

7-2-2013

Exclusivity or Exclusion? A Case Study of Sustainability in Glenmore Park

Alyssa Markle
Macalester College

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/cities>

Recommended Citation

Markle, Alyssa (2013) "Exclusivity or Exclusion? A Case Study of Sustainability in Glenmore Park," *Cities in the 21st Century*: Vol. 3: Iss. 1, Article 3.
Available at: <http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/cities/vol3/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Geography Department at DigitalCommons@Macalester College. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Cities in the 21st Century* by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Macalester College. For more information, please contact scholarpub@macalester.edu.

Exclusivity or Exclusion?

A Case Study of Sustainability in Glenmore Park

Alyssa Markle

Macalester College

1. Introduction

Master planned estates (MPE) aim to design a community in full, planning all aspects from houses and trees to schools and shopping centers. The rapid establishment of MPEs in Australia as the newest and most popular form of suburban development has generated both acclaim and controversy. For some, MPEs encapsulate all that is wrong with society as they further facilitate exclusive enclaves for the socially privileged. While for others, MPEs offer a better suburban environment with strong communities and quality services (Johnson, 2010). In 1990, a coalition began planning a new MPE known as Glenmore Park in western Sydney, an area long suffering from negative stereotyping and segregation. Given the far-reaching and detailed community planning inherent to MPEs, Glenmore Park was uniquely positioned to ameliorate the socio-cultural polarization prevalent in the area by capitalizing on the positive aspects of MPEs. In the promotional materials and Structure Plan for Glenmore Park, the coalition outlined an approach to development involving social, environmental, and economic sustainability initiatives. By examining these initiatives through an urban regime theory lens, it is clear Glenmore Park's coalition aligned a middle class progressive regime. The attention given to all three forms of sustainability properly situated Glenmore Park to break down the negative perceptions surrounding western Sydney through the construction of an innovative and sustainable community. However, in an attempt to answer the question, how does the presentation of triple bottom line approach to development, as seen in Glenmore Park's

promotional material and Structure Plan, align with the actuality of the MPE, it is clear that a regime misrepresentation occurred – where the goals of the coalition did not match the built community. In comparing the stated goals of Glenmore Park with the actuality of the MPE, the lofty objectives of the coalition did not come to fruition in the built environment. Rather, Glenmore Park’s coalition’s claims to social and environmental sustainability were mostly rooted in economic returns, an indicator of a development regime. As a result, the coalition facilitated the creation of a two-tier system where those within the estate benefited at the cost of those outside the estate. Ultimately, the exclusivity of Glenmore Park resulted in exclusion. Through the use of urban regime theory and discourse analysis, I will argue that the goals stated by Glenmore Park’s coalition and their supposed commitment to a triple-bottom line approach to sustainability may have only been lip service used to increase the coalition’s economic returns, thereby raising questions about the true motives of the Glenmore Park coalition.

To present my argument I will first provide background information in section one on the triple-bottom line approach to sustainability, the development of MPEs, and the evolution of negative stereotypes in western Sydney. The information in section one will be critical in understanding the great potential Glenmore Park’s coalition had in improving the overall region of western Sydney. Section two, methodology, will illustrate how urban regime theory, descriptive case study method, and discourse analysis will be apply to my argument, as well as why Glenmore Park was chosen as the focus of this paper. The methodology explained in section two will then be applied in section three, analysis. The analysis will be presented in four parts. Four guiding questions will be used to form the analysis: How was Glenmore Park presented by the coalition? What community was actually created at Glenmore Park? If a middle class progressive regime was not implemented, what regime did the coalition implement in Glenmore

Exclusivity or Exclusion?

2

Park? and finally, What are the possible motivations for a regime misrepresentation? These questions will clearly argue and explain how a regime shift occurred and how this shift resulted in a break down of the triple-bottom line approach to sustainability, which ultimately only favored economic sustainability. Before concluding in section six, section five will detail the implications of the findings for both western Sydney and the broader society.

2. Background

Prior to discussing Glenmore Park, certain foundational knowledge must be established. This section will provide information on the triple-bottom line approach to sustainability as well as definitions for social, environmental, and economic sustainability. While the term “triple-bottom line” is not explicitly stated in the planning documents for Glenmore Park, the central concepts of the terms are undoubtedly present and are therefore important to discuss. Next, a general overview of the history and defining characteristics of MPEs will be presented. Finally, a background of western Sydney will help provide context for the construction of Glenmore Park. Collectively these sub-sections will set the stage for a detailed examination of Glenmore Park.

2.1 Triple Bottom Line

In 1997, environmentalist and economist, John Elkington developed the expression “triple bottom line” in his book *Cannibal with a Fork: the Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business*. In the book, Elkington took the three-pronged approach to sustainability—social, environmental, and economic—established earlier by the 1987 Brundtland Report and connected it with the business sector. Elkington’s expression quickly became an international buzzword to describe a mode of corporate reporting that encompasses all three concerns (McKenzie, 2004, p. 6). Over time the term was applied to discussions on sustainability as well. The term “triple bottom line” crystallized the increasingly widespread view that, “it is not possible to achieve a

desired level of ecological or social or economic sustainability (separately) without achieving at least a basic level of all three forms of sustainability, simultaneously” (Sutton, 2000).

Understanding and properly applying all three forms of sustainability is key for MPE coalitions as it can help MPE developers uphold their exclusive appeal through the formation of strong, close knit communities while avoiding outright exclusion on the basis of race, class, socioeconomic status, age, or gender. Due to the immense impact that successfully or unsuccessfully implementing a triple-bottom line approach to sustainability can have on whether MPE positively or negatively influence the communities both within and outside of the MPE, as well as the frequency with which the terms social, environmental, and economic sustainability are used in general discourse and in this paper, it is important to have a clear, shared understanding of the terms moving forward. Although there are many competing definitions of sustainability, when I use the terms in this paper I will be referring to the definitions below.

Social Sustainability: Of the three forms of sustainability, social sustainability is often the most difficult to define and especially quantify term of the triple bottom line. Stephen McKenzie (2004) took on the challenge of defining social sustainability and identified five principles through which social sustainability can be achieved. They are:

1. Equity: the community provides equitable opportunities and outcomes for all its members, particularly the poor and most vulnerable
2. Diversity: the community promotes and encourages diversity
3. Interconnectedness: the community provides processes, systems, and structures that promote connectedness within and outside the community at the formal, informal, and institutional level
4. Quality of Life: the community ensures that basic needs are met and fosters a good quality of life for all members at the individual, group, and community level
5. Democracy and Governance: the community provides democratic processes and open and accountable governance structures (p. 18-19).

