glebe Society optimistically reported in September 1969 that relations with the Leichhardt Council were "good" (GSN, 9/69). The Annandale Association formed to protest an impending council decision to demolish an historic house, but only expressed frustration at the council's negligible response (AAN, 4/70; 7/70). The optimism soon waned and both groups resorted to
circumventing the local council and directly contacting the State authorities about plans for local foreshores (GSN, 10/69; AAN, 9/70) and freeways (AAN, 9/70).

Like the Balmain Association both had initiated research on local history (GSN, 2/70) and supported and contributed to the Leichhardt Historical Journal which each had helped establish (AAN, 6/71). Both had developed their own plans for zoning, development and preservation (AAN, 2/71, GSN, 10/69) and for tree planting (GSN, 1/69). The groups also undertook some adversarial, participatory action through protest marches, demonstrations against proposed flat development (AAN, 3/71, GSN, 3/71) which for the Glebe Society was successful in preventing the planned development of flats on Ferry Road. The Society's almost apologetic approach to the flat issue is a good example of how the Society was different from the more militant bent of the Balmain Association and its more adversarial action and the more festive tone of the Paddington Society's adversarial action.

In March 1971 the Leichhardt Council was to consider the development application (DA) for a block of flats at 59-61 Ferry Road, Glebe. From information gained at the Leichhardt Council meeting on 2 March the Society felt that unless it acted strongly and quickly to show council its strong opposition, the DA would be approved (GSN, 3/71). The Society organized 200 residents as well as representatives from various other resident groups (AAN, 3/71) to demonstrate and march against the proposed flats. The Society reported its action in an apologetic manner: "We may have been wrong in this, but we were not prepared to sit by and do
nothing...it was orderly, colourful and kept to the footpath" (GSN, 3/71).

The Balmain Association had encouraged its members to disrupt meetings to make their voices heard, sometimes with hundreds of residents crowding into council chambers. The Paddington Society seemed to revel in the colour and theatre of the Jersey Road demonstration, boasting of the overspill onto streets and footpaths. The Glebe Society and Annandale Association almost apologized for the trouble they had caused the residents. To them, the effort seemed needless in hindsight as, much to the Society's unexpected pleasure, council decided to reject the development application. After the fact the Society presented the effort as unnecessarily antagonistic in the light of the "good sense" eventually exercised by the Council. While the Balmain Association worked to accentuate its incompatible position vis a vis council, the Annandale and Glebe groups tried to minimize their opposing position, resorting to the tactics available to them only in what they considered extreme cases.

In 1971 the Leichhardt municipal election resulted in an independent majority more sympathetic to the interests of resident action groups. From 1971 to 1974 the wards of Annandale, Balmain and Glebe were represented either by independents or by ALP members sympathetic to the interests of the groups. The issues addressed by the independent council and the means council used to address them served to integrate the the interests of the resident groups. Council encouraged resident participation and consultation (GAN, 6/73); adopted a new planning scheme sympathetic to the interests of the resident
groups and the council itself joined in anti-development, anti-expressway efforts against the State government (Link, 13/10/71).

This changed the way residents chose to act to improve their residential environment. For the three years of the independent council the resident groups were no longer antagonistic to council decisions and activity (GSN, 8/74). Because the new council provided opportunities for resident participation residents rarely chose to circumvent council’s authority to address issues to other authorities directly. Nor did they choose to express their opinions in an adversarial fashion. Instead the groups were able to address issues traditionally denied them by their councils and to accomplish local goals with integrative actions of participation and discussion (AAN, 9/74).

Because the groups trusted the council and did not have to constantly examine council’s activities they could instead focus more fully on the threats of freeway development. The groups opposed the plans of the State Department of Main Roads for demolition and freeway construction through Glebe and Annandale, and Leichhardt Council joined the residents in their protests, an innovative position for a municipal council in Sydney. In the Jersey Road protest individual aldermen, from Paddington as well as outside, supported the position of the Paddington Society (PSN, 8/69). In the issue of the Northwest Expressway the whole Leichhardt Council supported the anti-expressway battle by holding rallies, and making representations to the State government on behalf of the residents (BAN, 8/75; LCM, 3/11/71).

In the local government elections in September 1974 the ALP
regained a majority on council, re-establishing the minority position of the resident action groups. Council abolished the practice of resident consultations and participation (BAN, 8/75) and halted the earlier tree planting program (BAN, 2/75) and council's protests against the expressway. Resident groups were again in the position where they would have to work in unconventional ways ways on the margin of local government to promote their interests.

Each group organized residents to pack council meetings (AAN, 10/74; BAN, 3/75, 4/76), and organize petitions (AAN, 11/74; BAN, 6/75; GSN, 9/75), and encouraged members to write State Ministers (BAN, 5/75; AAN, 5/75). In a more representative way the Balmain Association met with maritime union representatives and State maritime officials to discuss the Balmain container depot (BAN, 8/75), and produced two major reports on containers and on ferries (BAN, 8/75). As well each residents' group approached State officials on local issues (BAN, 12/74, planning; BAN, 5/78, industrial development; AAN, 2/77, freeways; AAN, 12/77, foreshores).

None of the efforts succeeded in changing the decisions of council, and in many cases only served to antagonize council members and frustrate residents (BAN, 12/74). To provide themselves a forum for discussing planning issues in particular, the three groups organized the "Leichhard Planning Forum". This group met for several years with members of the media, academics, planners and residents to discuss alternatives to the local planning system (BAN, 2/75). Forum organizers arranged a conference in April 1975 in which 200 people participated, to
discuss the State proposals for a new planning system, and in particular how it would affect the inner suburbs of Sydney (Leich. Planning Forum, 1975). The Forum committee later met with the chairman of the State Planning and Environment Commission to discuss changes in the local planning scheme and the local decision-making process in Leichhardt, but with no results (BAN, 7/76; AAN, 8/76).

This general lack of success in influencing Leichhardt Council had different effects on each group. In 1975 the Glebe Society decided to move away from planning issues and focus more attention on local social service organizations in Glebe, hoping to overcome the "social club" image by promoting a "social conscience" (GSN, 8/74). In 1977 the plans for expressway development through Glebe were shelved, allowing the Society to focus on the amenity of Glebe (GSN, 7/77) as well as a new Glebe High School (GSN, 8/78) and local community health programs (GSN, 3/79).

Members' interest in the Annandale Association seemed to wane after plans for the Northwest expressway were abandoned (AAN, 5/78). Participation in general meetings and social events dropped dramatically. The Balmain Association experienced the same decline in members' interest, resulting in the group leadership threatening to close down the organization unless members' interest and commitment increased (BAN, 1/79).

By the time of the 1979 Leichhardt Planning Scheme the three groups were more experienced in dealing with the town plans developed by the council. With the 1968 scheme, council
dismissed the objections of the Balmain Association because it considered the Association to hold no "interest or estate" (Link, 23/7/69). By 1974 the Glebe Society and Annandale Association had formed, and the liberal independent council permitted a close involvement of resident action groups in the formulation of the 1974 plan. When the subsequent conservative ALP council introduced amendments to the 1974 plan (by then known as the 1976 plan) the three groups encouraged members to stack council meetings (resulting in hundreds of spectators and disruption) and to sign a petition complaining against Council's amendments (GSN, 2/76). The groups also sent representatives to meet the State Minister for Planning and the State Minister for Local Government to present the views of residents about the plan (AAN, 9/76). The State government eventually disallowed the 1976 plan, and the Council produced a new plan in 1979.

By 1979 many characteristics of the resident groups, Leichhardt Council and the State government had changed, all contributing to a political environment conducive to more participation. The groups had been active for 10 to 15 years, had responded to two (and the Balmain Association to three) exhibited plans already and were experienced in preparing professional submissions to council. However, each was also experiencing a period of membership malaise at a time when the suburbs had more residents than ever with high incomes and university educations, owning valuable properties.

The exhibition of the 1979 plan galvanized all three groups and produced responses different from previous ones. As early as May 1978 the Annandale Association notified members of the
impending scheme, of what it could mean for Annandale and of residents' rights of objection (AAN, 5/78). The Glebe Society and the Balmain Association had formulated their opinions of the plan, which in their eyes, "could have serious deleterious effects on many streets and areas, affecting not only property values but more importantly the quality of life" (GSN, 2/79; BAN, 3/79).

Unlike their previous response, the three groups responded to the 1979 plan in a most detailed and sophisticated fashion. The Glebe Society undertook a door knock, explaining to each household the changes planned for its particular area, offering objection forms, instruction on how to complete them and petitions to sign (GSN, 8/79). The Annandale Association completed a 115 page submission of formal objections presented to council with a petition of 1784 signatures (AAN, 7/79).

Of the three groups the Balmain Association succeeded most in encouraging residents to see the effects of the plan on their specific dwelling and street. The Association drafted, printed and distributed to all households a "kit" of leaflets tailored to the particular zoning proposed under the plan for the area, with envelopes addressed to Council for residents' objections (BAN, 7/79). Although the Association itself prepared a 70 page submission of objections as it had in the past, the detailed instructions and tailored delivery to individual households meant that the Association's efforts to encourage other residents' objections had reached a new level of sophistication.

The council, although not very sympathetic to the residents' interests, seemed to recognize the groups as legitimate
representatives of resident interests and understood the influence these groups held. The growing number of groups alone put pressure on Council to attend to the groups' interests. By 1979 those resident groups operating in the Municipality and interested in resident issues included the groups in Annandale, Balmain and Glebe, the ALP branches in Annandale and Balmain, the 4-Shores Committee, Leichhardt Association, Leichhardt Planning Forum, Mort Bay RAG, Rozelle-Lilyfield RAG, and White Bay RAG (GSN, 8/79). Moreover there had been a Labor State government since 1977 which had showed more understanding of the residents' views than the previous government (BAN, 6/78).

In these circumstances the resident groups decided against unconventional, adversarial action as undertaken previously. Although each group did prepare its own submission and presented in some form a set of objections on behalf of its members, they also presented the plan to residents in an individualized fashion. In earlier instances the groups encouraged residents to come to planning exhibitions where Association members would answer queries and help residents make their objections (BAN, 6/68; GSN, 6/74). They had also encouraged residents to sign petitions, collective instruments of political voice (GSN, 5/75). By 1979 the groups approached residents on a house by house basis, with explanations of the plan and its effect on that particular area (GSN, 5/79; BAN, 5/79). This served to instigate action which distinguished streets from each other and planning problems from each other. The resident groups had moved away from instigating resident action on behalf of the "community" and community interest as a whole and was advocating a more
individual approach and response to planning matters in their suburbs.

This is not to say that the groups abandoned collective goals or action. Nor had they previously ignored the importance of individual approach and response. It is to say however that by 1979/1980 the efforts of the groups had shifted to reflect more of the individual than collective efforts at controlling local amenity. This shift made more political sense as residents might find it easier to understand, grasp and address the impact of planned development of flats on their street than the impact of a general municipal-wide flat code incorporated into a town plan. The separation of areas and their problems from other areas with different problems and interests would theoretically allow and encourage more residents to object to aspects of the plan.

The groups were aided in their objections by the State Minister for Planning and Environment, Paul Landa. He responded to residents' requests for planning control until the scheme was gazetted, (BAN, 3/80) and organized a meeting of representatives of residents, the council and the State Department of Environment and Planning to jointly consider objections to the Planning Scheme (GSN, 8/79). Soon circumstances changed as a majority of independents were elected to council in September 1980. The residents' objections to the plan were heard in November 1980 and the new legislation for State Environment and Planning was in operation by late 1980 changing the nature of relations among residents, municipalities and the State on planning issues (BAN, 12/80). Once again the bounds of resident interest and action were
redefined with some made marginal and others acceptable and conventional.

Summary

This chapter has examined the activities of four resident action groups from 1964 to 1980. The particular interest of each group was found to vary among physical, political and resource issues unlike letters and petitions to council which were predominantly physical issues. All groups were concerned with promoting the suburb's character and distinctive qualities, and with trying to influence local government decisions but the efforts varied among groups according to the group leadership and the group's relationship with decision-makers. In instances of both promoting distinctiveness and exercising influence, some actions were undertaken by a few group members on behalf of many, and others were large, participatory events which encouraged the involvement of all group members.

The evidence of group activity was also analyzed in terms of the relative position of the group vis a vis the local aldermen, the municipal and State government. In some instances a group like the Paddington Society was antagonistic with local aldermen but accepted by the local council, with the opposite situation in Balmain. Where there was antagonism the groups practised protest-oriented, adversarial action. All groups however, took advantage of the organization to pool the skills of their middle-class, professional membership and undertook many conventional politically acceptable actions unavailable to individuals and ad hoc petitioning groups.

From their beginnings the groups were composed
disproportionately of middle-class homeowners and over the years more and more residents in each suburb had the higher incomes and occupational status of the group members. By 1980 the groups were more like the overall resident population, they had practised their tactics for 10-15 years, and had been joined by similar groups in nearby suburbs (the Chippendale Society had formed in 1972 (GSN, 3/72), the Stanmore Society in 1977 (AAN, 11/77), and the Leichhardt Association in 1978 (AAN, 8/78)) and more groups in their own suburbs.

By the late 1970s group efforts were no longer undertaken solely on behalf of the "community" but were instead tailored to more specific locales within a suburb. In Paddington this happened when residents began to address the traffic problem, in Leichhardt when resident groups addressed the 1979 Town Plan. In both municipalities the efforts of resident groups had become much more sophisticated and conventional. They appealed more to the specific concerns of residents, tailoring what were often wider, more general problems throughout the municipality to more local concern.

While examination of cross sections of groups is useful in identifying systematic trends and variation, it necessarily obscures the detailed structure of social and political relations in resident issues and ignores some of the larger structural changes in society. While residents were addressing local issues, patterns of employment and consumption were shifting. This type of detailed information and the subsequent conclusions which can be drawn is only possible with case study data. The
next two chapters present two such case studies, the first on industrial land use, the second on roads, traffic and parking.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER SEVEN

1 A list of some of the groups is available in Appendix 6.

2 The importance of a separate, distinct community is highlighted in areas where such characteristics are lacking. Surry Hills and Newtown are two such areas. This quote from the Draft EIS for the proposed Teachers College in Newtown states Newtown's position clearly:

Until the recent increase of activity by residents' groups, Newtown had not officially been regarded as an entity, and many forces still operate to fragment the area and reduce its potential cohesion. The area is in three local government areas (City of Sydney, South Sydney and Marrickville) and there is little interaction between them...This lack of official cognisance of the community of Newtown has meant that no actions have been taken to aid and reinforce this community and planning has tended to disregard its existence as a unit. (Jackson Teece et al., 1975:37).
CHAPTER EIGHT: INDUSTRY AND GENTRIFICATION

Two World Wars have been fought in the past fifty years for democratic rights and principles and I often wonder was it worth it if we are to pushed around in any case.
—industrial owner to Leichhardt Council, March 1965

Chapter Seven found there to be considerable variation in the interest and activity of resident action groups across suburbs and historical periods. Some of this variation could be attributed to the various issues addressed at the time, and to the relationship of the group to the municipal council. Both of these have been influenced by the social and political changes of gentrification. Some of the changes to local manufacturing and transport employment have also affected the inner suburbs. Part one examines the circumstances of industrial and residential land uses in Sydney, part two the circumstances in the Leichhardt Municipality and Balmain in particular, and part three the specific Balmain developments and the response of residents to the container terminals, chemical storage plans and coal loader upgrading.

Issues of industrial development are different from many other resident issues addressed in the municipal arena. Unlike localized physical problems such as the condition of streets and footpaths, industry can affect both a resident’s immediate amenity and the general amenity of the suburb. This often means that residents without proximate, property-related interests are equally interested in minimizing possible air and water pollution or subsequent traffic flows.
As well, industrial development raises issues of local employment and local residential amenity. Where residents' concern about conditions of streets and footpaths varied little with the social shifts of the areas, their concern about the presence of local industry was accentuated as fewer residents depended on local industry for employment and more were interested in the amenities and property values of their suburb and dwellings.

The actors concerned with industry extend beyond residents and municipal councils. Landowners and businesses obviously have major interests in controls on industrial land uses (LCM, 15/3/65). The Maritime Services Board (MSB) and other state authorities conducted many activities of State-wide significance within inner urban areas. Councils often took an activist role in defending their municipalities against the intrusions of other levels of government as well as the private sector. In these cases, the middle-class residents and their action groups and the municipal councils can come together as a coalition of opposition.

Of the six study areas, Balmain serves as the best illustration of these points. Industrial development was also significant in Newtown and Surry Hills but only Balmain had a number of contentious industrial issues addressed by resident action groups. The more contentious issues in the other two areas were of institutional expansion: Sydney Teachers College in Newtown and the proposed hostel for homeless persons in Surry Hills. This is borne out in the letters and petitions addressed
to local councils on the issue of industry. From 1961 to 1980 there were 224 letters or petitions written on industrial issues within the six areas: 50 percent from Balmain residents, 23 percent from Paddington residents, and only 27 percent from the other areas. For Balmain residents industry was the single most frequently addressed issue by a substantial margin.

**Inner Industrial Sydney**

The inner suburbs of Sydney have historically been the centre of Sydney's industrial, office and commercial activities. Although this role has diminished, by the late 1970s the inner suburbs still had disproportionately large shares of the metropolitan area's non-residential land use, industrial establishments and industrial employment. Each is examined in turn.

In terms of land zoned for industrial use in the metropolitan area, from 1956 to 1972 the share within the City of Sydney fell from six to three percent of the metropolitan total; South Sydney from 21 to 10 percent, and Leichhardt from three to two percent (Plant Location International (PLI), 1976). The inner areas were declining in terms of their metropolitan role in providing industrial land.

However, what was there did expand, as seen in Table 8.1. The number of hectares in actual use by industry rose from 1956 to 1972.
Table 8.1: Industrial-Zoned Land in Industrial Use, 1956-1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Average Annual Increase (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Sydney</td>
<td>108.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sydney</td>
<td>373.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: PLI, 1976)

The land was in high demand because it provided proximity to suppliers of goods, transport centres at the airport and rail station, and to customers. Average prices for both small lots (<.4 ha) and large lots (> .8 ha), were two to three and sometimes four times higher than for lots further out (PLI, 1976).

Much of the industrial land in each of these municipalities adjoined land used for residential purposes, as seen in Table 8.2 resulting in dwellings close to sometimes noisy and dirty activities (Table 8.2).

