Emplaced Displacement and Public Housing Redevelopment: From Physical Displacement to Social, Cultural, and Economic Replacement

Laura Wynne & Dallas Rogers

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Emplaced Displacement and Public Housing Redevelopment: From Physical Displacement to Social, Cultural, and Economic Replacement

Laura Wynne [a] and Dallas Rogers [b]

aInstitute for Sustainable Futures, University of Technology Sydney, Darlington, Australia; bSchool of Architecture, Design and Planning, University of Sydney, Darlington, Australia

ABSTRACT

This article reports on a study of the Waterloo public housing estate in Sydney, Australia. In 2015, the state government announced the inner-city estate would be redeveloped to accommodate some affordable/social dwellings (30%) but with the majority of new dwellings being private market housing (70%). Based on ethnographic research conducted with residents of Waterloo between 2010 and 2017, we analyze the Waterloo redevelopment as an example of emplaced displacement. We draw on the work of geographer Doreen Massey and legal scholar Sarah Keenan to understand place as more than physical space, allowing us to conceptualize displacement as something more than simply the movement of people from one physical place to another. We bring to the fore the subjective experience of place, as articulated by public housing tenants, demonstrating that although they remain physically in place, the threat of eviction posed by the redevelopment significantly alters tenants' spatial, sociocultural, and temporal relationship to place (i.e., the spaces tenants carry with them). The concept of embodied displacement seeks to capture the spatiotemporal diversity of low-income public renters' experiences of loss of place.

This article reports on a study conducted in the neighborhood of Waterloo, a suburb 3 km south of the Central Business District (CBD) of Sydney, Australia. The New South Wales (NSW) state government holds large tracts of public housing and public land in and around Waterloo, and the area's high-rise public housing buildings are a defining landmark. As in other so-called global cities, the NSW state government is in the middle of a decades-long process of "renewing" public housing estates—to use the government's policy language (NSW FACS, 2018). The broader area that falls under the government's development agenda is known as Redfern-Waterloo, and it has been associated with Aboriginal and low-income housing in media and other public discourse for over four decades (Rogers & Darcy, 2014; Shaw, 2000). In 2018, the Waterloo public housing estate was home to around 4,000 residents in 2,012 dwellings (NSW FACS, 2018), with a high proportion of elderly residents and tenants with English as a second language (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2017). The NSW Minister for Social Housing announced in December 2015 (NSW FACS, 2015) that the estate would be redeveloped to accommodate 10,000 people, some in affordable and social dwellings (30%), but with the majority (70%) in private-market housing in keeping with the government's controversial social mix redevelopment agenda (Darcy, 2010). One objective of the social mix agenda

---

is aimed at breaking up local "public housing" culture, which housing authorities suggest produces negative social outcomes (Darcy, 2010).

The redevelopment of the Waterloo estate is different to other public housing redevelopment projects in Sydney for two key reasons. First, medium- and high-rise public housing estates are the exception in Sydney, and in Australia in general, with the majority of stock comprising detached-dwelling public housing estates located in the middle- and outer-ring suburbs of the city. The high value of the land in this prime global city location is mediating what is possible in the Waterloo area through the redevelopment, especially in terms of the significant housing density increases that are possible at the site. These housing density increases were, for the most part, not possible in the earlier middle- and outer-ring public housing redevelopments. Second, and related to the first point, because of the significant density increases that are possible in Waterloo, there exists potential for the government to redevelop the area in such a way that allows the existing public housing tenants to remain in or return to the estate throughout or following the redevelopment. The land economics of the middle- and outer-ring public housing estate redevelopments in Sydney over the last 15 years often involved the removal of some—at times, all—of the public housing tenants to allow for the introduction of new private housing stock within the economic limits of the land and property markets in these areas (Bijen & Piracha, 2017; Rogers & Darcy, 2014). In the Sydney context, the Waterloo redevelopment offers a somewhat unique case of tenants remaining in place despite being evicted from their homes. We analyze this as an example of *emplaced displacement* to contribute to the conceptual debate about displacement in urban redevelopment more broadly.