By creating businesses, communities, and a society that fosters the above traits, social sustainability can be enhanced.

Exclusivity or Exclusion?

4

Environmental Sustainability: Environmental sustainability refers to the ecological component of sustainability. John Morelli defines environmental sustainability as, “a condition of balance, resilience, and interconnectedness that allows human society to satisfy its need while neither exceeding the capacity of its supporting ecosystem to continue to regenerate the services necessary to meet those needs nor by our actions diminishing biological diversity” (2011, p. 23). Environmental sustainability includes a diverse range of focal topics including renewable energy sources, pollution reduction, waste reduction, and ecological preservation. For many, “it has become commonplace for ‘sustainable development’ or ‘sustainability’ to be defined strictly in terms of ‘environmental sustainability.’” This poses a serious problem as it limits the potential positive impact of sustainable development (Basiago, 1999, p. 155).

Economic Sustainability: Economic sustainability “implies a system of production that satisfies present consumption levels without compromising future needs” (Basiago, 1999, p. 150). In the case of business operations, economic sustainability calls for a wise use of resources so that businesses can continue to function over a number of years, while consistently returning a profit. The measure of economic sustainability is most commonly presented in monetary terms. Identifying and correcting inefficiencies in the business operation in order to increase monetary returns is a key component of economic sustainability. As Andrew Basiago states, in essence, the “‘sustainability’ that ‘economic sustainability’ seeks is the ‘sustainability’ of the economic system itself” (1999, p. 150).

Planning for Glenmore Park began in 1990 and the first phase of construction was completed in 1998. With the Brundtland Report being released in 1987 and Elkington’s book being published in 1997, the idea of a three-pronged approach to sustainability and its application to development were hot topics of discussion at that time and undoubtedly influenced

Glenmore Park's coalition even though the term is not explicitly stated in the literature published by the coalition.

2.2 Master Planned Estates

While MPEs are a fairly new addition to Australia's cityscape, the development and implementation of MPEs is quite old and can be traced back to the United Kingdom in the late 1800s. At this time, bourgeois philanthropists were creating communities aimed to rescue workers from the squalor, crime, and moral degradation of large industrial cities (Bounds, 2004). Thus social concerns were at the heart of MPEs from their earliest conception. MPEs were propelled further by Ebenezer Howard's Garden City Movement in the early 20th century. Howard's visionary cities were conceived with the utopian values of health, peace, and community. Central to Howard's movement was the presence of "greenbelts" or parks that acted as buffers between developed areas. The existence of green spaces added an environmental component to MPEs in addition to social concerns. After World War II, MPEs fulfilled the strong post-war housing demand, first in the USA, and later in Australia. "Like their predecessors, these estates were shaped by a vision of sanctuary and community, combined with a far more clearly articulated objective of returns on real estate investment" (Cheshire et al., 2010, p. 359). The MPEs that stand in Australia today have evolved from these early precursors, but as Lynda Cheshire et al. note, along with the initial social and environmental focus, economic motives have surfaced.

Though varied in many aspects, MPEs' essential features include: a definable boundary, a consistent, but not necessarily uniform character, and overall control by a single development entity. Exhibiting substantial diversity, such planned estates generally contain a range of residential and non-residential land uses, open space, public services, and facilities. "They aim to

provide residents with a complete living experience, from schools and shopping centres to parks and, in some cases, employment. MPEs therefore tend to be large-scale developments which involve comprehensive planning, separateness and concerted efforts to create ‘community’” (Johnson, 2010, p. 376). As Louise Johnson states, “for some, [MPEs] epitomise all that is wrong with current Australian culture, as exclusive privatopias where the socially privileged can affirm their superior ethnic and class positions. For others, however, they offer a better suburban environment; with quality, comprehensive services provided in a timely manner, a positive community, and financial, personal, and physical security” (2010, p. 376). The attention given to the successful implementation of a triple-bottom line approach to development can help determine which direction a MPE will go, either privatopia or panacea.

2.3 The Evolution of the Westie Stereotype

In order to understand the development of Glenmore Park and the great potential the coalition had to positively influence the wider community, it is important to be familiar with the larger region of western Sydney. “For three decades, the Australian mass media have portrayed western Sydney in a predominately negative manner. As a result, a set of stereotypes has been socially constructed, continually reiterated, and embedded in the public consciousness. These constructions are generally narrow and derogatory” (Kenna, 2007, p. 303). The cause of these negative stereotypes is rooted in the prevalence of affordable housing that formed after World War II. The suburban dream was widespread in the post-war period and many Sydneysiders moved to western Sydney in search of affordable housing (Mee, 2002, p. 338). Government intervention enabled the availability of public housing in western Sydney, both through subsidies for home purchase and through the direct provision of public housing (Mee, 2002, 343). In the post-war period, Italian, Maltese, and Greek migrants took advantage of western Sydney’s

affordable housing options (Gwyther, 2008). As a result, the term ‘Westie’ became a rhetorical device to designate the ‘other’, non-Anglo Australian Sydney. ‘Westie’ was used to set western Sydney as spatially, culturally, and economically different from the more prosperous and privileged Sydneysiders of the north and east. By the 1970s, the populations of western Sydney shifted as a new wave of immigrants came to Sydney. Non-European immigrants, particularly from South-East Asia and the Middle East and more recently North-East Africa, began to take up residence in western Sydney. Many of these migrants arrived as refugees. Access to affordable housing, migrant services, family reunion, ethno-cultural familiarity, and social networks all influenced the immigration shift and settlement in western Sydney (Gwyther, 2008). The aesthetic and cultural changes to the region elevated the negative understanding of the term ‘Westie’. As Gabrielle Gwyther (2008) notes, “it became a term of division and derision, and shorthand for a population considered lowbrow, coarse and lacking education and cultural refinement”.

In recent years, however, the concentration of public housing in the region has decreased. Gwyther sees a connection between the decrease in public housing and the changing demographics of the region. Mainly, as the population inhabiting western Sydney has become less Anglo-Australian, the meaning of ‘Westie’ has become more derogatory resulting in the general region being viewed less favorably. These negative perceptions seem to have manifested into a movement to decrease public housing in order to “improve” the region. As Gwyther states “the image of public housing estates as dangerous sites of dysfunctionality, delinquency, broken homes, and riotous behavior is now deeply etched in the local psyche, and strongly influences the public’s perceptions of life in Sydney’s western suburbs” (2008).