Table 8.2: Residential and Industrial Land Uses in Inner Sydney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Hectares</th>
<th>Industrial Hectares</th>
<th>Total Hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Sydney</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sydney</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>48.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>62.</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrickville</td>
<td>58.</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randwick</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummoyrne</td>
<td>72.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: PLI, 1976)
According to Kendig, within the six inner Sydney local government areas of his 1976 study, 45 percent of inner Sydney neighbourhoods contained or adjoined land zoned for commercial use, 39 percent for industrial use, 31 percent for roads, and 23 percent for railways (Kendig, 1979). Smoke from the industries and port activities, traffic noise and inconvenience have been part of the inner Sydney environment for many years (Holmes, 1947; Balmain Association, 1977; Hold, n.d. and Ryan, 1979). Residents of several generations have lived in these areas of mixed land uses.

Parts of the inner areas were also distinguished by the high density use of industrial land and employment. Table 8.3 shows the number of industrial establishments and the number of industrial employees per hectare of land used for industrial purposes in inner municipalities in 1972. Both Sydney and Leichhardt have denser development than any of the other municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Hectare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sydney</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sydney</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrickville</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randwick</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummoyne</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: PLI, n.d.)
Although the amount of land used for industrial purposes increased, the actual number of manufacturing establishments decreased in the inner areas, suggesting larger industrial establishments, and a shift of the industrial base from manufacturing to other industrial uses. Between 1968/69 and 1972/73 the number of manufacturing establishments in the City of Sydney fell from 1711 to 1326 (-23%), in Leichhardt from 718 to 628 (-13%), while in the metropolitan area they only decreased by 1 percent (PLI, 1976).

Figures from the Leichhardt Municipality give a more detailed picture of industrial establishments in an inner city municipality. In 1962 the municipality had 727 factories. 40% produced industrial metals, machines and conveyances, 10% clothing; 10% timber; 8% food, drink and tobacco; and 8% wood furniture and bedding. The remaining 25 percent ranged from quarries and bricks to paper and printing (IMC. Health Admin. Serv, Annual Report. 1962). The largest applications for building approval among those lodged in 1962 included at least seven for factories, automotive garages, cold rooms and chemical plants. Most of these initiatives were small, with comparatively low capital costs.

The nature of industrial development was changing however, as land use was expanding but the number of traditional manufacturing establishments was declining. Transport-storage, retailing and wholesaling replaced much of the declining manufacturing sector. These industries generally required more space than many traditional inner city factories, but required fewer employees. As such, their potential expansion threatened
nearby residential areas while providing fewer jobs. As well, they generated more freight and passenger traffic than many factories did (Butlin (ed.), 1976).

In terms of the effect on the resident workforce the inner suburbs lost both industrial work opportunities and many residents employed in industrial and blue-collar occupations. In terms of the manufacturing sector, there were fewer local residents employed in the sector. Admittedly the definition of factory work changed from 1945 to 1971 but the figures in Tables 8.4 and 8.5 still give an indication of the change in employment patterns of persons who worked in the different suburbs and municipalities.

Table 8.4: Estimated Share of Employed Persons in Factory Work, 1945

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Workforce</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>58.</td>
<td>8300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>60.</td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>50.</td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Inner Suburbs</td>
<td>63.</td>
<td>95,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Eastern Suburbs</td>
<td>42.</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Outer Suburbs</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>114,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: CCC Report, 1948)
Table 8.5: Employed Persons in Manufacturing, 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Workforce</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>1427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>2208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td>3699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>2697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>353,498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: 1971 Census)

Not only were working-class residents a smaller percentage of the population because of increasing numbers of middle-class residents, the working-class residents were also declining in number. Table 8.6 shows the disproportionate decline from 1971 to 1981 in miners, transport workers, craftsmen and service workers in the six study areas.

Table 8.6: Percentage of Workforce with Blue-collar Occupations, Six Study Areas, 1971-1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>59. 3196</td>
<td>32. 2035</td>
<td>-36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>54. 4625</td>
<td>33. 2592</td>
<td>-44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>51. 4518</td>
<td>35. 2683</td>
<td>-41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>66. 7730</td>
<td>51. 5018</td>
<td>-35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>56. 5815</td>
<td>31. 3492</td>
<td>-40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>53. 7866</td>
<td>43. 4822</td>
<td>-39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>34. 489,395</td>
<td>42. 583,285</td>
<td>19.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Census)

The numbers of working-class residents fell much more sharply in the six study areas than in the metropolitan area as a whole. Indeed overall population losses were greater in the
inner suburbs than they were elsewhere due to a variety of factors. With industrial shifts throughout the country there were fewer manufacturing jobs and more service-related jobs. In the Sydney context the outer suburbs were increasingly important as industrial locations, and there were fewer industrial establishments in the inner suburbs and more in the transportation, storage, and wholesaling sector.

These changes had implications for the inner residential areas both in terms of the environment and the population. In terms of the environment there were fewer factories with the smoke and noise associated with them. However, there were more traffic generating industries, which also disrupted the areas.

In terms of the population there were fewer residents employed in blue-collar occupations and thus fewer with an interest in seeing blue-collar jobs maintained in the local area. As well, with gentrification fewer residents not only did fewer residents have the incentive to encourage local industry but more were interested in controlling it. As well, with fewer local residents working in local industry, there were more commuting workers, which added to the levels of traffic, further threatening local amenity.

The industrial circumstances in inner Sydney had shifted. There were different types of industrial development, imposing new threats on inner residential areas. There were fewer residents with a vested interest in protecting industrial development, but strong incentives for both public and private developers to maintain or increase their inner city industrial investments.
Industrial Interests in Leichhardt and Balmain

Many of these same shifts and implications were evident in the Leichhardt Municipality and Balmain in particular. Although Leichhardt was not as industrial as its neighbouring municipalities, it was noted for the small but fairly heavily concentrated industrial land uses (PLI, 1976). In terms of land use planning, the municipality operated under the Cumberland Planning Scheme until 1968 when the council gazetted its own planning scheme.

In Balmain the development of industry had a long and diverse background. On the waterfront there had been a variety of ship building and dry dock facilities dating back to the 19th century. The best known was operated by Thomas Mort. This was followed by timber milling and allied crafts of furniture manufacture and dressed timber, soap works, coal mining and loading, wheat silos on Glebe Island in 1917, oil and petrol distributing depots and the Colgate-Palmolive factory in the 1930s and the coal loader at White Bay in 1950 (Holt, n.d.)

During the twentieth century road transport replaced much water transport. Goods and materials which had originally been transported by ship to wharves, jetties and docks were more frequently and soon completely transported by trucks through Balmain streets (Logan, 1965). The smoke and noise of factory work did not provoke many complaints to council by residents, although council made efforts to control problems by establishing a Smoke Abatement Advisory Panel (1955) and Noise Control Advisory Panel (1968). Despite the efforts, residents of the 1950s and 1960s reported different forms of industrial noise and
"fallout" depending on the direction of the wind. A breeze from the west carried a fine dust of wheat from the Glebe silos, while a north wind carried soap flakes from Colgate; and a southerly, coal dust: all scattering on cars and hanging wash and through open windows (Irving, personal communication).

Much of Balmain's established industry was still operating in the 1970s, but overall manufacturing establishments had declined and fewer residents were employed in transport or manufacturing occupations. Figure 8.1 shows the decline in establishments and Table 8.7 the employment patterns in Balmain and the Leichhardt Municipality.

Figure 8.1: Manufacturing Establishments in the Leichhardt Municipality, 1953-1965

(Source: Council Records)

From 1971 to 1981 the number of blue-collar workers in Balmain dropped much more rapidly than in the nearby industrial suburb of Leichhardt and in the metropolitan area.
Table 8.7: Percentage of Workforce in Occupations Related to Transport, Communications, Manufacturing, 1971-1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>3377</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>-42.</td>
<td>-20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>5860</td>
<td>4845</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>-17.</td>
<td>-23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>492850</td>
<td>478956</td>
<td>487252</td>
<td>-3.</td>
<td>-2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Census)

One industrial owner in the Leichhardt Municipality T.A. Mulhearn attributed the decline in industrial development to deliberate council policy. In a stern letter to the council Mulhearn accused Council of "smothering" industrial activity with "rigid conditions", disallowing shift work and instead encouraging flat development in order to create "one vast residential area of small flats and multi-storey dwellings":

Just what exactly is your Council trying to achieve? Is it their intention to create hundreds of small dwellings in the municipality and completely smother all industrial activity in the vicinity with the result that hundreds of man hours per week are sacrificed while the resident is forced to travel in crowded inadequate transport to such areas as Bankstown, Parramatta, Botany, etc. in search of employment? If the wish of the local resident were taken into consideration, you would find that all he wants is to be able to work in close proximity to his home as his father and grandfather has done (LCM, 15/3/65).

However, over the next fifteen years fewer and fewer residents (whether homeowners or tenants) were to be employed locally. Resident interest was increasingly directed to the
effect of industry on the amenity and value of their dwellings and the local community and not to the provision of local employment.

Residential Interests in Leichhardt and Balmain

From 1961 to 1980 the Leichhardt Council received 83 pieces of correspondence from Balmain residents on issues regarding industrial problems but only three from Annandale residents and nine from Glebe residents. Of the six suburbs, Balmain residents were most active and as seen in Figure 8.2, the most active from 1965 to 1970.

Figure 8.3: Letters and Petitions in the Six Suburbs and from Balmain, 1961-1980

(Source: Council Records)

Of the 83 from Balmain, 27 were concerned with noise and soot, the control of which was within the jurisdiction of the Council's Smoke and Noise Abatement Advisory Panels. Twenty dealt with plans for the chemical tanks storage first mooted in the mid-sixties. Twenty-three dealt with the cargo container terminals developed at Mort Bay and White Bay, and the others with issues such as plans for marinas, electricity mains and
substations, Cockatoo Island and smaller industrial sites such as food factories (LCM 2/7/63), garages (LCM, 5/5/64), the Balmain coal mine (LCM, 25/1/66) local printers (LCM, 1/5/66) and bakeries (LCM, 2/69). The most active period was from 1965 to 1969 when the State government planned the container terminal and chemical storage facility.

Industry was an issue which aroused a good deal of collective resident response. Of the 83, twenty-six were sent by an organized interest including the Balmain Association, the local hospital (LCM, 6/63), the West Balmain Protective Association (LCM, 5/66 and 2/67), Balmain Industries Association (LCM 11/66), the Balmain Development and Associates (LCM, 12/67, ALP LCM 9/68, 4/69, 6/69, White Bay RAG (LCM, 12/74), Balmain Residents Against Cargo Trucking from Mort Bay (LCM, 10/75) and twelve from the Balmain Association. Of those 26, six were actually commendations of council -- particularly in support of council's opposition to chemical tank storage and container terminal plans for the Balmain foreshores.

Although group activity was important, most were complaints and objections in the form of letters and petitions of individuals and more loosely connected petitioning groups. As was seen in the earlier examination of resident complaints (Chapter Six), most residents were concerned with physical issues. Seventy eight of the 83 addressed physical concerns and were attempts by residents to control their physical environment through land use or externality/amenity issues. Most were "requests" to "correct" a noise, air or traffic problem, or were an "objection" to the planned or current use of local land by specific industries.
The two concerns of requests to correct and objections to a planned use are inherently different issues. Where the former implies an attitude of conditional acceptance of an existing land use, the latter conveys an attitude of unconditional refusal to a newer expanded use. For instance, the two objections made against the Big Sister Foods Factory were not that the factory had no right to be there, or that it should be moved, but that the traffic should be controlled to minimize noise and damage, e.g. conditional acceptance (LCM, 2/7/63; 16/7/63). The latter are questions that arise regarding the controls on both the uses of land and their effects on adjacent uses.

The difference between the issues is a fundamental one as it raises the questions of residents’ attitudes to mixed land uses and the extent to which they wish to manage their physical environment. Efforts to control industrial externalities can saddle industry and municipal government with the expense of initiating, policing and enforcing amenity standard (Agnew, 1981). Efforts to discourage or disallow industrial development and expansion altogether can affect the employment opportunities and economic well-being of those non-residents and residents alike who work in local industry, and municipal rate coffers may lose rate revenue. Nonetheless there are also benefits in both instances. Limited control of industrial externalities benefits the surrounding environment and the residents therein. However outright prohibition of industry or industrial growth would benefit residents more by preserving and improving their residential environment in a more permanent way.
With outright prohibition however, locally employed residents or residents in a laboring or working-class occupation would arguably find themselves in a contradictory position. Where on the one hand some of their physical and property value interest would lie in improved residential amenity, they would also have an economic and practical interest in maintaining industrial employment in the suburb. Middle-class residents living in industrial suburbs do not depend on industry for their living and could justify prohibiting industrial development. However, working-class residents dependent on manufacturing or transport jobs would be less willing to consider residential amenity as a value distinct from or more valuable than local employment opportunities and would be less willing to prohibit that development.

The occupational background of letter and petition writers concerned with industrial issues illustrates some of that tension. Of the actual objections to industrial land use expansion, five were addressed by residents with middle-class occupations and five by residents with working-class occupations. This does not indicate any clear contradiction of interest among working-class residents. There seemed to be as many working-class as middle-class residents willing to prohibit industrial development.

However, working-class residents were much more likely to address industrial issues as issues of control of the external effects rather than prohibition of the land uses. Of the letters concerned with amenity and abatement of noise and air pollution without banning industry altogether, five were written by residents with middle-class occupations but thirteen by those
with working-class occupations. The residential interest of working-class residents living in mixed residential/industrial areas conflicted with their employment interests. The evidence shows that more working-class residents tried to overcome that conflict by working to ameliorate local residential-industrial conflict without insisting on industrial displacement. Working-class residents were more concerned with amelioration of problems as opposed to the middle-class interest in complete land use change and planning prohibition of industrial development. With the increasing gentrification of the suburb the conflicts between industrial and residential interests increased, as did the participation of middle-class residents.

The Balmain Association

Resident action groups in Balmain and the Balmain Association in particular addressed the industrial issues and land use problems. Indeed, the large developments required collective action because they were instigated by State authorities which were less likely to respond to individual local interests the way municipal authorities did. The Balmain Association's earliest activities were instigated by rumours of the container terminals and a chemical tank depot to be developed on Balmain's foreshores (BAN, 8/75).

Although the matter of the proposed tanks and that of the containers took up most of the time and energy of that group, it also addressed other industrial issues. In 1968, 1974, 1976 and 1979 the Association addressed industrial plans mooted in council's gazetted planning schemes, hoping to remove non-
conforming industrial uses from primarily residential areas (Balmain Assn., 1968a). These, along with plans to re-activate the Balmain coal loader (BAN, 7/77 to 5/79), build marinas (BAN, 3/75 and 7/78), develop a sand terminal (BAN, 8/80) and develop smaller industry (BAN, 5/70; 7/77) prompted organized response by groups and the Balmain Association in particular. Altogether a review of council correspondence revealed only thirteen letters to council from the Balmain Association on specifically industry-related problems. A review of Balmain Association newsletters indicated that the group addressed the local industry question approximately fifty times, and dealt primarily with the large industrial developments. Most of the issues mentioned in the newsletters concerned the Morts Dock development and the container issue (38%), and the others addressed the coal loader (18%) or chemical storage tanks (14%).

In reference to the frameworks developed in Chapter Two, in most instances the group articulated its interest in industrial development in terms of the immediate effects on the physical environment and not in the political or resource implications. However, because the aims of the Association were often opposed to those of the local and State governments the Association needed to address the other aspects of the problems if it was to ensure its success in pursuing its physical interests. For instance, if the Association was to succeed in convincing council of its viewpoint it would need to operate in an environment of consultation and participation. This would require changes in the local political system. The group's interest could be summed up in specific areas of interest: participation in planning and
development control, and amenity improvement. This required the group to take political interests in reforming council practice and procedure, local political traditions and local social attitudes.

Although the Balmain Association showed a markedly anti-council attitude on many industrial issues the Association tried to avoid an "anti-industrial" attitude or overt efforts to limit industrial activity in the Balmain area. Indeed, in a local newspaper the Association went to great lengths to point out that it was not an anti-industrial group:

Many of the industries established in the area, particularly those on the waterfront are an essential ingredient of Balmain's development. Not only do they add colour to the suburb's everyday living but they also provide employment for many of the suburb's residents (Link, 9/21/66).

The Association seemed more interested in keeping the more traditional industries which helped distinguish Balmain from any suburb without foreshores, and less interested in industry which could operate just anywhere.

The Association had many indirect ways of controlling and reducing industry's impact on the surrounding community. For instance, Association calls for public participation in planning decisions seem to have been initially intended to raise general political issues rather than influencing particular land use questions (LCM, 29/11/66; 8/3/66). However these issues of participation and consultation were most frequently voiced when protesting the Mort Bay and White Bay container terminals, the storage of chemicals and the upgrading of the Balmain coal
Notwithstanding claims to the contrary, many of the Association's efforts could be interpreted as "anti-industrial". The Association's interest in development control, although usually articulated in opposition to flat and unit development (BAN, 2/70, 11/71) was also directed against several council decisions to allow small factories to operate in residential areas (BAN, 7/77, 9/75). Also, their interest in amenity issues, usually articulated by the group as opposition to "environmental nuisances" (BAN, 4/72), was most specifically directed to the noise and air pollution of local industry and the traffic it generated (BAN, 8/71, 10/71). The Association may not have opposed industrial land uses in general but it often did so in particular time and places. Concerns for the specifically industrial issues often motivated the more general efforts to reform local planning objectives and procedures.

The Balmain Association used its middle-class resources to pursue its interests through conventional action. On the conventional side the Association organized meetings (BAN, 4/68), deputations (BAN, 8/69), and referenda (BAN, 8/66); wrote newsletters (BAN, 10/67) and planning reports (BAN, 6/67), much as any legitimate group would. This helped generate a respectability and legitimacy which enabled the group to encourage others to join its activities in both integrative and adversarial efforts, encouraged local and state representatives to listen to their opinions (BAN, 6/67) and encouraged individual members to participate (BAN, 12/67), write letters or voice opinions on their own. The Balmain Association used each of these
tactics on various issues of industrial development in Balmain. The most frequently reported effort by the Balmain Association was the writing of letters both for publicity and for pressure. These included letters to local papers State cabinet ministers and local industrial managers (BAN, four in 1967 and 1968, and four between 1970 and 1979).

The Association’s main task was to keep its membership informed, concerned and prepared to act as individuals within the conventional legal/democratic system. This involved making legal claims (BAN, 8/67); attending council meetings (2/69), reporting pollution (2/69, 5/79, 6/80); objecting to the LPS (7/79), voting (8/74), and writing local representatives, (10/69). The Association also made representations directly to State members (BAN, 4/67) to Commonwealth Senate Inquiries (BAN, 8/67, 4/73, 1/79) and many unreported verbal, personal and written representations.