The Waterloo case, we argue, exposes a variety of displacement experiences including displacement that occurs in the absence of the physical relocation of people. Displacement is a concept that is often recruited to understand the dynamics and experience of urban change. Despite its relevance for understanding a range of urban experiences and phenomena, much (but not all) of the debate about displacement has focused on questions about how to quantify, measure, and account for the physical displacement of people (as summarized by Davidson, 2009). A spatial assumption—that displacement requires the movement of a body from one physical space to another—was historically implicit within the narratives around the idea of urban displacement. However, many scholars, such as Davidson (2009), Davidson and Lees (2005), Marcuse (1985), and others, have called this spatial assumption into question by focusing on the *experience* of displacement and urban change, and thereby render less significant the role that physical movement might play. Indeed, when we align the ontology of place within the concept of displacement with mathematical space and/or physical movement, we render less visible—and perhaps even silence—a whole raft of urban displacement experiences.

We focus here on the experiences of residents of public housing threatened with emplaced displacement. Although they have not yet physically moved, and although their homes have not yet been demolished, the threat of eviction has already done significant damage to their relationship to place. Disruptions to the temporal, spatial, and sociocultural relationship between residents and their home/place are commonly articulated, as we demonstrate by drawing on ethnographic data collected from Waterloo.

1. Displacement, Embodiment, and Urban Renewal

Geographers have long conceived of place as something more than a physical space that is located at a specific point in calendar time. At their most basic, space and time can be divided into objective and subjective elements (Rogers, 2014). The physical, objective mathematical points that mark out the borders of a public housing estate are easy to find in policy documents (Rogers, 2014). We are also familiar with the mathematically informed seconds, minutes, days, and years of the Gregorian calendar, which allow us to keep track of a place in calendar time. Governments use both objective and subjective representations of time and space to situate public housing tenants (subjects) and public housing estate (objects) in relation to neighborhoods (places). The government's subjective

representations include, for example, the various government policy discourses that seek to construct certain social and material pathologies about a place, or the complex policy symbolisms (e.g., economic rationales and dysfunctional tenants) that define and codify the people and places that become the focus of urban redevelopment (Rogers, 2014). What is often missing from these policy statements are the tenants' subjective markers of place: the subjective, lived experiences of public housing tenants within specific demarcations of objective space and time. Gieryn (2000) describes place as having three aspects: a geographical location, a material form, and a site that is invested with meaning and value (p. 465). Massey (1995) argued that places are actively produced and are therefore inextricably linked to the social context within which they come into being. These constructions of place are the product of subjective perceptions, narratives, emotions, interpretations, and imaginings (Gieryn, 2000, p. 465).

Through our empirical analysis below, we interrogate the conceptualization of place within theories of displacement by bringing to the fore the subjective experience of place as articulated by public housing tenants in their neighborhood. We are following the work of other scholars (such as Bourdieu, 1979; Malpas, 1999; Massey, 1995, among many others), who, for decades across geography and the social sciences, have explicitly understood place to mean something more than a mathematically defined physical container (Massey, 1993). Despite this understanding, the policies that guide urban redevelopment are underwritten by an ontology of space that (a) constructs the place as a mathematical demarcation of physical space (e.g., a regulatory space that is marked out by the landed boundaries of the public housing estate); and (b) is a construction of place that silences the subjective narratives that public tenants create to talk about their experiences of their home in this place. Under this notion of place, the eviction and physical relocation of tenants from one neighborhood to another is considered displacement, whereas eviction that results in remaining in or returning to the neighborhood may not be. The Waterloo case therefore highlights avenues for understanding displacement by better understanding the objective and subjective complexities of this place. It also lends support to earlier calls to conceptualize the *place* in dis*place*ment as more complex than merely a movement in physical space.