Kathleen Mee (2002) notes the changes in government funding regimes and policy in favor of smaller concentrations of public housing and directing funds to support people in the private rental market as key to the decrease of public housing in the region. In recent years the direct provision of public housing has been undermined by federal government policy changes that redirect funds to support people in the private rental market by supplying rent assistance (Mee, 2002, p. 344). This change from the construction of public housing to financial assistance to promote private rentals has had a large impact on low-income residents in the region as well as general housing affordability. By examining the Australian Bureau of Statistics' data from 1996 and 2001, the shift from public to private rentals is apparent. In the Penrith local government area (LGA) where Glenmore Park is located, 1,051 private rental dwelling were built over the five-year period whereas public dwellings decreased by 39 dwellings (Mee, 2002). When examining these numbers in terms of rental costs, only 20% of the private rentals cost less than AUS \$150 per week whereas 78.54% of public rentals cost less than AUS \$150 per week (Mee, 2002, p. 347).

The erosion of affordable housing in western Sydney has real consequences for residents in the area since public housing creates opportunities for a stable life. "Access to public housing allow[s] residents to plan their futures in place as they enjoyed security in their housing supply" (Mee, 2002, p. 346). Having stable housing means a stable education for children and the creation of an environment where local communities can development. In short, the supply of public rental housing allowed those unable to afford home ownership to access some of the benefits of suburban life" (Mee, 2002, p. 346).

Given the negative stereotypes in western Sydney, the decline of affordable housing in the area, and the historical precedent of designing MPEs to strengthen communities, the

developers of Glenmore Park possessed a very influential opportunity to decrease the polarization that has come to stereotype western Sydney. Glenmore Park's coalition sat at a pivotal intersection where the chance to make real, long-lasting, deep change in the way a region was viewed and lived was in their control. Unfortunately, Glenmore Park's coalition did not seize this opportunity and instead further exacerbated the negative stereotyping in the region. The next section will discuss the application of urban regime theory, discourse analysis, and case study method to Glenmore Park as a means to examine how the coalition failed to capitalize on the positive aspects of MPEs.

3. Methodology

In order to analyze how the presentation of a triple bottom line development in Glenmore Park's promotional materials and Structure Plan and its alignment with a middle class progressive regime ultimately shifted to a development regime in the actuality of the MPE, I will use urban regime theory and discourse analysis. This section will explain the principles of each method and their application to Glenmore Park. Additionally, I will discuss why Glenmore Park was selected as the MPE for this case study. As noted, the main two forms of literature I will be examining are Glenmore Park's promotional materials and their Structure Plan. Promotional materials include pamphlets, billboards, and community newsletters published by the coalition. The target audience of these materials is potential residents to Glenmore Park (Kenna, 2007). The Structure Plan is a report required by Penrith City Council that details the overall framework for decision-making and implementation of Glenmore Park (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 3). Since the report was required by the city, the city was the intended audience; however, the report was assessable to the public.

3.1 Urban Regime Theory

Exclusivity or Exclusion?

10

Urban regime theory is grounded in the concept that governing capacity is not secured through the electoral process. Rather, governing power is created and maintained by forming coalition partners with both governmental and nongovernmental parties. Urban regime theory stresses the importance of nongovernmental activities and resources as key to the well-being of society, and, as a result, these nongovernmental activities and resources have political influence. Because nongovernmental institutions hold political power, the government needs the cooperation of the private actors. Cooperation can be achieved through coercion, but is most readily achieved through active and cooperative partnerships. Collectively, the coalitions that form via the partnerships of the government and private sector become the governing power.

From the secondary literature available on Glenmore Park, it is apparent that there were many actors outside of the governmental sphere involved. Two of the largest private sector actors were Elders Finance Group and Lensworth (property developers). Lensworth was later replaced by Stockland in 2005. On the governmental side, the main actors were the New South Wales Department of Housing and Penrith City Council. Collectively, these institutions formed the foundation of the governing coalition named Glenmore Park Developments. The presence of nongovernmental partners supports one of the main components of urban regime theory. A final member of the governing coalition was a Community Services Planning Team. The significance of their role seems relatively small since their existence was only mentioned in one piece of literature, a presentation by Gary Dean. Dean, the Senior Environmental Planner of Penrith City Council, mentions the Community Services Planning team in a presentation to students at the University of New England - Armidale. He states, “this team was comprised of representatives of various human services authority and community... the team advised [City Council] on detailed issues relating to the needs and provisions of community services facilities” (Dean, 1995, p. 7).

Beyond this one sentence, the Community Services Planning team is not mentioned – alluding to the difficulties often experienced by coalitions in incorporating citizen involvement, as key distinction between the regimes that will be discussed in detailed later.

Since the coalition is the governing power, the composition of the coalition is of great importance. A narrow governing coalition results in policy guided by a narrow social understanding. Examining, “not only who is included, but also who is not” provides insight into motives of the coalition (Stone, 1993, p. 14). Often times it is citizens who are not included in the coalition. Stone presents four types of regimes: maintenance regimes, development regimes, middle class progressive regimes, and regimes devoted to lower class opportunity expansion. In each regime, the role of the citizens as part of the coalition differs along with the degree of difficulty to coordinate and sustain citizen involvement. As a result, coalition builders need to weigh the trade offs: the large amount of work involved in attaining citizen involvement versus having a narrow governing coalition whose policies may not reflect the needs of the whole populace.

The two regimes relevant to Glenmore Park are development regimes and middle class progressive regimes. Development regimes, as the name suggests, are concerned primarily with change, particularly changing the land use in order to promote growth. “They represent efforts to modify established social and economic patterns and involve the linking of private investment to public action” (Stone, 1993, p. 18). Because development regimes aim to modify, and therefore change and disrupt, development projects are often controversial. As a result, they are advanced most easily when the public is passive (Stone, 1993, p. 19). In order to keep the public passively in favor rather than actively against development projects, such projects often include an array of

incentives and small opportunities. These include jobs, contracts, new schools, parks, theater facilities, and many other amenities (Stone, 1993, p. 19).