With each of these collective actions, as with those of the individuals, it is difficult to assign a precise motive. It is clear that their interests were in trying to change the planning goals of the municipality and State government. This was articulated as an effort to separate residential and industrial land uses to improve amenity of the suburb and the affected dwellings. Because of the predominantly middle class make-up of the resident action group however, the increasing renovation trend among the middle-class, and the large property value increases in the suburb, it is difficult not to attribute an economic or property value motive as well.
The protection of property values was most clear in the publication "Balmain Residents Case Against Cargo Trucking from Mort Bay" (1975). Local estate agents estimated that properties affected by the container industry and resulting traffic could be detrimentally affected by up to 10 percent of the value of the dwelling at time of sale (1975, Append.9). It is clear that residents felt it was important to address the detrimental environment impact on their property values.

Containers, Chemicals and Coal

This section discusses the history of the particular issues in Balmain and examines them in light of the framework set out earlier. Figure 8.3 provides a chronology of the events to be discussed here.
Figure 8.3: Timeline of Events Related to Industry In Balmain, 1961-1981

1961

1965

Balmain Assn. forms

1966

Leichhardt Co. rejects State plans for 2 container terminals in Balmain
Balmain Assn. organizes public meeting and petition to object to the plans

1967

Federal Senate hearings on Containers;
Leichhardt Co. allows the containers

1968

Esso decides against chemical tanks in Balmain; Balmain aldermen vote for recission and are expelled from the ALP; Leichhardt Co. gazettes plan

1969

White Bay Terminal opens amidst resident protest


Independents win Co. 1971
Majority in Leichhardt

Leichhardt Co. erects traffic gates 1973
near terminals to control truck traffic
Council gazettes new town plan 1974

Independents lose majority on Council 1976

Council gazettes another town plan

Local govt. elections 1977
State govt. announces plans to upgrade the Balmain Coal Loader

Terminal Pty. vacates Mort Bay site 1979
Council gazettes another town plan

Local govt. elections 1980
Between 1965 and 1967, just as the Balmain Association was beginning to act on local issues, Associated Steamships Pty, the Maritime Services Board (MSB), Swift and Co. and Esso each proposed separate industrial developments for the Balmain peninsula foreshores and the Association directed much of its time and energy to these issues.

Associated Steamships planned to lease land owned by the State Maritime Services Board for container terminals at Mort Bay on the central part of the peninsula. The land had originally been owned by Thomas Mort’s ship building and repair company, but by 1967 had not been in use for about six years (C.P.P., 1968). Development there would put noisy industry in close proximity to residences and require heavily laden trucks to navigate several kilometres of narrow residential streets on steep grades before reaching Victoria Road, the main road connecting the peninsula to the city and Western suburbs.

The MSB planned an additional container terminal on the eastern side of the suburb at White Bay. In the early sixties the land housed a few sheds and was used for minor, MSB purposes (Senate Hearings, 1968). This development would bring about problems similar to those at Mort Bay. White Bay, however, was served by a goods rail, and a single, flat street within a kilometre of Victoria Road. The chemical plant and tank farm were planned for the White Bay Terminal at the end of Stephen Street, and the Coal Loader was near the White Bay Terminal on Robert Street (C.P.P., 1968).
The Balmain Association quickly organized a public meeting to discuss the port plans of the MSB and urged the Leichhardt Council to disapprove the plans (BAN, 10/66). The council did reject the plans, especially objecting to the development on the Mort Bay side where Council hoped to develop high-density housing (C.P.P., 1968). This development, they complained, was incompatible with nearby residential development, was inappropriate for the location and topography, would injure amenity through vibration, noise and soot, and increase heavy traffic on narrow streets (LCM, 17/5/66). The arguments rested strongly on the amenity rather than property values.

At the time, the container and shipping industry was undergoing increased pressure for growth and modernization which the Liberal State government wished to encourage, believing it to be in the interests of State economic growth (C.P.P., 1968). On the advice of the State Planning Authority (SPA) the State Government overturned council's disapproval arguing that the MSB-owned the land and as a state authority had jurisdiction over the land, and that the development of the container industry was in the national interest (C.P.P., 1968; Johnston, 1979). In February 1967 the State Planning Minister also overturned council's decision and allowed Esso to build a chemical storage area at Darling and Ewenton Streets (LCM, 7/2/67), and a later application of a developer to store Latex emulsion at 123 Darling Street (LCM, 15/10/68).

Faced with the SPA decisions, council had no alternative but to approve the developments. Disapproval would accomplish nothing more than a statement of "principle" in defending the
residential interests of Balmain. The Balmain aldermen Nick Origlass and Izzy Wyner and the Balmain Association wanted council to stand on principle and vote against this development which council had little control over. The council majority refused and when the developments were put to a vote Origlass, Wyner and the other Balmain alderman Graham crossed the floor to be the only three aldermen to vote against the ALP caucus. Their defection made no difference and the council vote allowed the developments. Shortly thereafter Origlass put himself forward as a candidate in the coming State election (Johnston, 1979).

These acts of party disobedience, the tank farm decision and some long-standing animosity between the caucus and Origlass and Wyner prompted the ALP to expel all three Balmain aldermen from the party (Jakubowicz, 1972). Origlass later lost the State election although he made a credible showing (Johnston, 1979). He and Wyner won the Balmain aldermanic positions on an independent labor (Balmain Leichhardt Labor) ticket in the next council election.

The Balmain aldermen began their efforts by working within the established municipal, State and party systems to gain favourable outcomes for Balmain. However, they had an antagonistic relationship with the ALP, and the ALP-controlled council, and they opposed the Liberal government’s plans for their suburb. They tried to argue that the importance and value of Balmain’s amenity was worth council taking a stand on principle. When that failed Origlass and Wyner chose to separate
themselves from the majority by voting against caucus, were expelled and left to try to influence what they could outside the caucus room. Once outside the decision-making they formed their own party, won seats on council and pursued adversarial political tactics against council and the State authorities. The industrial developments had seen the Balmain aldermen pushed to the political margins.

The industrial developments also worked to galvanize the Balmain Association. Although it had formed before the controversial developments were discussed, the container issue brought the Association together quickly. By May 1966 the Association had organized a petition of over 700 (LCM, 17/5/66) against the proposed container development at Mort Bay. Just as council had, the Association argued that traffic chaos, noise, and loss of residential amenity would result. Unlike council, the Balmain Association was not as bound by conventional municipal practice and with its predominantly middle-class membership had a variety of resources and tools available for its battles. Their public meeting to discuss the general port plans of the MSB attracted 500 people (BAN, 10/6) and those attending resolved to urge the Premier to hold a public enquiry into the port plan with all work suspended in the meantime (LCM, 1/11/66).

The Association also urged residents to attend the SPA appeal hearing (Link, 26/10/66), distributed leaflets to commuters using Victoria Road to warn them of the potential effect on traffic (Link, 15/7/66) and organized a spontaneous demonstration at Parliament House (Link, S/3/67). The marginal position of the group meant that such adversarial action would
not harm their political influence or position because they had no stake in the system, but their activities could serve to draw attention and publicity to their cause.

However, the middle-class backgrounds and the professional resources of the members and leaders also enabled the Association to undertake mainstream, conventional action even as a marginal group, as seen in the container hearings. In 1967 the Commonwealth Senate undertook to investigate the container method of handling cargoes in a series of Senate select committee hearings. These were conducted in various cities over the course of several months. The committee heard 177 witnesses covering a wide range of issues. Of the 177 all were representatives of private enterprise or State maritime authorities, save three residents and three municipal representatives — all from Balmain: John Power, lecturer in government at the University of Sydney and President of the Balmain Association; Mrs. L.R. Roussos and Mr. G.B. Cochrane, Balmain residents and organizers of the Balmain Residential Development committee; and Origlass and Wyner (pre-expulsion) and Arthur McKenna, the Leichhardt Town Planner (C.P.P., 1968)

Here was an instance of middle-class residential interest marginal to the national containerisation issue expressed through conventional methods and in established political arenas. The Balmain witnesses reaffirmed their position but had little impact on the committee. The committee chairman indicated that much of the residents' evidence was irrelevant to the issue at hand and directed too often to criticism of State authorities in NSW.
According to the terms of reference as interpreted by the committee chairman:

We have decided that properly and in the interests of constitutional propriety the discussion and the evidence must be confined to the physical pros and cons as to whether or not in the light of the knowledge a container port can be established at Balmain (C.P.P., 1968:77).

The chairman entertained no discussion or criticism of the NSW government, planning authorities or MSB which the residents had hoped to discuss. As Cochrane said "I did not know what the terms of reference were. I did come here to criticize the MSB for its efforts to evade council’s laws" (p. 101). Although the committee stated that the residents were making their plea to the wrong body they could only reply "There has been no other body--statutory or otherwise -- that would listen" (p. 102). The residents and council representatives clearly felt that the situation in Balmain required unusual efforts to represent their interests.

The testimony of the Balmain residents and representatives rested on two measurements of value. One was the value of the container industry to the national interest, defined by and insisted on by the Senate committee. The other was the value of residential amenity to the local residents. As Power said:

None of us is an expert in transport or cargo handling, but by applying what intelligence we have to these problems and examining the evidence that has been published it seems to us that the metropolitan and national interest is not served by development of Balmain. Our interests are not, of course. The fact that we are interested parties does not mean that we are incapable of being objective about these matters (C.P.P., 1968:82).
The Balmain witnesses most frequently voiced fears over the issues of traffic and parking with no reference to property values. But the likelihood of diminished amenity was not a sufficient argument for the committee. Disturbance of amenity was not entirely acceptable as an interest if it impeded "development and progress industrially" (ibid.). The local residents' definitions of what was valuable and worth preserving were not those of the Senate committee.

The residents obviously were not in a position to influence decisions on this issue on a national level. The national concern for environmental issues, which might have struck a responsive chord if the issue were raised today, had yet to surface as they do today. After the hearings the residents returned their attention to issues which they might be able to influence within the Leichhardt Municipality. The residents' participation in the hearings showed that although the interested Balmain residents were in many ways irrelevant to council and the Balmain Association marginal to institutional politics, their organization and middle-class resources enabled them to undertake more frequent local actions both within and without the normal local political activities.

From Prevention to Control

In 1968/69 the nature of Balmain's industrial land use issue changed from prevention of land use expansion to control of their effects. Esso had decided against building tanks for chemical storage but construction had begun on the Mort Bay and White Bay sites for the container terminals. At the same time, council gazetted its first planning scheme in the midst of a local
government election. All three events influenced the issues residents addressed and how they addressed them. The construction and operation of the container facilities shifted residents' goals from stopping large-scale industrial development to limiting its effects on neighbouring residential areas. The development of the local planning scheme introduced an opportunity for residents to contribute to the future control of industrial development. The 1968 election allowed residents an opportunity to voice their dissatisfaction with past efforts at preservation and future plans for residential influence on local decision-making.

On the container issue residents shifted their complaints and objections to the control of the safety and amenity aspects of the physical environment, which were the responsibility of either the council or the MSB, depending on the issue. Leichhardt Council received its first petition addressing the problem of heavy trucks on suburban streets in September 1968. This was followed a dozen written complaints of noise and nuisance (LCM from 2/69 to 6/78).

The council was also a political actor and fought to maintain local control. Although it had been innovative in tackling the issues in the State political arena, it used mostly integrative and institutional tactics. Of its ten written actions on the issue of local industry most took the form of resolutions targeted to the MSB (LCM 6/65, 5/66), the Premier and State government (LCM, 6/65, 3/67, 5/66, 4/67), NSW Legislative Council (LCM, 4/67), and Esso (LCM, 9/66). These
were to no avail, and neither were the personal deputations and representations of aldermen and council officers. Appeals to the State representatives, MSB and SPA planners legal challenges in planning appeals tribunals failed too.

Residents did address the container terminals as land use issues again when the MSB proposed to erect a 70 foot high shed at White Bay (LCM, 17/12/74). Land use issues were also raised when the MSB lease to Terminal Pty. was due to expire at Mort Bay. Both the shed and the lease extension were opposed by the White Bay RAG and the Balmain Branch of the ALP while others remained silent on the container land use question, concentrating instead on controlling their detrimental environmental effects (BAN, 10/74). From 1961 to 1980 residents raised smaller land use issues elsewhere in the suburb but their influence on the container developments apparently came to be seen as increasingly futile in many people's minds.

The gazetting of the local planning scheme in Leichhardt in 1968 offered residents an opportunity to express their interests in the future land use of the municipality. For residents and the Balmain Association this seemed a prime opportunity to set out Balmain's historical and physical distinctiveness and the value the Association saw in managing it in a controlled, preservation-minded way. To address these issues the Balmain Association published two reports of professional standard, one addressing residential development (Balmain Assn, 1968a), the other making formal objection to the Leichhardt Planning Scheme (1968b).
Because council denied the Balmain Association right to object, it sent its reports to the State Planning Authority asking for permission to comment on the scheme. The State Planning Minister Phillip Morton agreed to look into the matter and on the issue of objections stated "it is competent for the association to lodge formal objections with the Leichhardt Council" while leaving the decision to council (BAN, 8/69). Aldermen Brady replied that the SPA contradicted its earlier advice which claimed that all objectors must have a property interest, thus excluding the Balmain Association. Although Brady reported the council willing to accept the objections if they had "sufficient merit", he dismissed them saying most of the matters raised by the Association had already been addressed by council.

In terms of industrial development the plan generally endorsed the status quo, although it did propose some changes to consolidate land uses and reduce some mixed uses. This disappointed both residents and industrial interests. Three unions objected to zoning changes from industrial to residential because of the impact on employment, but they were disregarded because they too had no estate or interest (LCM, 4/6/68, 11/6/68; Local Leader, 12/6/68). The Balmain Association objected to the industrial use on the waterfront and several other non-residential uses in residential areas (Balmain Assn., 1968a), but council disregarded them because the Association had no interest or estate in the matter. Even a petition of 992 objectors was rejected because it had originally (and mistakenly) been directed to the SPA, which in turn forwarded it to the Leichhardt Council. Council then refused to accept it because the organizers had in
the first place sent it to the wrong authority (LCM, 25/6/68).

During the hearing of objections to the scheme people with all manner of interest packed the gallery, holding placards and interrupting with interjections:

"Up the Tigers! The Land grabbers want the lion’s share"
"Wake up people of Balmain! Your jobs are at stake!"
"We have always lived and worked in Balmain -- leave it that way!" (Local Leader, 12/6/68).

Although the issue had changed from prevention to control and the target from State to local government, many resident interests were still defined as irrelevant and marginal by local government. This frustrated the political efforts of the Balmain Association and other "interested" residents in bringing about the sort of planning change they desired and in participating in the management of industrial development.

Rebuffed at those efforts, residents turned to the local elections as an opportunity to influence council decisions on industrial development. Origlass and Wyner were re-elected as Balmain independents, but as a minority on council only served to represent Balmain’s minority interests with no hope of gaining political control.

Continuing Battles

The gazetting of the Leichhardt Planning Scheme and the 1968 local government election were only the beginning of the battle of interests on the issue of industrial development in Balmain. A demonstration of fifty residents greeted the opening of the White Bay Terminal in March 1969 (Link, 26/3/69). Soon thereafter, a local action committee of residents whose dwellings overlooked the terminal promised vigilant attention to the noise
and soot at White Bay, threatening to report all violations of regulations (Link, 6/8/69). The MSB offered to buy the dwellings but were rebuffed by residents and criticized by the Balmain aldermen for not offering compensation instead (LCM, 23/9/69).

Strained relations between council and Balmain residents continued until a majority of independents were elected to council in the 1971 local government elections, as discussed in Chapter Five. The election did not broaden the jurisdiction of local government control over the negative externalities of the container terminals. It did, however, place in authority aldermen sympathetic to the amenity problems resulting from industry, eager to encourage citizen participation and hopeful of gazetting a new local planning scheme.

The new council made progress on three fronts. Although it was frustrated in attempts to regulate the soot and noise of the container sites (BAN, 10/69), it decided to erect traffic gates across the streets around the Mort Bay facility. This limited trucking to 7 am to 7 pm Monday to Friday and 7 am to 1 pm on Saturday (Balmain Residents Case, 1975). Residents applauded this action and fought several times to continue with the closures.

Council also completed a new Outline Plan for the municipality with plans to redevelop the industrial foreshores with parks, small marinas and low and medium density housing. The council had prepared for this plan by sponsoring many small, local meetings which allowed residents to express their interests and concerns (Hampton and Pike, 1975). These and other efforts
of the council improved the relationship of residents and council, and made resident interest a more integral part of municipal decisions.

Immediately after the progressive council submitted the new plan to the State Planning and Environment Commission (which had replaced the SPA), the independents lost their majority on council to the ALP, throwing the plan and council's policy on industrial development into question again, and pushing the newer resident interests outside the decision-making process. The next plan gazetted in 1976 reversed many of the intentions of the 1971-1974 council, but was dismissed by the State Planning Commission of the now Labor State government (BAN, 6/78). The Association began to hope the State government was sympathetic to its goals, but only for a short while as the government soon announced plans to upgrade the coal loader at Robert and Mansfield Streets Balmain notwithstanding planned development of port alterations at Botany (BAN, 7/77).

The Balmain Association immediately called a public meeting on the coal loader plans. At the meeting the local State ALP member Roger Degen explained that the plans, as with the containers ten years ago under a Liberal government, were important to wider State interests of coal contracts, revenue and employment (BAN, 9/77). Not satisfied with Degen's response, residents of Balmain, Lilyfield, Rozelle and Glebe formed the Coal Loader Opposition Group (CLOG) and joined by the Glebe Society and Annandale Association, made submissions for the Environmental Impact Assessment undertaken by the State Pollution Control Commission (NSW, SPCC, n.d.). Fortunately for the
residents, the State government eventually decided to instead expand at Port Botany where, as suggested elsewhere, the heavily migrant, blue-collar area would suffer the effects (BAN, 5/79; Butlin, 1976).

No sooner had the coal loader issue been settled than the lessee of the Mort Bay container site gave notice of its intention to vacate and the Leichhardt Council gazetted its next planning scheme. Both were to affect the future land use plans for industrial sites in Balmain. In the instance of Mort Bay there had been fourteen years of resident action and ten years of operation and the company was moving to Botany Bay, the new centre of Sydney for container transport. The 1979 plan zoned the area for waterfront industrial use although the Balmain Association and others suggested several residential and open space alternatives (BAN, 5/79). Again the Leichhardt Plan preserved the status quo in opposition to resident interests hoping for increased non-industrial use.¹

Although the Balmain Association addressed the issue of the newly vacant site, general resident interest had a declining say in the land use plans of the suburb. Residents' response to the 1979 plan was minimal and generally singlehanded, reflecting a "distinct lack of interest" among residents and Association members (BAN, 10/79). Although the Balmain Association produced one of its most sophisticated efforts in a seventy-page booklet of objections to the LPS as pertaining to the Balmain/Rozelle area, it was accomplished by a small group of members (see Chapter Seven). Each area had a booklet specially targetted to
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the issues and problems of its area but only two members made themselves available to distribute the leaflets (BAN, 5/79).