Throughout this analysis, we follow scholars, including Elliott-Cooper, Hubbard, and Lees (2019), who argue that we need to adopt more nuanced approaches to understanding displacement that capture the full range of displacements that occur within urban gentrifications, rather than simply being tied to 20th-century narratives that limit gentrification to being understood in Marcuse's terms (which were highly relevant to the 1980s context of New York City, but fail to capture the breadth of experiences in settler-colonial cities like Sydney in the 21st century) and that rely on physical displacement as evidence for displacement. Davidson (2009) prompts urban scholars to reconsider displacement as loss of place, and not simply as the process of physical relocation. Similarly, Hyra (2015) describes the experiences of residents who stay put in a gentrifying neighborhood by noting the ways in which residents experienced a loss of place through cultural and political displacement, despite not being physically displaced. In Hyra's case, the residents experienced a financially mediated displacement that resulted from the influx of higher income newcomers to the neighborhood.

We understand emplaced displacement, then, to be a form of displacement following Elliot-Cooper et al.'s description of this phenomenon as "a form of violence that removes the sense of belonging to a particular community or home-space" (2019, p. 12)—that is, it is the relationship to a place that is displaced, rather than an individual being physically removed. Emplaced displacement is not only spatial, but—following Brickell, Arrigoitia, and Vasudevan (2017)—it is an "affective, emotional and material rupture" (Cooper et al., 2019, p. 494)—a severing not only of physical dwelling in space but of connections and ties that link people *across time* to a space in specific ways.

Keenan, 2017., n.p.) draws on critical race and feminist theorists to argue that governments create spaces as "seemingly politically neutral, uniform and fixed" as a necessary first step to securing their power over people and place. Keenan shows "that space in fact consists of multiple, dynamic realities; realities which affect different people in different ways." Drawing on the work of geographer

Doreen Massey, Keenan's work usefully moves beyond thinking of places as bounded physical areas, because the same place "will be experienced and articulated differently by different people, this understanding accounts for the same place having mismatched and even contrasting meanings for different people" (Keenan, 2017., n.p.).

This Massey-inspired ontology of place, which is constituted by multiple and overlapping subjective and objective meanings, allows us to conceive of the government as acting beyond the physical boundaries of the public housing estate (Rogers, 2014). Keenan (2017., n.p.) further deploys the ideas of Anderson, Sharma, and Wright (2018) about the "borders [that] follow people and surround them as they try to access paid labour, welfare benefits, health, labour protections, education, civil associations and justice" to claim that one "way to understand the complicated connection between human subjects and the places we live in and move through is the idea of 'taking space with you'": that we take a particular space with us as we move. In this sense, urban renewal and displacement both ruptures and reinforces the spaces that public housing tenants *take with them*.

> Within the contemporary English landscape, for example, the space of "the tower block" has particular meanings and consequences: it means poor, over-crowded, migrant, socially immobile, working class, racialised, ghetto; and its consequences are government and corporate containment and malicious neglect, particularly as these spaces of poverty become blights on a rapidly gentrifying landscape, bringing down property prices and getting in the way of "regeneration." Belonging to the space of the tower block means having a materially lower than average standard of living and an identity that will not be listened to or taken seriously by those in power…. (Keenan, 2017., n.p.)

Residential displacement—physical relocation from one part of the city to another—has received greater attention in the literature than have the spaces that public housing tenants take with them as they remain in place amid an influx of new, affluent residents (Hyra, 2015, p. 1755; Keenan, 2017.). But perhaps more importantly, the more foundational concern should be that urban renewal and displacement stands to rupture the spaces that public housing tenants take with them through redevelopment in all the wrong ways—that is, in ways that will further contain and marginalize them. A Massey-inspired ontology of place within displacement requires us to reorient our attention toward the experiences of those who are unable to integrate the space they take with them into the new social, cultural, and economic dynamics of the suburb that is coming into being through urban renewal. As Slater argues, by focusing "on the voices of those who live in public housing," we bring forward "a compelling view from below that is wildly at odds with that from above" (Slater, 2013, p. 384).