In contrast to the economic and growth focus of the development regime, the middle class progressive regime focuses on issues such as environmental protection, historic preservation, affordable housing, affirmative action and the linkage of funds for various social purposes (Stone, 1993, p. 19). In middle class progressive regimes, or simply progressive regimes, development must be encouraged, or at least not prevented, but the means through which development is achieved is different than in development regimes. In this type of regime development for the sake of growth is not the focus, rather the aim is to use development to ameliorate social and environmental injustices. To do this, progressive regime depends on public support. Although citizen participation is not required, it is useful in informing citizens of the policy while simultaneously keeping them committed to the end goals (Stone, 1993, p. 20). Active and informed public support helps drive the regime. However, maintaining citizen commitment requires informing, mobilizing, and involving the public – a demanding task. As a result progressive regimes are often a more difficult governing task than development regimes.

Urban regime theory provides a good lens of analysis in answering my question, how does the presentation of triple bottom line approach to development, as seen in Glenmore Park's promotional material and Structure Plan, align with the actuality of the master planned community, by providing a typology of regimes where different goals, barriers, and forms of sustainability are prioritize; Clarence Stone's regime categories allow Glenmore Park's presentation and built reality to be compared across the different regimes. Stone's regimes provide a structure of analysis, which with the case of Glenmore Park can be applied.

3.2 Descriptive Case Study and Discourse Analysis

Exclusivity or Exclusion?

13

As previously stated, Glenmore Park is being used as a descriptive case study. According to Robert Yin, a descriptive case study is one that examines the application of theory, rather than challenging or revising it. Yin defines a case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real life context” (Yin, 2009, p.18). Case studies are used when a “how” or “why” question is being posed, and the observer does not have much control over the situation. The question I have posed is a “how” question, namely how does the presentation of triple bottom line development in Glenmore Park’s promotional materials and Structure Plan align with the actuality of the MPE?

To extract the possible meanings, both apparent and underlying, from the texts surrounding my case study, I employed discourse analysis techniques. According to Lawrence Berg (2009, p. 215), discourse is “the taken-for-granted, and most often, hidden, frameworks of ideas that structure both knowledge and social practice.” In other words, discourse is the subtext that permeates all interactions, and colors the underlying, often unexamined, meaning. There can be many discourses, but usually one dominant one (2009, p. 215). Discourse analysis is based on the post-structuralist notion that language does not accurately reflect reality, but instead works to define it (Berg, 2009, p. 216). Discourse analysis seeks to uncover the power language has and how the words we choose shape our reality. I will apply discourse analysis to the promotional material and Structure Plan of Glenmore Park to identify what regime most closely aligns with the coalition’s aims in comparison to what regime aligns with the community the coalition created.

Berg states that discourse analysis is a practice inherently hard to define, but offers a list of useful categories to aid in the completion of a discourse analysis (2009, p. 219-20). These include suspending preexisting categories, absorbing oneself in the texts, coding themes, and

identifying 'regimes of truth,' inconsistencies, absent presences, and social contexts. Since my research question rests on detangling and identifying any gaps between the presentation and actuality of Glenmore Park and determining why these gaps occurred, discourse analysis is a valuable method to employ.

3.3 Why Glenmore Park?

Glenmore Park is located 31 miles West of Sydney's central district, in an area formally known as the South Penrith Release Area. Construction on Glenmore Park began in 1990 and was completed in 1998. According to the Structure Plan, the developers of Glenmore Park wanted to achieve "a diverse, relatively self contained residential environment [so that the community could] form its own positive identity" as well as "the creation of a 'village' feel or atmosphere" (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 5). In the Glenmore Park Structure Plan the developers named twelve key terms to encompass their intended goals. These key words are: "Village, Community, Self Contained, Special Characteristics, Safety, Individuality, Integration, Interaction, Diversity, Variety, Quality, and Management" (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., p. 5). The lofty goals of Glenmore Park coupled with the dramatic opportunity to influence the wider community of western Sydney prompted me to examine the development of Glenmore Park more closely. Due to the negative stereotypes surrounding western Sydney, the developers of Glenmore Park had, as Debra Costely (2006, p. 171) notes, "a rare opportunity to contribute to the construction of [an] innovative and sustainable communit[y] that can underpin failing social structures," and thus present a compelling case study for the influence of MPEs.

For more practical reasons, Glenmore Park was also a logical choice because of the existing research available. Due to distance limitations, direct observation and interviews, two techniques that Yin identifies as necessary in order to separate a case study from simple

histories, were not feasible. However, I was able to find a case study by Therese E. Kenna (2007) who visited Glenmore Park and conducted surveys as well as observations. The data I had access to were a variety of texts that describe the community, the development plans, and advertisements.

4. Analysis

Now that the proper background knowledge is in place, an in-depth analysis of Glenmore Park can occur. With an urban regime theory lens, the analysis will first examine how a progressive regime formed through the presentation of Glenmore Park as seen in the promotional materials and the Structure Plan. This presentation of the MPE will then be compared with the actuality of the existing MPE and the development regime that consequently formed. After identifying similarities and inconsistencies between the two realms, a rationale will be presented to explain the potential reasoning for this regime misrepresentation.

4.1 How was Glenmore Park presented by the coalition?

MPEs are constructed as a packaged community. As Cheshire et al. state, property developers have a “role as conceivers, designers, and implementers of these places [and have] a prominent role in the regulation, association, and even enforcement [of the community structure] in order to fully realise their master plan” (2010, p. 360). It is key to recognize the use of the possessive pronoun “their”. A MPE coalition decides what *their* ideal community is and then sells that ideal to citizens. The concept of “community” has become a commodity to be sold, all of which falls under the jurisdiction of the development coalition.

By examining the promotional material and Structure Plan in order to see what ideal community, in reference to the triple-bottom line approach, the Glenmore Park coalition was aiming to create, it is clear that Glenmore Park aligns with a middle class progressive regime.

The presented material gives attention to affordable housing and environmental concerns, two principles central to the progressive regime. Economic growth and development is acknowledged as important, especially in an efficient manner, but not at the cost of other more important goals. The use of development to ameliorate social and environmental injustices clearly aligns Glenmore Park's coalition with a progressive regime. By focusing on affordable housing, Glenmore Park's coalition aimed to tackle one of the larger obstacles of a triple-bottom line community as seen by Costely. Costely states that, "one of the biggest challenges to the development of innovative, inclusive, and sustainable communities is getting the mix of housing right so as not to facilitate the establishment of ghettos" (2006, p. 167). Progressive regimes are also characterized by citizen participation. The presence of a community based coalition member, as represented in Community Services Planning team, further strengthens the progressive regime status of the Glenmore Park coalition. In order to fully realize the commitment of the coalition to a progressive regime, all three forms of sustainability will be examined so as to highlight the clear alignment.