The Association was experiencing a general decline and malaise in activity and membership. James Colman the town planner appointed to hear the objections, commented on the public's poor response to council's invitation to take part in the objection process (BAN, 3/80). However, a year later he more specifically noted the lack of resident participation and consultation allowed by the council in the plan preparation. For that and many other reasons Colman condemned the plan and recommended that another be prepared (Leich. Co., 1981).

Other indications of resident interest in local industrial matters showed shifts in interest as well. Between 1976 and 1980 council recorded only five petitions and one letter from residents and groups on industrial issues and each on a separate issue. All, save one written by Nick Origlass, were from middle-class residents. Not only had interest declined but what was left had become solely middle-class.

The changed social and political environment of Balmain and the Leichhardt Municipality could have been expected to provide more resident interest. There were more middle-class residents with resources and with the property interest of homeownership suited for political action and the enhanced interest of renovation which theoretically are indications of increased interest.

There were some other changes which explain the diminishing signs of interest, some concerned with municipal procedure and some with resident action. In terms of Leichhardt's municipal
procedure more residents directed their letters, petitions and verbal communications directly to council officers or subcommittees responsible for the problem at hand instead of to the council as a whole (LCM, 1979, 1980). Only letters addressed to the council as a whole were considered here as evidence and their decreasing use by residents could be partly due to the smaller number received by the council and the larger number received by the specific committees and municipal officers.

This also indicated a growing "issue specific" perception by residents. Although all councils work in a committee system with separate roles and responsibilities, traditionally all matters residents wished action on were addressed to the council as a whole. Only in the late 1970s did both council and residents begin to distinguish the roles of council committees and officers to the extent that correspondence was addressed directly to committees and council officers and less frequently considered as a matter to be addressed by council as a whole.

In terms of resident action, groups experienced an ebb in member participation. As noted in Chapter Seven, from 1976 to 1980 three of the four groups examined here wrote of a small "crisis" of some kind, questioning whether resident action groups should just "wind up" and go home. The Balmain Association experienced this malaise too, which explains some of the fall in the group’s activity and interest.

The overall incentive and imperative nature of political action had changed with increased gentrification and patterns of industrial development. After fifteen years of gentrification
and resident action in Balmain, there had been several accomplishments in efforts to improve Balmain's amenity. At the same time many middle-class people were moving in and contributing to the community, which helped improve the suburb's status. The Balmain Association's early and substantial growth can be attributed largely to the battles like the containers and chemicals in the 1960s. These large issues having major and widespread effects served to galvanize residents, gave the Association a high profile and developed a collective identity. By 1980 the major threats had disappeared (although some were still to come like the Second Harbour Crossing and the public housing at Mort Bay), and more attention was paid to the smaller, more numerous decisions outlined in the town plan. These small scale actions were more likely to provoke individual action than collective action. As well, the new middle-class residents had gained sufficient electoral strength to elect a progressive council, which shifted many of the remaining debates away from resident action and into municipal politics. Although land use issues were still important to residents, the threat of industrial development had declined, as had much resident action.

**Summary**

This chapter has examined the circumstances of industrial change in inner Sydney and the subsequent response of local residents. While manufacturing declined overall across the years, there was a peak in the transportation sector in Balmain from 1969 to 1979 in the container industry. Early response to industrial developments were by blue-collar residents who used letters and petitions as their primary political tool. Over the
years and both the proportion of the blue-collar workers and their use declined. Thus what began as a series of letters and petitions of local residents complaining of industrial noise and pollution grew to an increasing middle-class concern with concentrated industrial land use in a residential area. With the industrial development of container wharves, residents shifted their goals from prevention of new land uses to control of the local effects of existing uses. When the major industries finally left the area resident goals changed to land use and planning decisions.

Whether residents' actions were adversarial or integrative depended more on whether they were in a political minority or were addressing issues tangential to the local political arena, which in turn was determined by the political institutions they were addressing. Thus the Balmain Association could legitimately use integrative, conventional action and give evidence at the Senate hearing on containerization (even though with no effect) and within twelve months be denied right of objection on the Leichhardt Planning Scheme because the group had no "interest or estate". As a result the group took disruptive action at council meetings, interrupted peak hour traffic and demonstrated at Parliament House, which galvanized public attention to their issue and allowed them to express the strength of their views. From 1971 to 1974 council encouraged residents' interest, did not relegate them to the political margins and promoted resident participation in conventional, integrative efforts in municipal decision-making.
The evidence also showed that residents usually articulated their interest in terms of the amenity, claiming an interest in quietness, cleanliness, health and safety with infrequent references to property values. However, the increasing popularity and high value of property in Balmain could not be denied and by 1980 home ownership and renovation were no longer the perogative of a few. Resident action was more widely accepted and practised although association membership and participation in group activities had declined.

Increased interest in property values alone cannot help explain increased resident action on industrial issues in Balmain. The fact that many middle-class residents were in the minority and promoted innovative planning ideas often irrelevant to the political decision-makers better explains why residents were interested in issues of industrial development and how they worked to achieve their goals.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER EIGHT

Ironically, as will be discussed in the Conclusion, the site was eventually used for public housing, which created one of the suburb's most virulent resident protests in the mid-1980s.
Chapter Eight found there to be considerable resident interest in issues of industrial land use, at a time when the overall number of inner city industrial establishments were declining but when there were several new large developments in Balmain. With traffic there was considerable resident interest at a time of increasing inner city car ownership and metropolitan-wide car use for commuting. Part one examines the resident interest in roads and expressways, part two parking, and part three traffic.

Like every major western city Sydney has experienced massive growth of car ownership and suburbanization of residential development. In Sydney in 1950 there was one car for every ten persons, which grew to one for every four in 1966 and one car for every three persons in 1971 (SATS, 1974). Moreover there was a massive growth of inner city jobs, parking and traffic problems in inner areas and efforts to construct new roads and widen old inner city roads designed in a pre-car era (Manning, forthcoming).

Roads, parking and traffic show the conflicting interests that arise as a result of gentrification and the increased use of local facilities which affect residential amenity. As with industrial land use and development the issues here highlight the conflict of interest between people who value the resources
because they use them and people who are adversely affected by them as residents and property owners. These conflicts occur between local and non-local interests, and between residential and commercial interests within inner areas.

Roads, parking and traffic are intrinsically different issues with some common aspects. Road construction, widening and later maintenance are major capital investments designed to permit a freer traffic flow. Although councils maintain and control the use of local roads, the State Department of Main Roads is responsible for building and maintaining roads classified as "Main Roads". In the inner city this can require considerable amounts of dwelling demolition and land resumption, and generates noise, air pollution, and other negative external effects. While commuters from other areas to inner city jobs might view these developments favourably, they impose high costs on inner city residents.

Traffic and parking controls are generally determined by local government although State policies generally influence them. Roads, parking and traffic however were addressed by residents at a time when more inner city residents owned cars and relied on private vehicles for transport. Not only were the subsequent problems increasing for residents, residents were themselves part of the problem, and the gentrification in the inner suburbs was making it worse.

Issues of traffic and parking highlight the increasingly contradictory position of inner city residents. While defending their homes and amenities against freeways which would have diverted through-traffic, they also aimed to restrict through
traffic and parking on existing roads. Their private residential interests were directly at odds with those of car commuters from outer suburbs to inner city jobs and also pitted inner city residents against each other. While they had an interest in the general improvement of local roads and parking access, they also had an interest in protecting their own street from such developments.

What made the position of inner city residents increasingly contradictory in all of these transport issues was their own rate of car acquisition. With increasing affluence accompanying gentrification, the increase in vehicle ownership in the inner suburbs was more dramatic than in most other areas (Table 9.1). Although the number of vehicles per dwelling was still quite low compared to the metropolitan average, the older, more densely settled and built up parts of the city could not accommodate the vehicles as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Vehicles per dwelling</th>
<th>Percentage change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>1.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Census)

Each issue involved different sets of actors and interests and was addressed in different political arenas. Residents'
position vis a vis majority interests and decision makers also varied from issue to issue. In the inner suburbs from 1961 to 1980 the newer purchasers with middle-class backgrounds and skills were distinct from their local social and political environments, but became more a part of them as more middle-class home purchasers moved in to the areas. Each of the three issues of roads, parking and traffic are examined to determine resident response to the issues and the intents and outcomes of resident action. Figure 9.1 provides a timeline of events related to the three issues in these areas and discussed in the remainder of the chapter.
Figure 9.1: Timeline for Events Related to Roads, Traffic and Parking, 1961-1980

1964
Traffic Advisory Authority formed

1967
Paddington residents oppose local road widening

1968
Sunning recommends against Padd. rd. widening

1961
1965
1970
1975
1980

Leichhardt Co. opposes freeways 1970

Andl. & Glebe oppose freeways 1972

Committee for Pedestrian Priority formed in Paddington 1973

Syd. Area Transp. Study released 1974

J.Thompson fountain opposed in Padd. 1975

5 streets closed in Padd.; Councils given authority to control local traffic; 1976

Ferry Services resume in Balmain

DMR drops freeway plans; Padd. Action Plan released 1977

Resident parking est'd. in Glebe and Padd. 1979


PATSYM released

TWU bans Paddington
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There were a variety of parties interested in the issue of roads and expressways: the DMR which constructed the roads; property owners affected by the roads including residential, commercial, industrial and public property owners; affected residents who were not property owners, road users and local councils. Because the DMR was responsible for the plans and because its efforts were of such a magnitude in the inner suburbs, it is not surprising to find that most protest efforts were aimed at the NSW State government and led by organized resident groups and often local government itself.

The DMR's primary solution to growing transport problems in Sydney was to construct more roads, including plans for 160 km of a radial freeway system with the hub in inner Sydney (DMR, 1966). In 1963 the provisions of the State Main Road Act had been extended to the inner suburbs, permitting proclamation of existing and proposed expressways (DMR, 1964).

The DMR articulated an interest in efficient and speedy city traffic and considered the desired aims worth the financial cost of property resumption and construction (DMR, 1964). DMR never publicly discussed the extent of residential demolition for the planned road construction but was presumably still working under the guidelines of the Cumberland County Report which recommended extensive demolition and redevelopment of the inner suburbs (CCC Report, 1948).

There were however, insufficient funds for major road building resulting in most of the DMR's inner city work taking the form of road widening and piecemeal road construction.
Although they had actually reserved some 10,000 to 15,000 dwellings (Kendig, 1979), they only bought and demolished a small number of them. By the time the state road authorities had gained increased Commonwealth grants for road construction the cost of land resumption, especially in the inner city, had soared. The rising costs, the cut back on capital work expenditures by the Fraser government in the mid-1970s, and the election of the Labor government in 1976 led DMR to abandon most inner city freeway plans and to scale-down many road plans (Glebe Project, 1980).

Of the six areas of particular interest in this thesis, five were targetted for dwelling demolition and subsequent road widening or freeway construction with consequent losses of dwellings expected throughout the inner city. Annandale expected to lose 550 dwellings; Glebe, 655; Newtown (several hundred), Paddington and Surry Hills (Kendig, 1979). Balmain’s position on the peninsula left it unaffected, although it had industrial traffic problems of its own.¹ In sympathy with the threatened futures of its neighbouring suburbs, Balmain residents joined the anti-expressway battle (Link, 2/2/72).

Paddington

One of the first expressions of resident interest on the issue of roads and expressways was the opposition of Paddington residents to the widening of Nield Avenue and Boundary Street in 1967/68 and later in opposition to the widening of Jersey Road. Because the plans were initiated by DMR residents had no reason to address their complaints or objections to their municipal
council. An extraordinary venue for resident interest arose when the State Minister for Local Government arranged a special hearing to examine the road and redevelopment plans targeted for Paddington. This had been instigated by resident opposition expressed primarily by the Paddington Society.

At the hearing both individual residents and the Society argued against demolition because they were interested in preserving the physical distinction and social community which they valued in Paddington. They convinced Commissioner Bunning and by the end Bunning too, wished to preserve what he saw as:

the social advantages of Paddington living and the spirit of camaraderie which exists between the people of the area, many with similar interests such as enthusiasm for the arts, and of the way in which this assists them in their pursuits and makes for a living environment which suits their temperament (Bunning, 1968:4).

Bunning also pointed out the importance of the increase in owner occupation, house sales and renovation in the suburb. For these three reasons — the increased financial value and distinctive architectural and social environment — Bunning recommended the road plans be abandoned and the suburb preserved.

Most of the testimony about the distinction and value of Paddington came from residents and not from the municipal council. George Warnecke, one of the aldermen for Paddington did testify at the hearing, but as a local resident, not a representative of council. Alderman Murchison of the Woollahra Council also gave testimony, but otherwise no interest was expressed by the council.²
This unusual hearing by the State government further enhanced Paddington's special and distinctive character. It allowed the residents to express their novel views on the use and exchange values of only recently condemned dwellings and the community of Paddington in locally innovative and yet legally conventional way. By the time the DMR proposed to widen Jersey Road in 1969/70 the Paddington Society was in a stronger position and could undertake more adversarial action (see Chapter 7).

The Road Issue Elsewhere

In the Leichhardt Municipality resident interest was strong and expressed most often through the resident action groups. The Glebe Society began its first full year of activity addressing the expressway plans through Glebe. The suburb was threatened with two freeways, one planned as a tunnel under the central part of the suburb (Map 9.1). As can be seen from Map 9.1, the proposed routes would destroy many dwellings, separate Glebe from Annandale and divide Glebe into three sections. The Society's main concern was to ensure that the freeway go under Glebe as a tunnel. They argued that "a second open expressway through Glebe will effectively destroy the natural unity and amenities of a highly valued and historic suburb" (GSN, 1/70). Their interests, like those of the Paddington Society, were in the distinctive and valuable aspects of the suburb. At the time however, they accepted the essence of the plan and did not question the eventual construction of the expressways.
Only a year later in 1972, joined by the Annandale Association, the Society came out in unqualified opposition to the expressways. The arguments and interests had shifted and now addressed physical, social and resource as well as political issues. Their interests reflected more the general and growing concern with equity and environmental aspects of car use (Manning, forthcoming). In terms of the social environment the planned route of the western distributor through Ultimo/Pyrment and Leichhardt would have divided many suburbs which resident groups argued should remain integrated. They believed that physical divisions by expressways would leave many residents disadvantaged by the severance of historically important ties (GSN, 2/71; AAN, 6/73). These urban strategies dependent on cars rather than public transport were seen to disadvantage women, the poor, the young, the old and the disabled and fought to have funds invested instead into public transport (GSN, 8/71, 2/75, 8/75, 9/75; Manning, forthcoming).

The concerns with physical issues were twofold: one directed to pollution, the other to congestion. Opponents of expressways feared that households near the new roads would be subjected to increased levels of noise and air pollution which have a detrimental local impact as well as a wider metropolitan impact (GSN, 11/69, 9/73, 5/75; AAN, 6/75). If road widening and freeway construction were to encourage more vehicle use the toxic and particulate pollution levels of the city would rise and disperse to affect the air quality of the whole city. Not surprisingly many homeowners had reason to fear the depressing effect of major roads on property values (Bradly and Holsman,
Objectors to expressways also turned DMR's efficiency argument on its head. Where the DMR argued that the radial freeways would allow more efficient travel, critics noted the limited access of cars to the inner city and across the Harbour, once freeways had enabled cars to reach the city (GSN, 2/71). Unless the DMR widened city roads first and constructed another Harbour crossing, all vehicles using the expressways would have to funnel through the already congested city streets and Harbour Bridge.

In Leichhardt the expressway plans became political issues in 1971. The newly elected Leichhardt Council with a majority of independents led by Nick Origlass announced its intention to lead the anti-expressway protests in the municipality. They were joined by other councils, student groups and other interested persons and groups to form the Anti-Urban Radial Expressway Group (Link, 3/11/71).

The issue of road widening and expressway construction was more widely debated in Leichhardt than in Paddington. The interests were not limited to amenity and property values as was the case in Paddington; and the arguments did not rest solely on the distinction and value articulated by newer middle-class residents and resident groups. Instead they included concerns with equity, and the general environment and resulted in co-operative action with other affected groups.

The tactics the resident groups used in the Leichhardt Municipality were also more wide-ranging than those practised by
residents in Paddington. Few interests were addressed to local council, save several from Glebe residents concerned with the future of the recently closed Federal Road on the western foreshores (LCM, 10/68, 6/75). Unlike Paddington residents, residents in the Leichhardt Municipality were never offered the opportunity of a special hearing to consider the road plans, nor were they relieved from the threats posed by the plans as quickly as Paddington had been. Instead residents continued to meet and discuss the issue for eight years.

The discussions and meetings were numerous, resulting in a variety of actions which were both representative and participatory, adversarial and integrative. On behalf of association members the groups wrote the State Ministers (GSN, 1/70, 3/76; AAN, 9/70, 6/73) and sent deputations to explain the residents' views (GSN, 6/72) and encouraged members to do the same on their own behalf (GSN, 8/71, 5/75, 9/76). Although the DMR often responded to these conventional, integrative actions (AAN, 9/70; GSN, 3/70) the groups represented small suburbs on a metropolitan-wide issue and carried little influence, and could not report any success in changing the plans or influencing the decision-makers.

Hoping to accomplish what the letters, petitions and deputations did not, resident groups organized more adversarial action with was a march through Glebe (AAN, 7/72) a rally for supporters (AAN, 11/73) and a demonstration with subsequent arrests in Fig Street, Ultimo (GSN, 8/74) -- all to no effect. The groups' invitation to the Builders Laborers Federation (BLF), to ban further demolition work in Glebe (Review, 10/72) did
manage to stall the demolition work. Although resident groups hoped that the Sydney Area Transportation Study would recommend cancellation of expressway plans (AAN, 6/74), the study endorsed the planned freeways through Glebe, Annandale and Leichhardt (SATS, 1974).

Residents were encouraged when the ALP gained control of the Commonwealth (1972-1975) and later the State government (1976). In 1973 the Commonwealth Labor Government acquired 700 Church of England residential properties in Glebe, which it planned to renovate for public housing. These dwellings were in the middle of the planned freeway route, adding a Federal interest to the local issue. In general the Federal Labor government opposed the expressways (Glebe Project, 1980). In 1975 Neville Wran, then Opposition Leader in the State government, attended an anti-expressway rally in Glebe and promised that if elected his Labor government would review the radial expressway policy (GSN, 1/80), a promise he fulfilled after election in March 1976 when the government abandoned the expressway plans in late 1977 (AAN, 11/77).