Our data expose people who are concerned about being displaced in their own homes and neighborhoods. We note that the term *replacement* has been used by Hamnett (2003) in his dismissal of the phenomenon of gentrification-induced displacement, where he uses replacement to argue that class upgrading can be accounted for by the disappearance of the working class from society, rather than its displacement from urban space. This use of replacement has not been adopted by other scholars, and we, rather than following Hamnett, adopt a different notion of replacement as emplaced displacement, following Australian scholars such as Hulse and Reynolds (2017), who describe replacement as a process of gentrification without physical relocation.

Hulse and Reynolds (2017) describe a dynamic associated with buy-to-let housing markets in Australia, which involves low-income households staying in place and in poverty despite housing prices rising around them: this is the space that the resident takes with them. Hulse and Reynolds (2017) show that this does not follow the standard gentrification-induced-displacement script as previously theorized, but rather that the upheaval of residents' lives is occurring with them in place. Thus, Hulse and Reynolds (2017) use the term *replacement* instead of *displacement*. In this analysis, we follow the work on displacement-without-relocation outlined herein and adopt Hulse and Reynolds' concept of *replacement* to describe the rupturing of the space that the residents take with them as they stay put. Emplaced displacement, then, refers to the rupturing of the spaces that public housing tenants take with them as they remain in place during a redevelopment.

2. The Waterloo Case Study

This analysis draws upon ethnographic studies conducted over a long timeline. The primary empirical data used below come from a study conducted over a 14-month period, from November 2016 to December 2017, by Laura Wynne. This ethnographic research primarily comprised participant observation of meetings and events of groups engaged in issues around the redevelopment project, including a resident action group focused on opposing the redevelopment, a neighborhood committee comprising tenant representatives and local service organizations brought together to advise on community engagement and consultation around the redevelopment, and a number of capacity-building programs run by local community development organizations. Data were collected in the form of fieldnotes that captured general mood and sentiment as well as specific quotes and researcher observations. These data, used in conjunction with Dallas Rogers' long-term research interest in the Redfern/Waterloo area (Arthurson et al., 2014; Porter et al., 2013; Rogers, 2014, 2016b; Rogers, Darcy, & Arthurson, 2017), provide a rich picture of the neighborhood as it has undergone change. Together, we observed hundreds of hours of public meetings and forums run by both government departments and local community organizations between 2010 and 2017.

The redevelopment of Waterloo is, at the time of writing, still in the planning stages. This planning stage has been ongoing since 2015, when the redevelopment was first announced. Although this means that we cannot report on residents' reflections following the redevelopment, what we can report on here are residents' fears and concerns regarding expectations of neighborhood change and upheaval that they feel will result from the redevelopment. The data show that the disruption of connection to place is already in effect, in the absence of any physical redevelopment commencing.

Waterloo has a long history of embodied displacement and upheaval. The area is home to the Aboriginal people of the Gadigal Clan of the Eora Nation. The Gadi clan, whose land stretched from Burrawurra (Sydney Harbor's South Head) west to Blackwattle Creek, maintained the land through burnings and the maintenance of paths throughout their country. After the European invasion and the displacement of the Gadigal people from their land, Boxley's Clear, as Redfern was known in the early 1800s, continued to have importance as a meeting point for dispersed members of the Gadigal people and of their neighboring clans. Eventually, however, European settlers became intolerant of their presence and the Gadigal were moved on to Waterloo, Alexandria, and beyond (Sydney Echo, 1890).