Social Sustainability: Social sustainability, as stated earlier, relates to the equity, diversity, interconnectedness, quality of life, democracy, and governance structures in a community. For Glenmore Park's coalition, the main way social sustainability was addressed was through the consideration of affordable housing. The Structure Plan addressed the issue of mixed housing, but the topic was not present in promotional materials. In section 2.2 "Aims" of the Structure Plan, "Choice" is listed a goal. Among other features, the document states that a top aim is "to provide people with a wide freedom of choice for housing" (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 10). Housing is mentioned again in section 3.12 of the Structure Plan, entitled "Housing Mix". The document states, "It is an important objective that Glenmore should provide

for and accommodate a wide choice of housing types and allotment sizes” (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 26). Elsewhere in the Structure Plan in addition to other sources, the goals of Glenmore Park continually stress, “a diverse and dynamic community” and “one reflecting all socio economic groups” as well as the need to “provide for and accommodate a wide choice of housing types” (Dean, 1995, p. 2; Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 6).

While multiple texts published in conjunction with Glenmore Park Developments (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990) and outside sources (Dean, 1995; Kenna, 2007) note of Glenmore Park’s commitment to social sustainability through diverse and equitable housing, within the Structure Plan inconsistencies are present. Soon after stating the importance of providing “a wide choice of housing types” the Structure Plan continues with, “however, an equally important consideration is the marketability of innovative or unusual housing forms and the manner in which they can be integrated within the community without causing unnecessary concern” (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 26). This ambiguity raises early doubts about the coalition’s commitment to social sustainability through mixed housing.

Environmental Sustainability: Glenmore Park’s coalition paid a great deal of attention to environmental needs. In the Structure Plan, eight out of thirty-one pages are devoted to landscape vegetation. Section 3.13 “Urban and Landscape Design” provides a very detailed guideline for Glenmore Park, including lists of acceptable plants and trees for the different seasons. Within the Structure Plan it is stated as a Landscape Principle, “to preserve as much as possible of the existing vegetation and to incorporate this within public areas” (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 28). A second principle is, “to preserve wherever possible the existing vegetation by utilising sensitive development techniques and appropriate forms of development”

(Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 28). While noticeably vague, it is clear the coalition took great care in identifying proper vegetation and stating the importance of preservation.

Beyond the Structure Plan, promotional materials also demonstrated an attention to environmental needs. In an examination of promotional materials, physical landscaping, parks, wetlands, and recreational spaces were heavily cited. Kenna found that, “20% of the marketing images were of parks and wetlands, and 28.3% of the marketing images were of recreational spaces. Similarly, natural surroundings (21.5%), physical landscaping (10.7%), parks and wetlands (28.5%), and recreational spaces (30.4%) were significantly represented in the marketing’s textual descriptions of Glenmore Park” (2007, p. 306). In comparison to similar developments, Glenmore Park features 30% more park areas, playing fields, and open spaces (Kenna, 2007, p. 306). The environment was definitely not overlooked in the planning and promotion of Glenmore Park.

Economic Sustainability: The promotional material had no reference to the coalition’s economic goals and strategies since the intention for these materials was to inform the reader of the MPE, not the business motivations of the coalition. However, the Structure Plan did include some economic components. The coalition had an intentionally “flexible” approach to development. The coalition reasoned that a flexible approach “arises from the desire to ensure that future changes in attitudes, needs, requirements and circumstances can be accommodated without being prejudiced by the early stages of development and decisions taken at that time” (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 3). In terms of economic sustainability, flexibility allows the coalition “to adapt to changing market preferences” (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 11). A second area where economic sustainability is addressed is under section 2.2 “Aims”. In a subheading titled “Economy”, efficient use of resources is stressed. It states that an

aim is “to see that financial resources and investments are used wisely and efficiently” (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 9). Economic efficiency and the importance of balancing it with the MPE’s other goals is recognized in the Structure Plan’s statement that, “the plan [...] needs to guide development in a way as to make the most efficient use of such investment, mindful of overriding objectives” (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 9). Though the “overriding objectives” are not explicitly listed, it seems logical to assume the overriding objectives refer to the twelve key terms used to encompass their intended goals: Village, Community, Self Contained, Special Characteristics, Safety, Individuality, Integration, Interaction, Diversity, Variety, Quality, and Management (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., p. 5). Across all three forms of sustainability, the Structure Plan and promotional material clearly place Glenmore Park in alignment with a progressive regime.

4.2 What community was actually created at Glenmore Park?

While the presentation of Glenmore Park fits with the key tenets of a progressive regime, a further examination of the built reality will demonstrate how the stated goals failed to come to fruition. To do this, an analysis of the built environment, via Kenna’s research, that moves beyond the words and planned development goals to the actual existence of Glenmore Park is necessary, in addition to a more critical look at the promotional materials and Structure Plan.

Social Sustainability: The ambiguity of the coalition expressed in the Structure Plan surrounding the importance of mixed housing was resolved by the time housing was constructed in Glenmore Park. Rather than siding with the goal of providing diverse housing and upholding the aim of “Choice”, the coalition decided to skip over mixed housing out of concerns of marketability. The lack of mixed housing is shown in the 2006 Census data, which is broken down by suburbs. The data on Glenmore Park shows that 5,805 dwellings were recorded. Of

those dwellings 5,537 were separate houses – 95.38 percent (NSW, 2008). Only 10 dwellings were recorded as a “flat, unit, or apartment in a one or two story block.” These 10 units only housed 20 people (NSW, 2008). When examining the “Separate house” category in more detail, 60.12 percent of the separate houses were two or more stories suggesting the houses are not modest. The statistics confirm that from the time the Structure Plan was written to the time houses were constructed the “important objective” of mixed housing was lost.

While the presence of mixed housing cannot assure an increase in diversity, mixed housing can serve as a proxy for levels of racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity. Pauline McGuirk and Robyn Dowling note the connection between housing type and demographics when they state that, “scale and relative uniformity of housing stock and overall land-use mix have significant ramification for the tendency to produce socio-spatial homogeneity and exclusiveness” (2007, p.33). Consequently, the lack of mixed housing significantly decreases the presence of social sustainability in Glenmore Park since equity and diversity are main components of social sustainability. The decision of the coalition to not incorporate mixed housing seems out of line with their goals. In particular, three of their twelve key words that encompass their goals would have been enhanced through mixed housing: “integration”, “diversity”, and “variety”.