The other two suburbs facing threats of expressway development were Newtown and Surry Hills, the two suburbs which by 1971 had the smallest number of middle-class residents and renovators and which had not yet articulated any interest in the distinctive social or physical characteristics of their suburb. As such they did not have the resources or incentive to organize resident opposition to the plans, any activities to attract the attention of other residents or the media.
In summary, there was stronger opposition in the areas designated for freeway development with more substantial middle-class investment in homeownership and renovation. Although many homeowners in Paddington, Glebe, Balmain and Annandale had higher property values and levels of renovation investment than owners in Surry Hills and Newtown, the interest in property value was not articulated by the owners of the more valuable property. Instead residents were more interested in local amenity and the "historic", "distinctive", "community" aspects of local life and endeavoured to use their middle-class skills and resources to ensure that expressways did not destroy those valued aspects.

PARKING ISSUES

Parking was for residents a much more individual affair; it was addressed by many residents but rarely mentioned as an issue in resident group activity. Unlike roads, local government was the public authority responsible for parking, not the state. The Sydney City Council tried to address parking issues through a Parking Advisory Committee, established in 1954 with aims to provide a forum for exchange of viewpoints between local government and various state authorities on the parking issue (DMR, 1966). Most local government solutions were not high-cost or capital-intensive, and only required parking signs and police enforcement.

As the level of car ownership among inner city households increased, both residents and commercial enterprises became more interested in local parking, but they often opposed each other. Residential interests were interested in restricted parking and road closures while commercial interests wanted to maximise
parking space convenient for their clientele and staff and fought vigorously against peak-hour clearways in front of their businesses, reserved residential parking near their shops (LCM, 21/2/67 and 1966-1972 generally; SCM, 22/11/74)) or limits to through traffic (PSN, 2/73).

Parking in the Six Areas

Within the letters and petitions addressed to the local councils of the six study areas, parking was raised 33 times. Most were in Balmain (12) and Surry Hills (6), and in the form of letters. Because of its more specific and local nature, parking was more easily addressed as an individual action and a much smaller than average number of the issues were addressed by resident action group or petition.

Inadequate parking was a problem in all the areas but did not prevent residents from asking for further parking restrictions (Surry Hills, SCM, 4/63, Balmain, LCM, 11/66; Paddington, WCM, 7/71; Glebe, LCM, 2/72) or from complaining about the number of parked cars in their area (Surry Hills, SCM, 7/71; Balmain, SCM, 5/67). This led councils to address the problem of parked cars without trying to provide a greater supply of parking. Because of cost and complications, most councils tried to control or limit the way drivers parked in their suburb, rather than build carparks or somehow provide more car parking spaces. Only the Newtown District Planning Objectors Association (NDPOA) in Newtown (SCM, 6/70) and the Westgate Chamber of Commerce in Leichhardt (LCM, 4/10/66, 19/3/68, 17/9/68, 20/8/69, 9/6/70) proposed off-street parking facilities as a solution to
the inadequate street parking of their areas but their suggestions were never taken up.

Most residents wanted to preserve their own interests by introducing residential parking. By 1973 Woollahra Council was considering preferential on-street parking for residents requiring identifying stickers on cars, regulatory street signs and constant policing (WCF, 7/12/73) and by 1979 there were schemes operating in South Paddington and Glebe and elsewhere in the city (NSW Traffic Authority, 1979).

Paddington

Parking pitted commercial interests against residential interests. Plans to open a TAB agency at Five Ways in Paddington provoked residents’ concern over possible aggravation of an already difficult parking situation (WC, 31/3/76). And yet later attempts to provide off-street parking for the Five Ways and later the Oxford Street retail centres met with local resident protest. On the Five Ways proposal one household responded "we do not need car parks for shoppers from other areas" (WCF, 365G, n.d.). Other residents objected to the Oxford Street off-street parking plans in terms reminiscent of opposition to industrial and freeway development: noise and air pollution, the taking of open space, and the depressing effect on nearby property values (WC, 12/9/79). In the face of negative resident response council abandoned both plans for car parks.

Resident action groups were less active on this issue and less interested in trying to influence local government’s policy. The few instances in which resident groups did address parking in their newsletters the complaints were all raised between 1975 and
1980, a time when car-ownership was rising in the inner suburbs and parking policies were needed to address increased parking demands (AAN, 3/80; BAN, 12/76; PSN, 1/75, 11/76 and 3/77).

What makes residents less likely to try to manage the parking issue in a collective or adversarial way? There is of course, the nature of the problem itself. Unlike road and freeway construction, parking is an agglomeration of many separate and varying decisions by a large number of individuals. Councils can be held ultimately responsible for the planning decisions which allow the problems to arise, as they were for flat development and industrial development in other areas. In parking issues the immediate targets are too numerous and individual to oppose collectively using conventional means. While individual developers and their developments and individual agencies such as the DMR can be focused on, lobbied and acted against, there are too many owners of parked cars with too many possible variations of behaviour to provide a responsive target for any collective direct action. Instead most actions are undertaken by individuals and directed against the policy formation process on council level.

The example of the John Thompson Memorial Fountain illustrates the importance physical developments have in focusing attention, of how seriously residents considered the parking problem in Paddington, and of the changes in local attitudes from 1965 to 1975. John Thompson was the founding President of the Paddington Society and an active and successful lobbyist on behalf of Paddington’s residential interests. When
he died in 1968 the Society organized a memorial fund and by the early seventies had decided to build a fountain in Paddington in his memory. The Woollahra Council cooperated in 1975 by providing space at the end of a recent street closure near Paddington, Hopetoun and William Streets, and the fountain was in operation by July 1975 (WC, 30/7/75). The reaction of nearby residents was vocal and negative. The objections were threefold: the taking of parking spaces, the street closure, and the building of a fountain.

Portions of the objectors' letter convey the strong objections of the residents, but also the irony of the situation. Where John Thompson had worked to promote the Paddington Society and protect the residential interests of the area, objectors to the memorial criticized it because they did no know who he was and because they felt it worked against the interests of local residents:

We have all been drenched in the last day and night trying to park our cars and running to our homes. Why should permanent residents be so badly inconvenienced for a memorial to some person most of us have never heard of?...There are already enough narrow streets in Paddington without creating another unnecessarily (WC, 30/7/75).

The individuals involved here had not been part of the early resident efforts and were ignorant of the contribution and therefore of the significance of the Thompson fountain, and attributed greater value to their parking convenience, which they wished to protect.
In industrial or freeway development, most residents could deny any direct personal interest in the proposed developments as users, where in parking most residents could not. In other issues most residents can work against what they see as harmful developments without jeopardizing their own interests or placing themselves in a contradictory position.

However, with parking, residents are also users and they cannot as easily separate their resident interests from the general interest. Their goals are less clearcut and residents are less able to separate themselves from the problem. They must try to identify the most successful way of targetting action against other users without working against their own interest as residents and users.

This necessary balance argues against a more collective and adversarial approach. Each resident is affected differently depending on his or her car ownership, access to off-street parking, proximity to non-residential premises, neighbours' demand for street parking, all militating against a common problem and collective response. Moreover, the parking population which instigates the problem is too numerous and varied in behaviour to organize against.

Although parked cars do make an impact on the physical environment, they can be short term, movable, and can be managed with the replacement of a parking sign. Only the provision of "parking facilities" as raised in Paddington and Newtown provoked the strong opposition seen in the earlier "physical" issues of industrial development and freeway construction. This less physical and more resource-oriented aspect of the problem also
made collective and adversarial actions less useful and help explain the lack of such action on the controversial issue of parking in areas of gentrification.

TRAFFIC

Traffic management like parking is a resource issue since it provides users with safer, more convenient and faster traffic flow. It pits the road-users against the residents who live near the road, but also places resident road-users in a contradictory position. Can they separate themselves from the problem to address it without working against their own interests? Can they take an individual aspect of the problem by itself and treat it as a single issue?

Property values are also important in traffic issues. There is more evidence to show the effect of traffic patterns on property value than most other local environmental factors (Balmain Residents Case, 1975; Datex, 1977; Bradly and Holsman, 1983). As a North Sydney real estate agent reported in 1973:

The prime requisite of nine out of ten potential buyers is a quiet street. No matter what a house is like, if it is in a quiet street it will invariably sell. On the other hand, a house in a very busy street, no matter how good it is, can be extremely difficult to move (Australian Financial Review, 29/11/73).

The other dimension of the traffic issue is the way residents try to address it. Where in parking the restrictions are partial: usually for non-residents, or from one side of the street, traffic restrictions can be more comprehensive. Although they restrict non-residents, they can restrict residents too which can put resident interests in opposition to each other.
Traffic Interests in the Six Areas

Within the six study areas residents addressed the issue of traffic and street closures 132 times to local government by letter or petition. Forty two percent of these were in the Paddington area, of which forty percent opposed the new Paddington traffic system, PATSYM, in eight months of 1980. Of the three issues of roads, traffic and parking, traffic was clearly the one most frequently addressed by residents to local government. Of the six study areas, Paddington residents were most vocal and within Paddington were most vocal about traffic changes in 1980. Table 9.2 gives some indication of the issue as addressed in the six areas.

Table 9.2: Correspondence to Local Government on Traffic-Related Issues in the Six Areas, 1961-1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letters and Petitions per 1000 Dwellings</th>
<th>Percentage of Traffic Issues Addressed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Issues of Roads, Parking and Traffic</td>
<td>Traffic Resident Group Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annandale 6 4 8. 61.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmain 8 6 19. 59.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe 4 3 28. 39.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown 2 2 0 57.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington 8 7 2. 98.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills 2 2 21. 57.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 5 4 13. 70.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number 168 132 17 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Council Records)
In the Leichhardt local government area Annandale, Balmain and Glebe experienced similar problems of industrial traffic, but of all areas, Balmain's container terminals caused the most severe problems. Trucks had to find their way through residential streets from ship to main road, generating unsafe, noisy and unpleasant industrial truck traffic in residential areas. Although the council and residents fought to remove the industry from the area, their short term objective was to ameliorate the traffic situation for residents. In response to resident interest the progressive council from 1971 to 1974 erected traffic gates near the terminals. These closed at night and after weekend business hours to ensure that the terminal proprietors and truck drivers were constrained to the letter of the agreement: no business after business hours.

The gates, however, were never addressed as an issue by the Balmain Association. Although the Association never explained why, it seems the traffic gates were very localized responses to a problem the Association was addressing on a more general level. Responsibility for their erection and operation instead lay mostly with the progressive council and the affected residents.

Annandale had less concentrated industrial development, fewer major roads to serve as traffic magnets, but streets in a clear grid pattern (see Map 3.1) which encouraged speeding and lack of caution. Most issues raised by Annandale residents in letter and petition dealt with safety (LCM, 17/12/63, 15/7/80), traffic lights (LCM, 2/6/64) or stop signs (LCM, 6/10/64, 30/7/69, 2/11/71, 15/5/73).
Glebe was closer to the city, which encouraged motorists to use streets in the suburb as thoroughfares either between Parramatta Road and the city or between Victoria Road and Parramatta Road (see Maps 3.3 and 9.1). The closing of the Federal Bridge Road affected through-traffic and provoked the most resident response to council with seven letters and petitions from 1968 to 1978. Moreover, dog and race tracks at Wentworth Park and Harold Park encouraged much non-local traffic. Residents’ letters and petitions dealt with efforts to ameliorate the immediate traffic situation of both through traffic and race-track traffic (Map 9.1).

The Glebe Society however, like the other groups spent little time or energy actively addressing individual problems of traffic lights, traffic signs or road changes in its suburb and concentrated on more major threats of freeways. However, unlike any other group the Glebe Society often addressed the issue of public transportation (GSN, 7/74, 8/71, 8/77, 2/80), reflecting its more general interest in matters of equity noted in Chapter Seven.

Newtown’s residents expressed concern over few traffic issues, addressing problems of semi-trailers (SCM, 10/5/61), car noise (SCM, 15/10/62), accidents (SCM, 7/4/71), traffic speed (SCM, 1/9/80), and street closure (SCM, 19/3/80). The Planning Association of Newtown expressed interest in reducing traffic routes through residential areas but never provided any specific solutions to the problem (SCF, 24/7/73). The North Newtown (COS) Action Group was primarily concerned with the detrimental effect of additional parking and traffic flows if the Sydney Teachers
College was extended (No. Newtown Draft EIS, 1975). However, there is no evidence of the group undertaking any action to pursue their interests.

Surry Hills like Glebe, and as will be seen, like Paddington, was in a convenient position between the city centre and suburbs further out. It had several straight, wide roads going directly east-west (Cleveland, Devonshire, Foveaux, Albion, Reservoir and Campbell) and north-south (Elizabeth, Riley, Crown, Bourke and South Dowling) encouraging use as thoroughfares (see Map 3.6).

Street closures were one way of ensuring that the increasing through traffic from the surrounding areas would have minimal effect on the streets nearby. Parkham Street residents were particularly vocal. In March 1975 forty-seven residents petitioned the City Council for the closure of the street at South Dowling Street (SCM, 10/3/75), supported by seven other resident letters and a petition from 16 residents in July 1976 (SCM, 12/7/76), but objected to by a proprietor of the same street, because of the effect on his business (SCM, 12/7/76).

As with the Balmain traffic gates, the mix of commercial and residential uses on a single street meant that traffic changes on that street would engender conflict and disagreement over whose interests should be promoted and whether some interests should be promoted at the expense of others. Residents had made their interests clear through group and individual efforts. They wished to separate residential and non-residential uses, create residential areas which were valuable as safe, quiet living areas.
While trying to manage their environments to achieve that outcome, residents had engendered conflicts with commercial, industrial and institutional interests. However few provoked the almost internecine conflicts between different resident interests and the local and non-local conflict evident when Paddington residents set about trying to manage the traffic problem in their suburb.

Traffic in Paddington

Of the 264 letters and petitions written by Paddington residents to their local councils, a quarter were about roads, traffic and parking, of which nearly all were focussed on traffic. Of the traffic issues the great majority were petitions and a third of these were addressed specifically to the 1980 Paddington traffic plan, PATSYM. Another third were concerned with earlier road closures and traffic pattern changes. The pattern of traffic was obviously of great concern to Paddington residents. It was more vocally attacked and defended than traffic problems in other areas and the local and historical circumstances help explain why.

The roads of Paddington had been increasingly frequented by vehicles on their way between central Sydney and the Eastern suburbs, particularly by motorists trying to avoid the congestion of the main arterial roads of Oxford Street and New South Head Road. The NSW Department of Main Roads had recognized the significant role of roads in Paddington as thoroughfares when it recommended road widening and upgrading in the Neild Avenue, Boundary and Jersey Road projects in the mid-1960s. These were later abandoned when Commissioner Bunning recommended that the
State recognize the suburb's historical and architectural unity and merit by granting it special zoning status to encourage preservation of the distinctive area.

Traffic, however, was not limited by historic zoning. As the area became increasingly "precious", more households owned cars and there was a boom in retailing. Traffic flows both within and beyond Paddington grew with increased car ownership and no expansion of the road system.

Once the Paddington Society had successfully prevented the widening of Jersey Road it turned its attention to the suburb's traffic problem. Having succeeded in preventing the provision of more road space which would accommodate more traffic, they were next intent on ensuring that existing roads no longer accommodated as much traffic. First 38 and later 40 residents on Elfred Street (WCM, 14/4/69, 11/12/72) followed by 135 residents on Hargrave (WCM, 22/1/73), 52 on Glenview and Liverpool (WCM, 14/5/73), 35 on Goodhope (25/6/3) and 37 on West Street (WCM, 27/2/78) complained of the "excessive and growing amount of traffic". The asked Woollahra Council to "reduce the volume and speed of traffic" and protested the use of local streets as thoroughfares.

The possible solutions to the problems were likely to cause disagreement. The two options most frequently undertaken were to change traffic direction on certain streets, and to close off streets at one end with a barricade. Map 3.5 shows some of the intersections where traffic was changed in Paddington. Street closures were not frequently undertaken until North Sydney...
Council first attempted to close certain streets to through-traffic in 1973 (WC, 20/6/73; AFR, 29/11/73). The council’s actions were challenged by the Police Department but later ratified by the Equity Court allowing any local government to undertake similar action (Sun, 2/5/73).

The State government moved to change the traffic policy-making process, delegating to councils the responsibility for local road closures and other traffic decisions (SMH, 7/5/80; NSW Traffic Authority, 1976). By 1976 local councils in consultation with the DMR and Police Department and with the consent of the Traffic Authority or Minister could undertake local traffic control measures (NSW Traffic Authority, 1978).

Resident vs. Commercial Interests

The Sydney City Council was the first to propose traffic changes in Paddington in its Action Plan for South Paddington, completed in 1972. The plan proposed the closure of five streets and the conversion of the closed sections of the streets to small parks (SMH, 12/12/72; So. Padd. Action Plan, 1972). This plan sparked a protest and political storm not seen in Paddington since the Jersey Road protest. From January 1973 to April 1978 the Sydney and Woollahra Councils received ten petitions on the street closures, four objecting (totalling 1496 signatures) and six (totalling 624) supporting. At a public meeting on the South Paddington plan attended by hundreds of residents meeting attenders booed Councillor George Warnecke, the alderman for the ward north of Oxford Street, because he supported the commercial interests against the street closures, and was not "legally" a representative of the area (Fitzroy Ward) on the Sydney Council
Although Warnecke was the longest-serving local representative of the suburb, including the time before North Paddington was apportioned to the Woollahra Council, his representative status was now limited to Paddington north of Oxford Street. In the eyes of the attending public he had no political "interest or estate" south of Oxford Street.

In an almost condescending manner the Paddington Society's support of road closures acknowledged the problems of changing longstanding patterns and criticized the short-sightedness of non-supporters:

Unfortunately, shopkeepers tend to be a conservative group and they are largely opposed to the Society's aims. Moreover the petition opposing the street closures has largely been signed by people who do not really understand the full implications of the plan and who may be under the wrong impression... (PSN, 3/73).

The Society was obviously not successful in winning over non-residential interests since three years later the Paddington Chamber of Commerce was still objecting with a petition of nearly 500 signatures (SCM, 13/9/76). This was followed by one of 253 signatories which supported the road closures (SCM, 11/10/76).

On the Woollahra side of Oxford Street the council was progressing with the plan for Paddington more slowly. In the meantime a few individual residents addressed the local traffic situation through letters but the issue was not directly addressed by residents until 1977. In August 1977 Woollahra Council released the Paddington Action Plan, called a public meeting for discussion and placed the plan on exhibition for resident comment. In response, resident interests argued against
car parks for shoppers from other areas and shop interests argued for more shops at Five Ways (WCF, PATSYM).

This clear conflict of interest between commercial and residential groups of road users illustrates the different resources residents and businesses gain from streets and roads. To one traffic is a menace which needs to be limited. To the other it is life-blood which must be maintained and encouraged. In the case of conflicting resident interests traffic is a menace which if it cannot be limited, should certainly be directed off residential streets.