Aboriginal connection with Waterloo did not cease with European settlement, and an Aboriginal community—nowadays representing a diverse number of Aboriginal nations, not just the Eora Nation but others from around the region and the continent—continues to live and work in the area. Waterloo and the adjacent neighborhood of Redfern remain a center of major cultural and political significance to the Aboriginal community. The following quote, from Wiradjuri man Joel Sherwood-Spring and Wiradjuri/Gamilaroi woman Lorna Monro, points to the decolonial space young Aboriginal people take with them in the area; they want to "critique colonisation and gentrification showing there is a Blak History to your flat white" (Sherwood-Spring & Monro, 2018, n.p.).

In the 1930s, governments were lobbied by "town planning activists and social reformers" to implement slum clearance measures (Allport, 1988, p. 106). The overcrowded, poorly maintained and inadequate housing of the inner city—mostly comprising Victorian-era terrace housing, often divided into multiple family units—was thought to be a threat to both moral and sanitary hygiene, and thus was determined to require demolition and rebuilding. Many residents were displaced farther west to suburban Sydney, and many were never given the opportunity to return to their former neighborhood (Allport, 1988).

The NSW state government continued redeveloping land around Redfern-Waterloo until the 1970s, by which time a large public housing estate comprising both low- and high-rise apartment

buildings had been constructed. The demolition of working-class housing (predominantly comprising the Victorian-era terraces mentioned above) in the area and its replacement with modernist public housing was met with a great deal of community opposition, and these projects were ultimately brought to a halt by the introduction of a Green Ban by the NSW Builders and Laborers Federation, who used strikes to prevent work that involved the demolition of built heritage and of workers' housing (Burgmann, 2000).

It is these homes—2,200 public housing dwellings—that are now subject to a redevelopment project. The decision to redevelop the estate was in part connected to the decision to locate a new train station, as part of Sydney's privatized metro line, adjacent to the site, thus creating an opportunity for transit-led "land value uplift" development (Hill PDA, 2016). The project is framed by the government as an "exciting" opportunity to build a "dynamic new community."[1] The government labels the project a *renewal* or *revitalization* project, and invokes an idea of the public interest to justify the redevelopment, arguing that value capture from the new private developments on site will allow a boost in affordable housing supply.

The redevelopment will see all existing public housing demolished, with privately developed residential and commercial buildings developed on the estate. Current state government documents claim that the residential buildings will have 30% of housing units allocated as social and affordable housing (to be managed by nongovernment landlords) and 70% privately owned dwellings (NSW Communities Plus Program, 2018). Residents have been promised that they will not be forced to leave the estate in the long term and that all who wish to be will eventually be rehoused on site, although some may need to be temporarily relocated throughout the development process (Pawson and Pinnegar [2018, pp. 323–326] discuss a similar process in the Bonnyrigg redevelopment). We now move into the analysis via three sections: spatial displacements, temporal displacements, and sociocultural displacements.

3. Spatial Displacements

In this section we interrogate how objective and subjective notions of space are recruited and deployed by different actors in Waterloo. As we noted earlier, place is more than physical space; however, physical space remains a significant spatial context to place (e.g., the physical scale of the redevelopment that is set by the state government in their policy and redevelopment texts). This seemingly coherent, objective scale is mapped out by government agencies via the spatial boundaries of the public housing estate, but it is not always the most appropriate scale or spatial modality for understanding the space tenants take with them through displacement. The NSW Department of Families and Community Services is responsible for delivering the redevelopment, and has been key to setting this spatial context. Their Communities Plus program policy texts, for example, state that "everyone who currently lives in Waterloo can return to Waterloo" (NSW FACS, 2016), providing a reassurance that attempts to fix the spatial context of displacement to the physical boundaries of the estate and thereby dispel the idea that residents will be displaced as a result of the redevelopment.