By looking at the built reality of the Glenmore Park, it is apparent that the actions of the coalition spoke louder than their words as the coalition failed to make a built environment conducive to a diverse populace. The low priority the coalition gave to diversity was consequently reflected in the priorities of the residents it attracted. In a survey conducted by Kenna, which asked residents of Glenmore Park to rank various motivations for moving to the MPE, responses regarding affluence, status, and type of residents were most prominent. 69.2

percent of respondents stated locating amongst a “better group of people”, 55.3% stated living in a “more affluent local community”, 53.4% stated living in with “like-minded people”, and 48.5% stated being amongst “a similar social status of residents” (2007, p. 309). Interestingly enough, the motivations “for more community interaction” and “for more social diversity”, key goals of Glenmore Park in planning documents, came in seventeenth and twentieth out of twenty-three possible motivations with 37.1% and 25.2% respectively (Kenna, 2007, p. 309). Evidently, residents of Glenmore Park responded to the actions, not the words of the coalition. The result is a homogenous community where diversity is not highly valued by either the coalition or the residents.

Environmental Sustainability: Although the developers did follow through with the advertised environmental aspects of Glenmore Park (at least to a greater degree than with mixed housing), a closer reading shows that the environmental features were not presented in terms of sustainability. By analyzing Glenmore Park’s publications through a discourse analysis approach, it is evident Glenmore Park’s coalition viewed environmental sustainability in economic rather than environmental terms. Instead of being motivated to protect the environment, the motivation seems to have stemmed from creating amenities (parks, bike trails, aesthetic appeal) to attract homebuyers. By focusing on the environment as a marketing tool, the environment is viewed as a commodity to be manipulated and sold. This commoditization of the environment in addition to amenity building as a strategy to entice homebuyers is seen on the Glenmore Park Realty website. Under the heading “Why Glenmore Park?” the environment is used as a selling point: “Enjoy the beauty of its outstanding surroundings, with an environment designed to enhance every aspect of your life” and “One of the best things about living in Glenmore Park are all the parks, reserves, waterways, and picnic areas” (Glenmore Park Realty).

While it is understandable that the coalition would represent the environment in economic terms, since they do have a goal of attracting residents and selling houses, it is one-dimensional nature in which the environment is presented that is troublesome. The marketing lines used by the coalition stress the visual appeal of the environment, with no mention of key environmental sustainability principles such as conservation, preservation, and ecological diversity. By placing no emphasis on these sustainability tactics, the degree to which the coalition actually cares about environmental sustainability begins to waver.

Furthermore, the immense amount of nature represented in promotional material seems to have been used to set Glenmore Park apart as an exclusive and distinct estate rather than an environmentally conscious community. As the text shows, the coalition was more concerned with aesthetics than environmental goals such as waste reduction, water conservation, lower carbon emissions and the like. Glenmore Park's coalition was so set on selling the environment that they constructed an artificial lake complete with landscaped parks and gardens (Glenmore Park Realty, 1990). Dennis Wood notes the irony seen in MPEs, that while MPEs consistently utilize nature as a selling point, they are actually "eating into and digesting virgin scrub, consuming wetlands by in-filling, and butchering forests by felling" in the process (2002, p. 1). But this is often overlooked since it is all in the name of forming a close connection to nature. The manipulation of nature to entice buyers with little to no regard of true environmental sustainability presents a strikingly different perspective compared to the goals of preservation and natural vegetation stated in the Structure Plan. Like social sustainability, the presentation and reality of Glenmore Park seemed oddly misaligned.

Economic Sustainability: Fifteen years after Glenmore Park opened, the MPE is thriving. As of October this year (2012), the medium house price was AUS \$480,000 (Property and Data

Trends). In comparison, the median house price in Penrith, the local government area in which Glenmore Park is located, is AUS \$349,000, a clear indicator that the Glenmore Park is financially sound (Property and Data Trends). The fact that Glenmore Park was successfully completed and continues to attract new residents today demonstrates the strong economic sustainability of the MPE. However, in relation to the other two forms of sustainability, it appears that economic motives superseded social and environmental goals. The Structure Plan noted that this could be a potential problem and that the coalition should work to prevent an economic take over. This warning, however, appears not have been strong enough.

4.3 If not a progressive regime, what regime *did* the coalition implement in Glenmore Park?

By breaking down each of the three prongs of sustainability and using urban regime theory to examine the built reality of Glenmore Park, it becomes apparent a development regime more accurately describes the regime present in Glenmore Park. Although the words and stated goals of the promotional materials and Structure Plan described a progressive regime, the actions of the coalition created a development regime, therefore indicating a regime change misrepresentation (since the progressive regime's goals never move past the planning stage), rather than a regime change. As the in depth analysis of each form of sustainability in this section will attest, across all three forms of sustainability there was a deeply rooted economic focus. This economic focus highlights a key component of development regime – growth. Beyond the general growth focus of Glenmore Park, the amenity building through the commoditization of the environment is a key characteristic of development regimes. As stated earlier, in development regimes in order to keep public in favor rather than against development, projects often include an array of incentives. These include jobs, contracts, new schools, parks, theater

facilities, and many other amenities (Stone, 1993, p. 19). Glenmore Park's coalition utilized amenity building in the form of artificial lakes, open spaces, parks, and recreational areas. Additionally, the presence of a community based coalition member, the Community Services Planning Team, had such a limited and seemingly insignificant role in the coalition (based on the fact that it was hardly mentioned), indicates that citizen participation, a key tenet of progressive regimes, was actually not a focus of Glenmore Park's coalition. The limited citizen involvement, the general growth focus approach of the MPE, in addition to the amenity building, establishes Glenmore Park as a development regime. One final examination across the triple-bottom line will solidify how the reality of Glenmore Park aligns with a development regime.

Social Sustainability: The coalition's inconsistent view on mixed housing, that ultimately resulted in extremely limited mixed housing, is rooted in economic concerns. In the Structure Plan, the hesitation to go forward with diverse housing options was due to a concern of "the *marketability* [emphasis added] of innovative or unusual housing forms" (Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd., 1990, p. 26). The word marketability clearly signals attention to economic needs. Since mixed housing is essentially absent from Glenmore Park, it is clear that the economic concern of marketability beat out social concerns of enhancing western Sydney by decreasing socio-spatial segregation.