**Resident vs. Resident Interests**

During the South Paddington street closures disagreement the Paddington Society acted on the traffic issue, forming a Committee for Pedestrian Priority (CPP) in July 1973. Its immediate concern was to reduce traffic volume on the McDonald Street-Glenmore-Gurner Street traffic corridor. To accomplish this the group conducted its own pedestrian survey and number plate counts and undertook publicity campaigns to gain pedestrian traffic lights, double yellow traffic lines to prevent overtaking and turning, and traffic re-routing and rule enforcement (PSN, 9/73).

Council responded by making some small changes but planned to make larger changes when implementing the Paddington Plan. When the plan was presented at the public meeting and the exhibition there was no response by the Paddington Society or Chamber of Commerce and practically no comment on the proposed street closures even though actual locations had been shown on exhibition diagrams (WCF, 365G).
By 1978 the Plan was still not ready for implementation and residents began to agitate for alleviation from traffic problems. Suffolk and Gurner Street residents petitioned council for a street closure and residents near Five Ways wrote to council suggesting that "A few bold but simple street closures would transform the life of the area" (WCF, PATSYM, 5/78). Council acted on neither. When the council called the next public meeting on the Paddington Action Plan on 20 June 1979, 250 people attended and most wanted to discuss the traffic situation. They convinced council to undertake a major traffic survey of the suburb (WCF, PATSYM).

There was a greater than usual group involvement in the traffic issue. Led by Max Kelly, Paddington historian and university lecturer, and Geoffrey Little, Sydney University professor of English, residents formed the Action for Paddington Traffic (APT) group. They organized after the council's public meeting on the plan and soon after presented council with a petition of 1104 Paddington residents complaining of council's lack of action and demanding municipal alleviation of the traffic problems of the suburb (WCM, 9/7/79).

Unlike others the APT group undertook civil disobedience, conducting a demonstration in the middle of Glenmore Road in evening peak hour, bringing traffic to a half hour standstill and backing it up for several miles. As a group representative stated, "We want to make the motorists who are using Glenmore Road as a through corridor so miserable that they will decide to stick to the main roads" (WC, 11/7/79).
The APT was essentially an offshoot of the Paddington Society. The group was a committee of 13 residents, including John Cooney and Max Kelly of the Society and other members who were in middle-class professions. The group produced a twenty-page "APT Statement" in October describing the effects of excessive traffic on the historic heritage of Paddington and the loss of amenity. Using their own pollution survey (undertaken by a member of the committee professionally qualified to do so), Woollahra Council measurements of noise levels and traffic accidents, and photographs of structural damage to dwellings, the group made its case to council (APT, 1979). The interests valued by a renovating, homeowning population, the resources of a middle-class membership and the environment of inner Sydney had come together in Paddington, as in other instances examined earlier, to encourage resident action on local issues in gentrified areas.

The petition and public meetings showed that the interest was wider than the 13 members of the APT. At a public meeting on the traffic issue 150 residents called for road closures and stop signs to encourage traffic to stay on the main arterial roads. Although the council engineer Jack Hunt pointed out that traffic diversion might only create problems for other residents, participants were adamant in their demands (WC, 11/7/79).

Council acquiesced to resident demands and commissioned a traffic study to be conducted by a consulting firm in conjunction with the council. The results were released in October and confirmed many of the suspicions of Paddington residents. More than 10,000 vehicles per day used the main Paddington traffic...
corridor, of which more than 60 percent came from outside Paddington. The area's annual accident rate of 86 was "excessive for a residential precinct" with excessive noise pollution and danger (PATSYM, 1979).

The PATSYM study was exhibited with its recommendations in October. In November a public meeting was called to consider the plan and the consensus was to choose "Option 5" of the recommendations. Almost all of the residents who spoke at the meeting had middle-class occupations. Option 5 would require closure of five streets and the introduction of several "No Right Turns" along Glenmore Road. The council's Local Traffic Committee adopted Option Five in early December, which was agreed to by council a week later. In January council asked residents to comment on the proposed road closures on their street and the Police, Traffic Authority and DMR were consulted. DMR suggested some alternatives, and council implemented the plan in late April (WCF, PATSYM).

From mid-1979 to mid-1980 the responses of resident, non-resident, local and non-local interests were vociferous. The resident interests were voiced mostly by middle-class residents who articulated them in terms of the distinctiveness they wished for Paddington and the subsequent effect on property values and quiet residential enjoyment. The local commercial interests complained of the effect on customer traffic and the non-local interests complained about the inconvenience they were subject to with altered traffic patterns.
Even before council decided on its option and made known its decision residents petitioned council against the traffic changes suggested in the study. Three hundred and fifty residents of Paddington "and elsewhere" (WCM, 29/10/79), 115 residents of Paddington "and elsewhere" (WCM, 29/10/79) and 100, 269, 92 in November (WCM, 12/11/79) and 97 persons associated with the Scottish Hospital on the western side of the suburb protested the proposed closures of Paddington Street, Dillon and Glenview Streets and traffic changes in Hargrave and Gumer Streets. After council adopted Option Five, but before it could implement the changes it received additional petitions from 125 residents (WCM, 24/3/80) and groups of 106 and 18 (WCM, 28/4/80) protesting against the intended traffic changes.

Once the plan was implemented local residential protest was even stronger. The resulting storm of letters was great and often very bitter. Nearly 500 residents wrote council about the traffic changes, most of whom were middle-class. Those complaining about the changes were adversely affected, and those supporting the changes were beneficially affected, and the advantages and disadvantages were seen in terms of both amenity and property values. Where before residents could understand that commercial interests might not completely comprehend residents' desire for barriers to through traffic (as voiced by the Paddington Society in the South Paddington street closures debates) such arguments were less convincing against neighbours and other residents who did supposedly understand. The fears of the Woollahra Council engineer had been realized and the new traffic system only transferred heavy traffic flows from some
streets to others, although discouraging some use of roads by
vehicles.

Residents made numerous references to decreasing values of
property in streets left open and increasing values in closed
streets and residents accused neighbours of improper motives. As
the residents so baldly state themselves: "We fail to see why
one group of residents' needs for peace and quiet should
outweigh any other residents' needs for the same commodity" (WCM,
9/7/80). The blame went even further:

Residents who pressured for closure of the
streets in question bought their houses
knowing that they were busy thoroughfares and
therefore noisier than others. They always
bought at a lower price than those who bought
a similar dwelling in a quieter street. Now
they stand to gain momentarily while those who
paid more, in many cases, stand to lose
financially and in regard to the commodity for
which they paid extra—quietness (WC, 9/7/80).

A resident of Woollahra articulated the "housing as a
commodity" argument on behalf of both Paddington residents and
Woollahra commuters. After accusing Paddington residents of
receiving a windfall (in buying inexpensive housing on busy
streets and raising the values by closing the streets), the
objector went on to say:

The people who normally drive through
Paddington to the city bought their homes in
the knowledge that there was available a
convenient short cut to the city which was not
as slow or choked with traffic as New South
Head Road or Oxford Street. They paid a price
appropriate to the situation. It is unfair
that they should be penalized to benefit the
people referred to in paragraph 1. (WCF,
1/5/80).
The Five Ways Village Association representing the shopkeepers at Five Ways even accused traffic activists of taking immediate financial advantage of the situation. It assumed that activists had bought properties in the area, arranged for the streets to be closed and had since sold the dwellings at a profit (WCF, 15/11/79).

In these instances the objection to the diminished amenity and property value of a dwelling could not be directed to a single neighbour's dwelling additions or renovations, nor could they be directed to an outside road construction authority or industrial proprietor. Even the council was partly immune because although it authorized and implemented the changes it had done so reluctantly and in response to resident action. As one of the aldermen stated:

I believe we have sold out to a couple of hundred residents of Hargrave Street and Glenmore Road, at the expense of every motorist in Woollahra...we were subject to great pressure from a very small but very well organized group of residents and I for one took the easy way out...the whole trial scheme cannot in my opinion succeed.....It is not the responsibility of Council to increase the real estate values of a few properties at the expense of many people and I can assure you that I will be voting against continuing the trial scheme after three months (WCF, 7/5/80).

Instead of holding council responsible, objectors held responsible the original instigators of the plan, the residents of the three main roads and the APT group. In the eyes of objecting residents, these were the parties responsible for the almost internecine conflict among Paddington residents resulting from the reorganization of resources through traffic management.
With the traffic issue in Paddington there is evidence of how adversely affected residents viewed the resident activists. Time after time Paddington residents and others criticized the efforts of the traffic activists to create a residential enclave in Paddington. "One does not even consider living in this area unless you are prepared to put up with traffic and the terrible parking facilities" (WCF, 3/5/80) was the sentiment of many Paddington residents. "These people want all the advantages of the city combined with those of the country, for example, no cars, no noise, no pollution and surrounded by parks. May I suggest they move to Campbelltown, Orange, or even Canberra?" (WCF, 16/5/80) Where, as one resident saw it "They can have the type of lifestyle they unrealistically expect in the city" (WCF, 15/5/80).

Many other planning goals of the new, middle-class residents and groups had been aimed at creating an environment more like Campbelltown than Paddington in the 1930s. Never before though, had their efforts to manage and produce that residential distinctiveness come under such criticism. Never before had so many middle-class homeowners and renovators been adversely affected by the actions of other middle-class homeowners and renovators, thereby magnifying the contradictory elements of distinctiveness inherent in many instances of resident action in areas of gentrification.

**Local vs. Non-Local Interests**

Although the conflict between residents advantaged and disadvantaged by PATSYM was vocal and adversarial, the conflict between the local and non-local Paddington road users was unique
for the organized, collective nature of the non-local road users protest. There had been opportunities for non-local interests to express their views. There were other aldermen on Woollahra's Council from outside Paddington who would have protected non-Paddington interests. As well, part of the role of the Police and Traffic Authority was to consider the interests of non-local users.

However, non-local users began to express their interest long before the larger authorities were consulted. Their objections, like those of residents on affected streets, began when the options for changes in traffic were exhibited in October 1979. A petition of 350 and one of 115 "residents of Paddington and elsewhere" (WCM, 29/10/79) protested the proposed closures. After the plan was implemented and the trial period shortened to three months, road users continued to object to the plan. Council received eight petitions within four months protesting against the traffic changes, one of 4360 signatures from "motorists using Paddington streets" (WCM, 12/5/80).

Although in the eyes of Paddington residents outside motorists had no "interest or estate" in how the municipality managed the traffic in Paddington, the 10,000 vehicle drivers who used the "Paddington Corridor" were not going to abandon their interests quickly. On the first of May the Taxi Council imposed a boycott on bookings from Paddington for the duration of the scheme with threats to extend the ban (WC, 14/5/80). One week later the Transport Workers Union (TWU) placed a total black ban on Paddington to embargo delivery of all goods to Paddington,
including food and fuel. The secretary of the union's Sydney branch, Harry Quinn, said he regarded the Paddington situation "as a test case in its campaign against local councils imposing street closures and other traffic restrictions" and as an opportunity to teach the "trendies and do-gooders the facts of life" (WC, 14/5/80). Although Quinn did not articulate it as such, he was providing Paddington residents the experience so many Paddington critics were suggesting activists wanted—-isolation, suburban quietness, separation and resulting distinction.

As a complete outsider and non-resident Quinn could afford to make such unsympathetic statements. He held no value in the area being separate, distinct or residential. He held value in its central position between the Eastern Suburbs and the CBD. Also, because of the flexible nature of traffic management he could afford such a dramatic solution. In issues of conflict over land use industrial owners could not suddenly pull out or close down to "teach local trendies" the advantages of local industry, nor could flat developers take down flat buildings for a short period to demonstrate the contributions of flat dwellers to population makeup and rate revenue. But transport labor could, and did, remove its services. Unlike the local council and affected residents who lived in the "trendy" area or depended on it for a living, any Paddington ire Quinn aroused did not affect him.

The ban was lifted a week later when the unions and the council reached a compromise allowing taxis the same access to restricted streets as buses. The transport ban, the professional
criticism from other planners and general flouting of the system could not convince council to abandon the scheme (WC, 9/7/80). Despite calls by Aldermen Rofe, Warnecke and Bray to attend to the protestors demands and cancel the plan, council continued and finally adopted the plan as a scheme with minor revisions in September (WC, 17/9/80).

The Paddington Society took a low profile on the traffic issue, one of the most virulent conflicts in the suburb. After implementation of the trial scheme the Society submitted a four page report to the Woollahra Council, supporting PATSYM (WCF, PATSYM). Compared to its involvement in working for historic zoning and other issues, the Society’s response shows a distinct lack of interest.

The nature of the issue made it difficult for group involvement. As early as October 1975 a Society member noted the conflicting and contradictory positions different members could hold on the issue:

No doubt there is a need to reduce traffic in Paddington and to that end to close certain streets. However, attitudes to this vary according to where residents live in the neighbourhood and what facilities he or she has for parking (some residents find it convenient to park on footpaths in Paddington and would not see it as in their interests if a street was closed) (PSN, 10/75).

No one group could represent all of those interests and manage them to the residents’ greatest advantage, and the Paddington Society was not even in a position to try. In October 1977 a series of executive committee resignations and subsequent unsuccessful recruiting attempts prompted President Hugh Parsons
to suggest formal restriction of Society activities with no more than a "continuing committee" with a caretaker role. Although the Society did revitalize in 1978 and continue to plan and organize on behalf of members on issues of development (PSN, 5/78) and open space (PSN, 1/78), traffic issues and the effects of PATSYM were not among them. If the issue was to be addressed the Paddington Society was going to leave it to more directly interested residents.

Interested residents did take up the issue, by forming the APT group with several Paddington Society members taking leadership roles. Faced with an organization unable and unwilling to distinguish and value the amenity of some members' dwellings and streets over those of other members, John Cooney, Max Kelly and others organized their own interest group. Although they did not generate conflict within the group they certainly generated it within Paddington in a way no individual activist could ever have done alone.

Summary

This chapter has examined the traffic issue in Paddington as a prime illustration of the conflicts brought about by gentrification. On this issue more than any other residents articulated their interest in controlling their immediate environment and their wish to better distinguish it from other inner suburbs with noisy, jammed streets. Unlike other issues such as industrial or flat development or open space the traffic issue was not one of a single minority interest. Traffic affected thousands of non-local users and nearly 5000 residents who also owned cars. Traffic pitted resident against resident
highlighting the contradiction of residents complaints about traffic problems created by non-residents when local car ownership was increasing. Traffic also presented the negative aspects of city living which offset some of the positive aspects which newer, middle-class residents valued: proximity to the city centre, commercial and residential diversity and rapidly increasing property values.

New middle-class residents tried to achieve what they considered modern planning standards in 19th century suburbs on a variety of issues: land use zoning, public facilities, and open space. Implementing changes in traffic and parking policy were different however. Such changes did not require permanent structural development or the high levels of capital investment that other developments did. Traffic problems did not stand as the physical or financial threat so many residents were accustomed to and did not provide the type of target residents were more accustomed to addressing. Instead resident interests were opposed to other resident interests as some accused others of selfish disregard for others and general greediness, epithets reserved in the past for outside threats.

Unlike other issues the worsening of the problem with traffic was partially due to gentrification. Increased local prosperity meant that more residents could afford to own cars. In industrial development or flat development or development generally residents were not considered to be part of the development problem. Although some flat developers or industrial owners might have been local residents they were never targeted
as such and most problems were seen to stem from outside.

It is paradoxical that as resident action was gradually losing much member impetus and participation generally, that one issue could stir as much resident interest as it did. But the original impetus of resident action had helped to make local government more amenable to resident demands and residents more accustomed to making demands of local government. However, not all issues, or just any issue could stir residents to take action. After an era in which resident groups and others had pushed to broaden "estate or interest" to include the public interest and the interest of non-proximate, non-property owners, many residents were still pursuing their own individually affected amenity. In the Paddington traffic issue this was seen in the large number of residents who publicly defended their property values and in the number who were more concerned with their own amenity rather than the amenity of the suburb as a whole. The efforts of the residents from 1961 to 1980 had broadened much resident interest to include resident action without shifting its focus away from self-interest.
1 And in the 1980s the State government proposed a second harbour bridge crossing which would have affected Balmain tremendously. That battle is another story.

2 At a Woollahra Council town planning committee meeting the planning control officer disagreed with Bunning. He stated: "Mr. Bunning's reference to a precinct of architectural and historic merit is open to argument...I was not greatly impressed with the existing development...Prior to this report I again traversed the area and in this instance was less impressed." (WCF, 30/5/68)

3 17 residents spoke at the meeting of whom six were on the electoral roll and of the six, all had middle-class occupations.

4 They included a doctor, company manager, secretary and consultant.

5 Of the 29 people who spoke at the meeting, 12 were on the electoral roll and 11 had middle-class occupations.

6 Of approximately 500 writers I took a sample of over a hundred on the electoral roll of whom 16% had working-class occupations and 84% had middle-class occupations.
This thesis has examined the ways in which gentrification has led to property-based political action by inner Sydney residents from 1961 to 1980. The conceptual framework as outlined in Chapters One and Two posited that residential change, in particular, the rising number of middle-class owners making substantial investments in their new homes, would lead to new kinds of political action consonant with their property interests and political resources. It was suggested that interests of these new residents would be marginal to those of local governments traditionally concerned with jobs and homes for the working-class tenants, and this would force the new residents to take action outside usual electoral "integrative" political channels. It was expected that property-based political action by these new residents would require collective rather than individual action, and their minority status would lead to various adversarial tactics working outside traditional political institutions. The frameworks suggested that the nature of these actions would vary depending on the kinds of issues at hand—provision, access, control and preservation within physical, political and resource interests—as well as the state and local political arenas in which the issues were contested.

The research in the thesis examined the applicability of these concepts in parts of inner Sydney undergoing gentrification. Chapter Three provided a synoptic discussion of the early postwar social and political developments which set the
stage for the political action which would occur from the mid-
1960s onwards. Chapter Four picked up in the early and mid-
sixties and analyzed the social and property market changes,
including subsequent renovation investment associated with
gentrification in the six inner suburbs of this thesis:
Annandale, Balmain, Glebe, Newtown, Paddington and Surry Hills.
Chapter Five discussed the centrality of local government to
property interests and residents' increasing and varying
approaches to local government as a political arena in which to
address these interests.