Following these types of policy framings by governments, much scholarly work on displacement has focused on the neighborhood scale. This is partly due to the practicalities of collecting quantitative data about urban change on scales smaller than the neighborhood. For example, it is far more difficult to collect data regarding people being moved *within* a neighborhood than it is to document movements *between* neighborhoods. However, this focus has contributed to an understanding of displacement as a neighborhood-scale phenomenon, explaining why the government—and indeed others, too—might not conceive of the Waterloo case as displacement. Marcuse usefully defined displacement as "when any household is forced to move from its residence" (1985, p. 205), under a range of specific conditions, thus focusing on the residence rather than the neighborhood. Lewicka (2011) show that people often report stronger place attachments at the level of their body, home, and immediate neighborhood than at the level of the suburb, city, or nation state (Rogers, 2014). But

attachments to place or a sense of home are multiscalar and can be hard to pin to a single scalar definition. Place attachments flow from the body through to the building and out into the neighborhood and beyond. The physical policy demarcation of the estate, therefore, is not a useful construct for understanding the spaces tenants take with them through redevelopment. Work by scholars such as Hubbard and Lees (2018) demonstrates the ways in which physical relocation can be distinguished from the loss of home: they describe the experiences of tenants subject to renewal processes in the UK who, although compensated for the loss of property through compulsory purchase orders, are not adequately compensated for the loss of *home*, which residents see as distinct from property.

Some residents of Waterloo reported that the prospect of moving within their neighborhood—from their existing apartment or building to a new or different one—was felt by them to be a form of displacement. When told that tenants "will not be made homeless" by the redevelopment, Catriona,[2] a long-term resident, responded "yes, but we don't know where it [home] is going to be" (tenant action group meeting, January 2017). For Catriona, a move within her neighborhood would be experienced as loss of home, despite not being made homeless. When a government representative told residents that "no one will need to leave the estate," another resident responded, "yes, but the area will be completely different" (Corinne, tenant action group meeting, September 2017). Thus, the tenants' concerns about displacement are related to the radical transformation of the neighborhood within the boundaries of the estate: despite not being physically displaced, the spatiality of their estate is being replaced.

The building or block scale is rarely discussed in explorations of displacement; however, it was raised frequently in discussions with residents of Waterloo. One resident, Robert, felt that "the moment the first building is knocked down, this community will be nonexistent anymore" (tenant action group meeting, June 2017). Such statements highlight that attachments to place might be felt on a smaller scale than the neighborhood scale, and that the loss of a particular building (i.e., the spatiality of that building) might trigger experiences of displacement in residents.

The neighborhood is defined differently by various actors, each of whom practices a different relation to the space. For government, this is largely about land ownership and zoning, whereas for tenants of the public housing estate, their relation to place is primarily oriented around their everyday practice of inhabiting the space. A disagreement about these understandings, which occurred in a community consultation meeting, sheds some light on the implications of such different understandings.

In this instance, a government representative was speaking to residents about information-sharing relating to the development of the new Metro Station on a block adjacent to the public housing estate. Despite this development being a key catalyst for the redevelopment project, the state government tends to treat them as largely different projects, because of key differences in landownership (private vs. public), stakeholders (businesses vs. public tenants), and government agency responsibilities relating to the two sites. As such, government representatives did not deem the public tenants to be directly affected by the redevelopment, because this was seen to be a separate pocket of the neighborhood, justified largely on the basis of boundaries drawn around publicly and privately owned lands. Several residents objected to this claim. One resident, Hannah, noted that tenants "don't see the Metro and the redevelopment as separate projects" (Waterloo redevelopment group meeting, August 2017). Another noted that "people walk past [the Metro Station site] every day, they want to know what's going on" (Waterloo redevelopment group meeting, August 2017). For residents, the metro site sits within the boundaries of their lived experience of the neighborhood—for many, it is in view of their home, or was passed on the way to the shops or the bus routes that service the area. In their experience, "the Metro and the redevelopment are not separate; this is just the beginning of a massive demolition" (Hannah, Waterloo redevelopment group meeting, August 2017).