Environmental Sustainability: As section 4.2 illustrated, the coalition's environmental concerns were far from environmental sustainability concerns. The underlying marketing purpose of the environmental initiatives was economically driven. The coalition's preoccupation with "enhancing" and selling the environment was for the sake of attracting future residents. The immense amount of amenity building serves to add value to the MPE. Gwyther refers to this "value adding" as additional capital investment in design features and community facilities

aimed to increase the perceived significance of a location (2005, p. 59). The process of value adding increases the cost of developing the land, which increases the cost to live on that land. As a result value adding “provides a useful acquisition barrier to those less well off” (Gwyther, 2008). By adding environmental amenities, the coalition may have actually created further barriers to social diversity.

Economic Sustainability: There is little need to explain where economic sustainability fits into the created regime since economic concerns essentially overran social and environmental sustainability. The previous two paragraphs highlight how the coalition placed economic sustainability at the forefront of Glenmore Park.

4.4 Possible motivations for the regime misrepresentation:

The above information has argued that a misrepresentation of regime occurred, where the presentation of Glenmore Park did not align with the constructed reality. While it is important to note this misalignment, further questions must be asked to determine why the Glenmore Park coalition, intentionally or unintentionally, misrepresented their regime.

Since the Brundtland Report was released in 1987 and John Elkington’s book *Cannibals with Forks: the Triple Bottom Line of the 21st Century Business* was published in 1997, the terms “sustainable development” and “triple bottom line” in planning projects have grown exponentially. The three-pronged approach to sustainability has resulted in multi-focal agendas where words are vaguely defined and terms are used interchangeably. McKenzie argues that, “‘sustainability’ is in danger of carrying so many implications and nuances that in order for it to be properly understood it must be defined whenever it is used” (2004, p. 1). Often times however, organizations fail, whether intentionally or unintentionally, to define ‘sustainability’ in order to use the word as a catch-all phrase for ‘good’. Absent or vague definitions “create a

smokescreen behind which businesses can continue its operations essentially unhindered by environmental concerns, while paying lip service to the needs of future generations” (McKenzie, 2004, p. 2). The Glenmore Park coalition’s actions may fall into this catch-all phrase for ‘good’ situation. With both the Brundtland report and Elkington’s book entering the conservation at around the same time as the planning and building of Glenmore Park, the appeal of a triple-bottom line approach was both trendy and not thoroughly explored. It was easy for the coalition to simply apply the “correct” language needed to promote a triple-bottom line community. However, as was demonstrated, carrying out a progressive regime requires more than the correct language.

The difficulties of sustaining citizen involvement and the immense amount of consideration needed to structure a socially, environmentally, and economically sustainable community seems to have eventually dissuaded the Glenmore Park coalition from following through with the progressive regime they had initially laid out. In comparison to the progressive regime, a development regime may have seemed much more manageable to the coalition. With the main goals of a development regime revolving around only one of the three prongs to sustainability—economic—the high level of community and environmental planning needed in a progressive regime was not called for. The attention of the coalition could focus solely on growth and economic returns.

Though it is challenging to ever fully know the developers’ intentions, it is important to examine whether the coalition happened to have a regime misrepresentation due to the difficulties of a progressive regime or whether they never truly intended to follow through on their progressive regime posturing. A closer look at the subtext of their promotional materials supports the argument that a progressive regime may have only ever been lip service.

Kenna conducted research on the constructed identity of Glenmore Park as seen in the media the coalition produced. By examining text and images, Kenna concluded that from the start the coalition aimed to create one of western Sydney's most prestigious and exclusive residential developments (2007, p. 302). In the marketing images Anglo-Australians were projected as the dominant ethnicity 100% of the time and 99.3% of the images in the community newsletters were dominated by Anglo-Australians (Kenna, 2007, p. 306). Maybe even more startlingly is the fact that "of the 286 images in the marketing material and community newsletters, only one image recognised a differing ethnicity (Italian owners of the local pizza shop)" (Kenna, 2007, p. 306). These materials strongly suggest that the coalition had intended a community of ethnic homogeneity from the start, which runs in contrast to key term goal of "diversity" mentioned earlier in the Structure Plan. This raises questions about the motives of the coalition. The perceived misrepresentation may have been more of a conscious decision from the outset where development regime goals trumped progressive regime goals. The language devoted to mixed housing and environmental preservation seems to have been empty talk used to boost the coalition's image as a development coalition "doing good" and, by extension, boost their profits.

5. Implications

Glenmore Park's coalition used language and text in their promotional materials and Structure Plan to highlight socially and environmentally sustainable goals that in actuality were not carried out in the constructed MPE. This disconnect between words and actions should not go unnoticed and lessons should be taken away. Accordingly, the case study of Glenmore Park has implications that will effect how MPEs are conceived and developed in both the immediate area of western Sydney and for MPEs through out Australia.

5.1 Immediate Implications for western Sydney

Not only does the exclusive nature of Glenmore Park result in a homogeneous community within the estate, the estate also harms the surrounding area of western Sydney through a self/other mentality. Rather than ameliorating the stereotypes of western Sydney, Glenmore Park exacerbated the socio-spatial polarization of the area. By creating an identity distinct from western Sydney, a self/other binary formed at the expense of western Sydney (Kenna, 2007). This binary elevates Glenmore Park above western Sydney as a distinctive estate while simultaneously confirming and intensifying the negative stereotypes of the rest of western Sydney that were previously discussed (Kenna, 2007). Such stereotypes include a populace considered lowbrow, coarse and lacking education and cultural refinement that placed ‘Westies’ as the lesser ‘other’. (Gwyther, 2008). Instead of capitalizing on the some of the laudable aims of MPEs such as, achieving “diversity through the adoption of a fluid and multifaceted concept of a cultural landscape, meshed with the surrounding areas,” Glenmore Park did just the opposite (Kenna, 2007, p. 312). The coalition did not raise the status and conditions of western Sydney; but instead, they confirmed the stereotypes of western Sydney, which worked to further enact socio-spatial polarization (Kenna, 2007, p. 312). Many envision Sydney as being socio-spatially divided between the wealthy suburbs of the north and east and the uncultured, poor, bland flatland suburbs of western Sydney. But through the establishment of exclusive estates, like Glenmore Park, socio-spatial polarization is occurring at a much smaller scale. Gwyther states that in, “the neighbourhoods of western Sydney, invasion and succession, of racial and socio-economic dimension, is just as significant a feature” as the north/east and west divide (2005, p. 65). Glenmore Park, therefore, furthers social problems, such as the voluntary segregation of the elite through MPEs, instead of eliminating them. If the division between those within the

MPE and those who are not continues to grow, the socio-spatial segregation aggravated by Glenmore Park could “enable the creation of zones of protected privilege that reinforce existing patterns of segregation” a troublesome and cyclical problem (McGuirk & Dowling, 2009, p. 122). As Costely states, “there is a concern that the increasing number of exclusive communities in Australia are quietly eroding the possibilities for integrated social development, which in such a multi-cultural country where diversity is celebrated [exclusive MPE] must be an issue that policy developers start to take seriously” (2006, p. 169).