The next two chapters examined the residential change which
gave rise to the new force of political action to local
government over the period 1961-1980. Chapter Six analyzed
traditional kinds of non-electoral political action, particularly
letters and petitions taken by residents attempting to influence
the decisions of local councils. Chapter Seven examined in
greater detail the collective action taken by four resident
action groups: the Paddington Society, Balmain Association, Glebe
Society and Annandale Association. The final two chapters
examined the conflict brought about by gentrification and
subsequent resident action in relation to particular issues.
Chapter Eight examined industrial development in Balmain,
concentrating in particular on port-related activities of state-
wide significance. Chapter Nine examined a variety of resident-
based political action in response to the traffic-related issues
which brought middle-class owners into conflict with each other
as well as a range of local and state government agencies.
**SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS**

**Gentrification and Resident Action**

In inner Sydney gentrification came about in stages. By the mid-1960s levels of homeownership had already increased dramatically as former working-class tenants and recent migrants bought homes only recently considered slums. The next stage was the movement of middle-class homebuyers into these older and often dilapidated terrace and other pre-World War I houses.

Gentrification was shown to have been first experienced in Paddington in the early sixties, followed by Balmain, Glebe and Annandale in the late sixties, Surry Hills in the early seventies and Newtown in the late seventies. As a result there was a sharp increase in the number of inner city residents with the property incentives and political resources to protect and enhance the value and amenity of their dwelling and community. The different timing and context of gentrification in these suburbs made it possible to examine the varying ways in which this urban change influenced local property-based political action.

The staging of dwelling improvement paralleled the social changes of gentrification. With the dilapidated state of the inner city housing stock many new middle-class homeowners increased their amenities and investments by improving their homes. Only through the purchase and improvement of older homes could these new middle-class residents secure both the distinctive features of inner city living as well as quality housing which met their high expectations. In terms of numbers of improvements and their value, Paddington and Balmain were found to have the earliest and highest levels of renovation, followed...
by Glebe and Surry Hills, Annandale and Newtown, reflecting parallel developments of social change. With the increased numbers of middle-class residents in the inner suburbs because of gentrification, it was unsurprising to find relatively fewer renovations by working-class and migrant households over time.

The staging of resident action paralleled the changes of gentrification. Not all improvements to amenity and property value could be accomplished by dwelling renovation. New residents of the inner suburbs also desired many environmental improvements which as public goods could only be obtained by influencing decisions of the municipal or State governments. Because the new residents were a minority, and opposed to many of the traditional policies in these areas, many of the State and municipal decision-makers ignored the middle-class residents and their interests. In some cases residents were unwilling, in others not welcome, to join the political majority of the ALP in local government. They instead began to undertake their own action to influence the decision-makers. In traditionally working-class areas the interests of the new middle-class residents in environmental quality and political participation were at odds with the traditional practices in these political arenas and therefore denied both electoral and informal political influence.

Each of the resident action groups had formed at a time when gentrification first became pronounced in their suburbs. Thus the Paddington Society formed in 1965, followed by the Balmain Association in 1966, the Glebe Society in 1969 and the Annandale
Association in 1970. The histories of the groups showed however, that those groups which formed first (in Paddington and Balmain) faced immediate physical threats soon after formation, peaked in their activity and membership levels before any of the other groups, and were the first to decline to the point of considering disbanding as a group in the late 1970s.

Resident action increased because the interests of many new residents were marginal to the traditional politics of local government. This fits the pluralist argument outlined in Chapter Two. The marginal position of the new residents was seen to stem at least partially from changes made by both local and State governments. Various State governments, in recognition of the important electoral power of resident interests in the inner suburbs and Sydney as a whole, had responded by shifting the boundaries of the inner city municipalities. The State Labor government added resident interests to the Sydney municipality by expanding the boundaries in 1948, the Liberal State government removed them by separating the municipalities in 1968, and the returned Labor government pieced them back together in 1984. The reorganization in 1968 which occurred in the midst of the gentrification process was especially important. The addition of the already gentrified Paddington suburb to the upper middle-class Woollahra municipality led to the incorporation and furthering of their interests through council. In the City of Sydney the few remaining residential interests were pushed to the political margins by the majority of central business district commercial interests. In Leichhardt the increasing middle-class renovating resident interests in all suburbs were kept on the
political margin by the traditional ALP-controlled council save three years of an Independent-controlled council from 1971 to 1974, and another in 1980. As a result, new middle-class residents continued to act outside municipal council without the support of the local aldermen.

Despite the changes among residents and local government most residents still addressed traditional property issues by traditional means of address. As homeowners the middle-class residents had the necessary "estate or interest" to address property issues proximate to their own property.

In the early days of gentrification before major resident changes, most residents addressed council (apart from elections) was on particular, individual and very local issues rather than more general policies. These mainly concerned the physical environment and included concern over uncollected rubbish or abandoned cars, trees which needed pruning or footpaths and streets which needed repair. Some new, middle-class residents did try to achieve a position of influence with council through participation and consultation, and so residents did address some issues in the political realm, however few addressed issues of resources, or preservation or access. Figure 2.2 was found to be too broad in scope for predicting the issues residents might address and the evidence indicated that the scope was limited to issues of physical and political provision. The means by which new residents addressed the issues were often innovative compared to previous local resident action as they prepared professional submissions, documents, and alternatives to development plans,
gave evidence at hearings, prepared alternatives to development plans, and advised on town plans and land policies. The issues they raised and pursued, however, were still traditional and property-related, albeit with a greater emphasis on environmental and historical concerns.

Gentrification also brought new residents to the suburbs who raised issues formerly unaddressed in the municipality. After gentrification more residents expressed interest in matters in which they had no proximate interest, or which contradicted local municipal practice. Many of the actions could be attributed to gentrification as these more innovative issues were generally promoted through the predominantly middle-class resident action groups rather than through the traditional working-class sources of individuals or groups of petitioning residents. The issues were considered "avant garde" as noted by Nachmias and Palen (1982) and included the promotion of residential amenity over commercial and industrial activity, open space over residential development, low density over higher density housing, and lower property rates over high levels of council employment. Few of these interests had been publicly articulated by residents before gentrification.

Because of the incremental changes of gentrification many new middle-class residents were a small minority with little influence through traditional channels in local government and often used collective action, adapting unconventional, adversarial tactics. As discussed by the more radical analysts, Piven and Cloward, and Fainstein and Fainstein, new and minority residents had no stake in the existing political establishment and
could afford to encourage hundreds of people to pack council meetings, shout down the Mayor and aldermen and hold demonstrations, rallies and marches. Because these residents had interests perceived to be at odds with those of the traditional decision-making authorities, they had the incentive to act in non-traditional ways. The new middle-class residents took advantage of their dual position and undertook both integrative and adversarial action when they wished. Figure 2.4 in Chapter Two proved to be a useful analytical tool for understanding the range of political action available to residents. Residents acted as individual homeowners, and collectively through residents' groups. They used the political avenues and tools provided by local and State government, as well as the more adversarial, protest-oriented action. Although similar actions had been taken in the past, they had been infrequent and thus unusual for inner city politics. After gentrification their greater frequency still served to draw the attention of the media and decision-makers, and in some instances did influence the eventual decisions.

Resident Action Groups

Action undertaken through traditional letters and petitions was fundamentally different from that undertaken by resident groups, both in terms of who took the action and the issues addressed. A greater percentage of letter and petition writers had blue-collar occupations than did resident action group members, and most letters and petitions addressed particular physical aspects of the resident's immediate environment which
needed attention. Resident action groups rarely addressed these issues, attending more to issues which were suburb-wide or which addressed issues of council procedure or practice. Groups were also as intent on building group strength and reputation as they were to exercise it, and spent much of their time and effort early in their organization attempting to develop rapport and a common mind.

Because resident groups were generally middle-class they were well-equipped for both adversarial action and conventional action. Unlike individuals and ad hoc groups of petitioning residents, resident action groups were seen to have an organized structure and an interested membership which could be galvanized quickly, making them better suited to collective, adversarial action. This was borne out by the evidence showing that most of the adversarial action directed against council stemmed directly from RAGS. As first indicated in Figure 2.4, groups were found to be well-suited for conventional, integrative action, as the pooled resources of the group could provide, from volunteer labour, written and verbal submissions of a professional standard.

The likelihood of adversarial action depended on the relationship of a residents group to its council. Because it was more like the upper middle-class population of the Woollahra Council, the Paddington Society was found to have had better relations with the council (post 1968) than it did with its "old guard" aldermen at the time, and undertook less adversarial action. The Balmain Association, Glebe Society and Annandale Association were ignored by the ALP Leichhardt Council. This
gave them more incentive to challenge the decisions and decision-making process of the council and to undertake adversarial action. The Balmain residents were unusual in having more sympathetic aldermen who played an important role in instigating adversarial action on council.

Although each group was primarily interested in property issues, the particular focus of these interests varied between groups. Where Cox (1982) had suggested that residents would be concerned with their property as a commodity, Mullins (1982), Cole (1985) and Datel (1985) argued that many issues were specifically middle-class, and the evidence showed both. The Paddington Society was more interested in visual aesthetics than any group, reflecting its advanced stage of gentrification and its early intent on gaining National Trust recognition. The Balmain Association was more interested in issues of political participation and consultation, reflecting its antagonistic relationship with council and its maverick representation by aldermen Origlass and Wyner. The Glebe Society showed more interest in issues of social welfare, perhaps related to its large tenant population, its proximity to Sydney University, and large number of pensioners in the former Church of England Glebe Estate. The Annandale Association was notably more interested in the events and activities of other groups than in radical, adversarial action. This may have reflected their less advanced gentrification, the unsympathetic reception by the Leichhardt Council, and their small size. All of these factors would have made resident-action-based political actions less viable and less
worthwhile to pursue.

As gentrification increased, resident group activity waned but became more focussed and targetted to specific interests of residents. Early in their activity resident groups had encouraged residents to pool their resources to protest against the major threats to the suburb such as expressways and industrial development. By the time of the 1980 Leichhardt town plan each group in Leichhardt abandoned their general, reformist approach and instead targetted individual appeals to specific parts of the suburb, hoping to make the local impact of the plan startling enough to spur each resident to make their own response to council as individual residents. The Paddington Society, while earlier united by common opposition to external threats became increasingly divided as traffic and parking were addressed more on an individual street rather than the suburb-wide basis.

**Industry and Traffic**

Gentrification increased the pressure for the control industrial development. In Balmain the new middle-class residents had no personal interest in the preservation of industrial employment and were found to promote residential amenity at the cost of local industry. As the area became more middle-class, resident interest shifted from trying to control the noise and traffic of local industry to trying to close it down by using land use planning.

Leichhardt residents did not succeed initially in halting major port-related activities of state-wide significance, even though the effects marshalled widespread opposition throughout the municipality and indeed by the council itself. Resident
activists had greater success however in limiting (and indeed driving out, in some cases) small scale manufacturing activities interspersed through residential areas. Gentrification led to a shifting political balance of residential interests from protection of jobs to protection of the environment. The activities of the Balmain Association against port development may have had indirect success by encouraging State government to hasten the development of Port Botany, and the transfer of heavy traffic-generating activities from Balmain's gentrifying area to lower density and more working-class Botany.

Gentrification increased the pressure for the control of industrial development and road expansion but residents were generally powerless in these State-determined issues. Organized action against freeways, road expansion and industrial development were easily and strongly organized by residents, had a clear cut common interests in opposing external threats brought about by State governments in the pursuit of metropolitan interests. Although Paddington residents succeeded in preventing the widening of Jersey Road, most road developments failed to proceed because of a shortage of the necessary funding and the increasing questioning by State and national electorates of road and car solutions to transport difficulties. Moreover, resident action groups were unable to ever address, let alone influence, the growth of inner city employment which was fundamental to these difficulties. The latter issues, and those concerning port development in Balmain remained firmly in the control of non-residential interests, irrespective of the organization of local
government or the political parties in power at the State or local level.

Resident action against increased levels of parking and traffic sparked strong conflicts which led to dissension among residents. Middle-class residents who owned cars and wished to improve residential amenity found themselves in a contradictory position. They wished to benefit from improved traffic as car drivers, while also desiring to preserve the residential amenity of their particular street by restricting the freedom of other drivers. Traffic and parking issues were less clearcut for a variety of reasons. They were less of an obvious threat than road widening and subsequent dwelling demolition and instead provided too numerous and various a set of threats for any one residents group to organize against. As well, the parking and traffic problems had been aggravated by gentrification, but middle-class residents were not willing to control their car movements to improve the local amenity.

Summary and Further Research

The aim of this thesis was to provide an integrative analysis linking processes of residential change to the issues and forms of property-related action in local political arenas. The broad historical sweep, and comparisons between suburbs made it possible to examine the effects of gentrification as it differed between kinds of areas, issues, political contexts and different periods of time. While this strategy provides valuable insights into the processes linking private and public pursuits of middle-class residential interests, it leaves open many important questions pertaining to the particular ways in which
these processes unfold.

One important direction for further research would be a more specific analysis of property-based action on the individual rather than aggregate level. For instance, instead of taking a broad, historical view, a small scale but intense case study of a small part of a suburb could test more specifically the possible connections suggested in this thesis between social class, home purchase and renovation, and resident action. With a population of 200 to 300 a survey could determine the tenure and length of residence of activists, how many were landlords or renovators, how many were employed locally and the changing value of their dwelling. This could allow better understanding of some of the motives for renovation and resident action.

A similar-sized study could more easily examine census data from collectors' districts, rate records and municipal records in a more detailed way and on a more discreet geographic basis. This could distinguish the level and type of political participation of homeowners and landlords from tenants, home improvers from non-improvers, the working-class from the middle-class, the new residents from the longer established residents in local political activity, in residents' groups, actions directed to council or in voting. This could allow better understanding of the role of class, and tenure and attachment to the trends in inner city resident action.

Perhaps more importantly, detailed studies could be carried out aiming to explain in specific terms the political forces which led to the various outcomes of property-based contests.
Such studies would develop the "decisional" analysis of traditional political science tracing pathways of decision-making and the role of bureaucratic and residential actors. They could examine more precisely the relative importance of resident-based political action in determining various government activities and their outcomes. In framing such studies it would be advisable to select particular issues, residential areas and political actions in order to examine the relative effects of each as suggested in this thesis.

Implications and Directions in Inner Sydney

Some of the implications of these findings have already been borne out in the three local government areas of this study since 1980. The 1981 census figures examined in Chapter Four showed the increased trend of gentrification in the six areas studied here, and elsewhere in the inner city. Some formerly working-class suburbs now have a majority of middle-class residents who would no longer be considered trend-setters and risk takers.

The property market for those wishing to live in the inner city has become increasingly tight. Prices of many dwellings have risen beyond the reach of prospective first home buyers with white-collar jobs and two incomes, let alone working-class families with one income. New residents choose to buy in the inner suburbs because they are known to be popular, they are well located for jobs and entertainment, and the dwellings are increasing in value. As compared to the conflicts of earlier periods, resident interests and images in these areas now have more conventional, mainstream qualities. Although the inner suburbs have not lost their distinctiveness, they are now
accepted as a small but no longer unusual option for middle-
class home buyers.

In the political environment the larger number of middle-
class homeowners has helped bring about the election of many
political progressives in the inner municipalities. In the 1980
election independents and progressive Labor representatives
gained the majority in the Leichhardt Council and maintained it
in the next two elections. In 1987 the NSW Minister for Local
Government granted permission for the Leichhardt Municipality to
abandon the ward system of voting and to have all aldermen
elected on an at-large basis. The result was an Independent-
controlled council, with several suburbs without local
representatives. The independents had succeeded in dissipating
the electoral support of the traditional ALP and geographically
broadened the electoral strength of the newer middle-class
residents, and gained office. Ironically the recent election has
left Glebe without a resident on council, perpetuating in a new
way the Glebe Society's longstanding complaint that it could not
contribute to decisions made on behalf of Glebe.

The 1987 election is indicative of the shift in political
attitudes and how gentrification has affected the Leichhardt
Municipality. With the traditional ALP, policy decisions were
made in caucus and generally local aldermen made the decisions
concerning their ward with no input by other aldermen; for
instance, an Annandale development was the decision of the
Annandale aldermen. Independents however, did not necessarily
limit their interests to their wards, nor were they bound by
caucus decisions. With the increasing electoral support in most but not all wards, independents were in the position where they had sufficient support to win a council majority although not controlling all wards. An at-large election allowed aldermen to consider the whole municipality as their political concern and allowed independent supporters to extend their electoral and activist strength beyond their suburb to parts of the municipality traditionally represented by the ALP.

The Labor State government amalgamated the City of Sydney and South Sydney councils in time for the 1984 elections which created a council of conservative Civic Reform aldermen and ALP aldermen, with independents and "progressive" ALP councillors holding the balance of power. The independents and progressives represented many residential owners, as exemplified by the election of Jack Mundey, former Secretary of the Builders Labourers Federation, organizer of many Green Bans in Sydney, and defender of environmental and residential interests against development interests. The success of the independents in delaying and defeating many development plans in Sydney provoked the ALP members to ally themselves with the Civic Reform aldermen to accomplish their goals for Sydney's development, an unheard of alliance. Finally in 1987 the Labor State government dismissed the Sydney Council claiming that it was unnecessarily delaying the work of municipal administration.

This dismissal exemplifies the effect of gentrification on municipal politics in Sydney in 1980s. In 1968 it was a Liberal government which dismissed the council and created a municipality with minimal residential areas and interests. In the early 1980s
the Labor government rejoined the two councils to maximise residential interests in Sydney. However, the nature of those residents and their interests had shifted to be more middle-class, environmentally conscious and anti-development. By 1987 the social changes had progressed such that independents and progressive Labor aldermen held the balance of power. Although they did not have the complete control independents had in Leichhardt, they did have a veto role, which brought about the strange alliance of Labor and conservative interests. Finally, the State Labor government dismissed the nominally Labor council, nominal because the role of the middle-class owners and renovators had emasculated traditional Labor influence and frustrated Labor plans for city development.

With their considerable electoral impact by the 1980s the middle-class residential interests were no longer as marginal as they had been earlier. Their stronger representation within local government lessened the pressures to act from outside through resident groups. The distinctiveness of some areas had been immortalized by National Trust recognition. The value of most areas had been established by their increasing status and subsequent upward movement in the property market over twenty years. There were fewer dwellings in need of restoration and the dwellings which did need renovation were in demand and likely to be renovated when sold. The residents, their dwellings and their suburbs were less marginal and had become better protected and promoted by elected representatives.
There were some large development issues which did arouse much resident action in the 1980s. As might be expected these were usually actions by the state government in pursuit of metropolitan-wide interests. State Department of Main Roads plans to route a second Harbour Crossing through Balmain sparked much protest, as did State plans to cancel plans for open space at the former container site at Mort Bay to instead build public housing. Both of these developments were targeted to Balmain; other suburbs suffered no similar threats. When considered over the course of the twenty years from 1967 to 1987, the efforts of residents and resident groups in the 1980s to influence decision-makers had declined. Those efforts residents did undertake were no longer as protest-oriented or adversarial as they had been in the past. The aligning of the middle-class resident interests with a sympathetic concil brought to near completion the transition from the earlier alignment between working-class residents and traditional ALP councils in the 1950s. The more intractable and ongoing conflicts are between inner city residential interests as represented by local councils, and the metropolitan-wide interests pursued by State government. Even in this area, however, local resident interests have been aided by the growing acceptance by the State-wide electorate of the residential value of inner areas.

In the final analysis, new middle-class residents at the beginning of gentrification began by promoting and protecting the distinctiveness of their suburbs. They adopted a variety of non-traditional political tactics appropriate to their minority and marginal position at the time. Over the course of political,
market and social changes of the 1960s and 1970s, the growing number of middle-class renovators had institutionalized formerly innovative values of historic and aesthetic distinction and the political participation of residents, through other avenues as well as elections. These developments, along with a growing electoral strength and representation undercut the political exclusion which had led to the formation of resident action groups.

However, without local municipal representation, residents in the City of Sydney and the suburb of Glebe might well have to rely on their resident action groups to defend their interests in the foreseeable future. What had seemed like inevitable middle-class electoral control and eventual resident group decline from increased gentrification could well cause resident groups in unrepresented suburbs to return to their pivotal role in local promotion and defense.

In terms of general resident interests, the case of Glebe suggests that residential change may have reversed the political balance of the 1950s. Working-class tenants have become the disadvantaged and voiceless minorities of the 1980s and 1990s. They are unlikely to succeed politically through resident action groups, however, given their declining numbers, minimal political skills, and lack of property interest in local politics. They have neither political control nor the necessary property interest or political skill for resident action. The middle-class residents however, now have both the political control and the resources necessary for maintaining that control.
APPENDICES

Appendix One

Property Values, CPI and Avg. Weekly Earnings, NSW, 1957-1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value of Property Transactions</th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>Average Weekly Earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pct. Increase
Over 20 Years 443.3 140.3 337.7

Methodology and Data Sources

Dwelling Renovations in Inner Sydney, 1961-1980

In setting out to measure renovation activity I looked for evidence which would allow analysis on a smaller than LGA basis, which would best measure residential renovation and which would provide renovators names to help determine some social characteristics of renovators. There were potentially four sources of information and I eventually used the building application registers of the four municipal councils. One possible source was the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) statistical publications on building permit approvals aggregated on a local government area (LGA) basis. These tables include information on dollars spent on new dwellings and alterations and additions (A/A) to existing stock. This material however, does not include A/As valued at less than $2000, and classifies A/As above $10,000 as permits for 'new' building, and not as A/As to existing buildings. Moreover, the figures are aggregated on an LGA basis, providing insufficient detail for any kind of smaller spatial analysis.

From the local councils there were three possible sources: the building application (BA) files themselves, council minute references to building activity and the BA register. The BA files themselves were too numerous, bulky and poorly stored to allow easy examination of pre-1980 files. The discussions and reports of building activity in the council minutes varied greatly over the twenty years, according to the assiduousness of
the office clerk with much detail sometimes and little detail other times. The BA registers in all councils provided uniform information over the twenty years and were the most easily retrievable and were used as the data base for this work.

Unfortunately for the researcher interested in all forms of dwelling renovation, the A/As requiring local government approval are limited. Only those changes necessitating "structural" change to a dwelling require council approval, leaving many interesting dwelling changes untraceable through these records. Knocking down or erecting interior walls, new plumbing, enclosing or opening verandahs and porches, carports and garages, pools and sundecks all require local council approval before commencement — no matter the significance or insignificance of the cost. Many A/As go unreported, though, as owners try to minimize the cost in time and money to them, the cost of meeting certain standards of construction, or the risk of having the application disapproved. It is difficult to estimate how many A/As are completed but unreported and unapproved. Reasoning and anecdotal experience could give some indication of what to expect, but are not estimated here.

It would be reasonable to assume that interior alterations and additions, less noticeable by authorities and less objectionable by neighbours, could escape undetected. Also, smaller, less costly alterations which an owner can "dismiss" as unimportant, or for which the administrative trouble of application seems too burdensome, would likely be unreported and unapproved. Sometimes such owners are caught and required to submit their plans for approval. The interest some neighbours
take in pursuing this kind of enforcement of their neighbours
dwelling alterations is an interesting political phenomenon
raised in the discussion of the stakes residents have in
maintaining their local environmental quality. It is important
to remember, therefore, that these A/A figures present only a
portion of the increased value placed on inner city dwellings and
only hint at the wider efforts being made by residents to
achieve housing satisfaction and financial gain, and at the
increasing stakes which homeowners held in the inner cities.

Also, there is evidence that some owners make more than one
application to council, the second one sometimes larger,
sometimes smaller. This can depend on whether council required
revision of the application which was then resubmitted, or
whether the owner wished to reconsider and re-apply. Where
second and third applications were noted they were not included
in the data set. Moreover they registers do not indicate whether
the renovation was carried out. Cross checking with Council
files or Council minutes confirm this but was not undertaken.
However, the applications still serve as a useful indication of
demand.

Entries in the BA register gave the date, applicants name,
address and description of land, description of building to be
undertaken, and estimated value of construction. BA data
collected from the registers allowed analysis of renovation
activity and investment across time and on a street, block, or
suburb basis. However, there were several components of the data
which need explanation.
Applicant’s Name – The name of the person involved can indicate their migrant background and with cross-references to the electoral roll, a person’s occupation. However, the person applying for approval is not necessarily the dwelling owner, and can be a contractor, builder and in the case of rental housing can be the landlord. However, with certain clues (if the address of the applicant matched the address of the dwelling to be altered) the names of occupiers were noted and the names of other applicants were not. Proprietaries and public authorities were excluded as non-residential.

Description – Some of the register entries included a list of the A/As involved and these were noted. Most common were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>balcony</th>
<th>water closet</th>
<th>recreation room</th>
<th>spa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>carport</td>
<td>kitchen</td>
<td>sun room</td>
<td>attic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garage</td>
<td>verandah enclosure</td>
<td>pool</td>
<td>living room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laundry</td>
<td>shower</td>
<td>sundeck</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toilet</td>
<td>porch</td>
<td>sauna</td>
<td>solar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These entries helped the researcher distinguish between residential and non-residential A/As and helped distinguish some residential A/As which were inappropriate for data collection.

They are as follows:

Non-residential A/As Excluded From Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vertical signs</th>
<th>partitions</th>
<th>carparks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coolrooms</td>
<td>awnings</td>
<td>mechanical ventilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>airlocks</td>
<td>combined shop/dwelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential A/As Excluded from Sample

| flats | units | stairs | fences |

However, the number of entries with descriptions of the planned A/A decreased over the years and other clues were used to discriminate between residential and non-residential renovations.
Properties were excluded which were disapproved, covered more than one block of land, involved disproportionately large amounts of money in largely non-residential areas, and were clearly flat, commercial or industrial premises. With these criteria a sample of residential A/As was drawn.

**Estimated Value**

This was included in almost all entries. Pre-1966 figures were converted to dollars and all figures were adjusted to 1980 dollars using the construction materials CPI index of the ABS. Using these criteria I collected a universal sample from which I coded and analyzed one third of the A/As in each of my study areas. However, I also collected information on Leichhardt, Lilyfield and Rozelle which was not used here. The universal sample was composed in an approximate way of:

- 3000 applications from Woollahra in regards to Paddington
- 3600 applications from Sydney in regards to Paddington, Glebe, Newtown and Surry Hills.
- 10800 applications from Leichhardt in regards to the whole municipality
- 580 applications from South Sydney in regards to Newtown.

The sample for analysis of the six suburbs was composed of:

- 446 Annandale
- 814 Balmain
- 352 Glebe
- 325 Newtown
- 975 Paddington
- 351 Surry Hills

3173 Total
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Table 1.2 **POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES BY STATES**

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>duty to provide (mandatory)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>power to provide</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>power to subsidise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N.S.W</th>
<th>Vic.</th>
<th>Qld</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>W.A.</th>
<th>Tas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Public works and services**

(a) **Roads, streets, bridges etc.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street construction</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repair/maintenance</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footways/furnishings</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning/watering</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharves/quays/jetties</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreshores</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) **Drainage etc.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drainage</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation of low-lying land</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood prevention</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) **Town Hall, public office**

| Town Hall or office | p | p | m | m | p | m |
| Memorial statues etc. | p | p | p | p | p | p |

**Recreation facilities**

| Halls/community centres | p | p | p | p | p | p |
| Parks, gardens, recreation reserves | p | p | p | p | p | p |
| Swimming pools          | p | p | p | p | p | p |
| Public libraries        | p | p | p | p | p | p |
| Athenaeums/mech. institutes/ bands | p/s | p | s | p | - | p |
| Museums                | p/s | p | p | p | p | p |
| Art galleries          | p/s | p | p | p | s | - (a) |
| Gymnasiums             | p | p | p | p | - | - |
| Tree planting/reserves | p | p | p | p | p | p |
| Amusements/entertainments | p | p | p | p | p | p |
| Preservation of places of historic interest | p | p | p | p | p | p |
| Orchestras/concerts    | p/s | p | s | p | s | - |
| Theatre                | p | p | p | p | p | p(a) |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N.S.W</th>
<th>Vic.</th>
<th>Qld</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>W.A.</th>
<th>Tas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries, crematoria</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p/m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgues</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commons</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pounds</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residences for employees</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerodromes</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping sites/caravan parks</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing rooms</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter parking</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parks</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Sanitary services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to recycle salvage</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage/nightsoil</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public conveniences</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage collection/disposal</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m/p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m/p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructors</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baths/washhouse</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Medical services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance service</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunisation</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m/p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental clinics</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor/dentist subsidies</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health centres</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Health/welfare services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home helps</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals on wheels</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly citizens</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home nursing</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergartens</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crèches</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity and child welfare</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostels for schoolchildren</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoridation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infectious diseases (control)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lend money to private individuals for housing</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to public/agric/other schools</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil defence</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment registry</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to aid smallholdings</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to encourage decentralisation</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night shelters</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamens boarding houses</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifesaving clubs</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire prevention/control</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p/s</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N.S.W</th>
<th>Vic.</th>
<th>Qld</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>W.A.</th>
<th>Tax.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisions</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building regulations</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning/town planning</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory acquisition of land</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard housing clearance</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban renewal</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal trading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acclimatisation of fish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afforestation</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abatements</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal mines</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building materials</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferries</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas supply</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice/refrigeration</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel/quarries</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets/weightbrides</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saleyards</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk supply</td>
<td>p(f)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor buses</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trams/trolleybuses</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport of goods</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop/offices etc.</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boats and letting of boats</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep dips</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection/licensing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food inspection</td>
<td>p/m</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weights and measures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding houses</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrol pumps</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles plying for hire</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs and cats</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m(h)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancehalls etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairs/amusements</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle licensing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughterhouses</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power to regulate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and eating places</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries, crematoria</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hearse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf lifesaving</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/hoardings</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuisances</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m/p</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuisous trades</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxious weeds/aquatic pests</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water pollution</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping of animals</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>m(dogs)</td>
<td>m(dogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping of firearms</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incinerators and tennis courts</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water holes and private swimming pools</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peddlers and hawkers</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of lower courts of justice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>m(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power to regulate (cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of vehicle load limits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquitoes</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion etc.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to aid sporting clubs</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table was prepared by the Department of Urban and Regional Development.
The Council of the Municipality of Leichhardt
Town Hall, Leichhardt

Local Government:

Comment is made from time to time on the role that local government plays in the affairs of the community. We are close to the 'grass roots'; we understand people's needs; we enter into the sphere of their day-by-day lives and can offer advice on problems of a local nature. All this is true ... however, my comment in this matter will be restricted to the field of public health and the part that local authorities play in that field.

Firstly, may I make the point that the public approach the local Council when sanitation deficiencies or structural problems require attention. The public do not approach State or Federal Government Departments on these matters — a very small percentage may contact the first and second tiers of government, who in turn, promptly refer the matter to the local authority for attention. These problems range from minor to major matters that affect an individual, a group of people or the community as a whole. In the following paragraphs, I will attempt to depict the variety of these complaints and enquiries. The listing drawn from memory, is far from being exhaustive, but will serve to illustrate how people are affected at times, in a local government area.

People:

People living in an area look to their local Council for solutions to problems that beset them in their every day life. Problems such as the new neighbours who disturb the tranquility by erecting a pigeon house to serve the needs of the husband who is a pigeon racing enthusiast; the plaintive and prolonged wail of the bag-pipes from the practising by the young lad at the back who has just joined the band of a Scottish Association; dogs howling at night; roosters crowing at sun-rise; the 'do-it-yourself' person whose labours with power tools pleases himself, but not his neighbours; the factory belching smoke; the smell from the still down the street where the new settler distills his own spirits; the spinster who loves cats, takes in strays and allows them to breed; the new addition to the next door property intruding on privacy and blocking out sun-light; the tree next door that grows tall and stately with spreading branches, thus depositing leaves in roof gutters and choking down-pipes; the jack-hammers down the street chattering incessantly on an excavation job; the man at the back, a keen gardener, failing to keep the lid on his liquid manure drum and the smell drifting in on the evening breeze; the "garbo's" being noisy and disturbing sleep in the early morning hours; somebody starting to keep fowls to beat the rising cost of eggs, and rats deciding to move in; a truck driver discovering that the street is a convenient by-pass to the new traffic lights at the corner, and others following his example;

393
Appendix Five

Petitions Received by the NSW Legislative Assembly, 1961-1980 and by the Four Municipalities from Residents in Annandale, Balmain, Glebe, Newtown, Paddington and Surry Hills, 1961-1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSW Legislative Assembly</th>
<th>Municipal Councils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period</strong></td>
<td><strong>No. Received</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/66-3/67</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/67-1/68</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/68-5/68</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/68-5/69</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/69-1/71</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/71-5/71</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/71-5/72</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/72-5/73</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/73-10/73</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/73-4/74</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/74-3/75</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/75-3/76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/76-4/78</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/78-9/78</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/78-4/79</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/79-4/80</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/80-11/80</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSW Legislative Assembly Records, Council Records.
Appendix Six

Resident Action Groups Organized in the Sydney Metropolitan Area

Groups in:

Winston Hills
North Sydney
Cammeray
Bronte-Tamarama
Hillsdale
Bankstown
Kingsgrove
Harbord
Centennial Park Residents Association
Millers Point-Dawes Point RAG
South Paddington Action Committee for Environment
Rocks Resident Group
Save the Parks Campaign
Residents of Woolloomooloo
Woolloomooloo RAG
Darlinghurst

Leichhardt
Stanmore
Chippendale
Ultimo
Pyrmont
The Rocks
Botany
1. COUNCIL RECORDS

City of Sydney Municipal Council.
---Minutes and Correspondence of Council Meetings, 1950-1987
---Register of Building Applications, 1960-1981
---files relating to Surry Hills Action Plan (11 and 12), 1974
---files relating to Newtown Action Plan (17), 1975
---"George Clarke" files, 1960s and 1970s
---planning map, 1970
---Parking Advisory Committee, Annual Reports, 1954-1976
---Attendance at various council meetings, 1985

Leichhardt Municipal Council.
---Minutes and Correspondence of Council Meetings, 1950-1987
---Register of Building Applications, 1960-1981
---Health Administration, Annual Reports, 1961-1980
---Attendance at various council meetings, 1985
---planning maps, 1974, 1979

South Sydney Municipal Council
---Minutes and Correspondence of Council Meetings, 1968-1985
---Register of Building Applications, 1968-1985

Woollahra Municipal Council
---Minutes and Correspondence of Council Meetings, 1967-1987
---files relating to PATSYM, 1978-1981
---planning maps, 1986
---Parking Advisory Committee, Annual Reports, 1966-1976

2. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

New South Wales
---Dept. of Local Government. Annual Reports, 1961-1980
---Dept. of Main Roads. Annual Reports, 1961-1980
---State Planning Authority. Annual Reports, 1964-1976
---Valuer General's Department. Real Estate Market, 1983, 1984
---Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979

Commonwealth
3. NEWSPAPERS

The Local Leader, 1968-1970 (Glebe, Annandale)
The Glebe, 1971-1981 (Glebe)
The Link, 1958-1977 (Balmain)
The Sydney Morning Herald, 1945-1981
The Terrace Times, 1972-1974 (Paddington)

4. RESIDENT GROUP SOURCES


Annandale Association, Newsletters, 1971-1987

--, 1968. "Residential Development of the Balmain Peninsula".
--, 1968. "Objections to the Leichhardt Planning Scheme".
--, 1971. Balmain in Time, by Peter Reynolds and Robt. Irving
--, 1975. "The Balmain Ferry Service".


City of Sydney Council, 1971. *City of Sydney Strategic Plan*.


Cumberland County Council, 1948. The Planning Scheme for the County of Cumberland, Sydney.


Manning, I., (forthcoming). *The Open Street*.


South Sydney Community Aid, 1974."Environmental Quality in South Sydney", Sydney.


Suttles, G., 1972. Social Construction of Communities, Univ. of 

Tanner, H., et al., 1975. Restoring Old Houses and Buildings: 
An architects guide, Macmillan, Melbourne.

Research Centre, Sydney.

Thornton, R. and Sommerville, A.W., 1935. Municipality of 


Turkel, G., 1980. "Privatism and Orientations Toward Political 

Vandermark, E. and Harrison, P., 1972. Development Activities in 
Four Sydney Suburban Areas, Australian National Univ., Canberra.

Vidich, A. and Bensman, J., 1968. The Small Town in Mass 
Society, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J.

Quadrangle Press, Chicago.

Weiler, C., 1978. "Achieving social and economic Diversity in 
inner-city neighbourhoods through increased demand for city 
housing by middle-income persons", paper presented at "Back to 
the City" Conference, Hartford, CT, Oct.


Wolfinger, R., 1971. "Non-decisions and the study of local 

6. PERSONAL COMMUNICATION

(Alphabetical Order)

Tikwis Begbie, Balmain Assn.
Lyn Beauregard, Woollahra Council
Frances Heathfield, Balmain Assn.
Beverley and Michael Horsburgh, residents of Annandale and Glebe
Bob Irving, architect, Balmain Assn.
Bob Johnston, planner
Eileen Lacey, Glebe Society
Charles McCausland, Paddington Society
Ted McKeown, Glebe Society
Kerry Nash, planner, Sydney City Council
Debbie Nicholls, Balmain Assn.
Annette O’Neill, Balmain resident
John Power, former Balmain resident
Greg Vickas, Newtown resident, planner
Bruce Wilson, Paddington resident
Paul Woodhart, Paddington resident
Tony Woodward, Leichhardt Council