5.2 Broader Implications and Lessons for MPEs in Australia

Beyond western Sydney, lessons from Glenmore Park can be gathered and applied to other MPEs. Although MPEs are by definition closed communities, they are not as isolated as they might like to think and indeed have repercussions far beyond their boundaries. MPE coalitions should recognize their influence and not become so inwardly focused (as did Glenmore Park) that they misuse opportunities to improve the larger community.

Given the influence MPEs hold, their plans and promises to implement social, environmental, and economic sustainability should not be taken lightly. Although Glenmore Park spoke of all three forms of sustainability in their promotional materials and Structure Plan, only economic sustainability was actually implemented. The concept of triple bottom line communities was introduced around the same time as Glenmore Park, and its popularity has spread dramatically since. Sustainability has become something of a buzzword, and its ubiquity threatens to weaken its meaning further. The case of Glenmore Park calls upon both coalitions and the community to be more conscientious about how the term sustainability, and even more generally the ideas of sustainability, is used. As citizens, the community can help to hold the MPEs accountable by being more critical readers of promotional materials to question if the

sustainability initiatives are genuine. To ensure the progressive regimes are actually what they seem and not just smokescreens for development regimes, citizens can actively seek a place within the coalition. This will help to make certain that social and environmental sustainability initiatives are not sacrificed for the sake of economic sustainability.

6. Conclusion

The developers of Glenmore Park had a unique opportunity to facilitate in the construction of an innovative and sustainable community that worked to eliminate socio-spatial polarization. Instead of capitalizing on the positive attributes of MPEs, Glenmore Park furthered existing social problems, particularly in the surrounding region of western Sydney. By failing to improve the areas located around Glenmore Park, the developers created a two-tier system. Those within the estate benefited from amenity building at the cost of those outside estate. Ultimately, the negative components of MPEs, as exclusive enclaves for the socially and ethnically privileged, trumped the positive potential of MPE to form strong communities that integrate and elevate the surrounding areas.

Glenmore Park represents a complex and multilayered development project where the stated goals and visions did not align with the process or final product. The use of urban regime theory helped to illuminate this disconnect between duplicitous words, underlying motives, and completed reality. By analyzing the material published by Glenmore Park and the secondary literature surrounding the development, in addition to understanding the larger context of the estate, it is clear that a regime misrepresentation occurred. This regime misrepresentation resulted in a lack of social and environmental sustainability. While the Glenmore Park continued to portray itself as a place of both social and environmental sustainability, their words lacked

significant backing in structure or action. Rather, their claims to social and environmental sustainability were mainly rooted in economic returns.

Work Cited

Basiago, A. D. (1999). Economic, social, and environmental sustainability in development theory and urban planning practice. *The Environmentalist*, 19, 145-161.

Berg, L.D. (2009). Discourse analysis. *The International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, 3, 215-221.

Bounds, M. (2004). *Urban social theory: city, self, and society*. South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Cheshire, L., Walters, P., & Wickes, R. (2010) Privatization, security and community: how master planned estates are changing suburban Australia. *Urban Policy and Research*, 28(4), 359-373.

Costley, D. (2006). Master planned communities: Do they offer a solution to urban sprawl or a vehicle for seclusion of the more affluent consumers in Australia? *Housing Theory and Society*, 23(3), 157-175.

- Dean, G. (1995). Glenmore Park: from flexible to traditional planning control. Presented to 3rd year undergraduates town planners at University of New England – Armidale, Armidale, Australia.
- Glenmore Park Realty. Why Glenmore Park? <http://www.glenmoreparkrealty.com.au/>
- Gwyther, G. (2008). Once were Westies. *Griffith Review: Cities on the Edge*.
- Gwyther, G. (2005). Paradise planned: community formation and the master planned estate. *Urban Policy and Research*, 23(1), 57-72.
- Johnson, J. C. (2010). Master planned estates: pariah or panacea? *Urban Policy and Research*, 28(4), 375-390.
- Kenna, T. K. (2007). Consciously construction exclusivity in the suburbs? Unpacking a master planned estate development in Western Sydney. *Geographical Research*, 45(3), 300 – 313.
- Masterplan Consultants Pty. Ltd. (1990) Glenmore park structure plan (South Penrith release area). Sydney, Australia: Author.
- McGuirk, P.M. & Dowling, R. (2007). Understanding master-planned estates in Australian cities: a framework for research. *Urban Policy and Research*, 25(1), 21-38.
- McKenzie, S. (2004). Social sustainability: towards some definitions. *Hawke Research Institute*, 27, 1-29.
- Mee, K. (2002). Prosperity and the suburban dream: quality of life and affordability in western Sydney. *Australian Geographers*, 33(3), 337-351.
- Morelli, J. (2011). Environmental sustainability: a definition for environmental professionals. *Journal of Environmental Sustainability*, 1, 19-27.

NSW. (2008). Table: Dwelling structure Glenmore Park.

<http://about.nsw.gov.au/view/census/Glenmore%20Park/B31/>

Property and Data Trends: Glenmore Park, (n.d.). Median sale prices in Glenmore Park for the past 12 months. www.rs.realestate.com.au

Stone, C. N. (1993). Urban regimes and the capacity to govern: a political economy approach. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 15(1),1-28.

Sutton, P. (2000). Sustainability: what does it mean. *Green Innovations*.

<http://www.green-innovations.asn.au/sustblty.htm>

Wood, D. (2002). Selling the suburbs: nature, landscape, adverts, community. *Transformations*, 5.

Yin, R. (2009). *Case study research* (4th ed.). Sage Publications: Thousands Oaks, CA.