This dispute serves as a reminder that boundaries of spatial areas such as a neighborhood are differentially defined depending on a range of experiences and knowledges. State government

understands the site as distinct from the estate redevelopment, caused in large part by the way that urban planners differentiate between sites based on ownership and land-use (the Metro Station site sits on former commercial, rather than residential, lands). The state government uses technical means—land ownership patterns and zoning—to understand space, place, and the neighborhood. For residents, on the other hand, upheaval at the Metro Station site is contiguous with that occurring in their own immediate surroundings, because it is defined as a part of the space they understand to be their neighborhood.

This experience of displacement appears to be related not merely to the loss of the building in which one's own home is situated, but also to a certain symbolism—an emotional attachment to place (Lewicka, 2011). The estate is currently distinct from surrounding areas because of its modernist urban form and *béton brut* design: tall, raw concrete buildings with large green expanses between. The built form of the Waterloo estate will undergo substantial alteration as buildings are demolished and new structures are built. This transformation in terms of architectural built form is not inconsequential for the experience of incumbent residents, whose attachment to this place is at least in part linked to the built form of the estate and its symbolic significance as a place designed specifically to shelter those in society most in need. Catriona notes that "Matavai and Turanga [towers] are models of their kind, they embody a vision for society; we might lose their legacy [if they are demolished]" (tenant action group meeting, January 2017). The redevelopment will transform the urban design of the area too, likely removing many of the public open spaces that serve local residents and demolishing their buildings. The symbolism of these buildings, purpose-built in a time of more government support for the poor and disadvantaged in the interest of social citizenship, is important for residents, many of whom feel connected not just to the buildings but to what they represent (i.e., these buildings *hold space* too).

Residents' responses to the wholesale transformation of the estate point to an experience of loss of place despite staying put. The area within the boundaries of the estate is expected to house around 10,000 people when the redevelopment is finalized—a significant increase on the current population of roughly 4,400 people. Enormous spatial upheaval will be required to transform the site, likely rendering the area unrecognizable as the spatial form is dramatically altered to fit the extra buildings. Residents are concerned that the neighborhood will not be able to accommodate the higher density: "there's already little room enough, they're going to squeeze thousands more in, there won't be room for anything" (Eileen, tenant action group meeting, June 2017). Residents are concerned that they will not be able to integrate the space they take with them into this new high-density space; they fear that the rearrangements of space will not facilitate the reforging of their connections to place, and that they will find themselves out of place in the newly developed space, despite remaining physically in place.

4. Temporal Displacements

In this section, we interrogate how objective and subjective notions of time are recruited and deployed by different actors in Waterloo. Temporal aspects are rarely interrogated in processes of urban change (Rogers, 2014), although we note that work by Elliott-Cooper et al. (2019), Lees and Ferreri (2016), and Pain (2019) has begun to pay attention to the temporal aspects of new urban renewal processes and instances of displacement. The Waterloo redevelopment is characterized by a long and uncertain time frame. The government's initial indication for a time frame for the completion of the redevelopment was 15–20 years (NSW FACS, 2015). Initially, thanks to unclear wording around a "right to return," residents were given the impression they might have to move away for the duration of the redevelopment. Further, the initial letter received by residents from the Department of Family and Community Services (now renamed Department of Communities and Justice) indicated that relocations of tenants would begin in mid-2017 (NSW FACS, 2015). No plans for relocation have yet been shared with tenants,

indicating that, at the time of writing in early 2020, the residents are still some way from having certainty around relocation time frames.

The long time frame may mean that many residents will never see the end of the redevelopment: the upheaval and change will be the constant that defines the last decades for many elderly residents. Bill, an older tenant representative, is concerned that "if older people have to move from the estate they will never come back" (Waterloo redevelopment group meeting, March 2017). Lana, reflecting on the long time frame for redevelopment and her own age, said "it'll be 30 years until this starts…I won't be here [in] 30 years, maybe I'll not need [to] worry [about the redevelopment]?" (Waterloo redevelopment group meeting, April 2017). Residents appear to struggle with the long time frame, convinced that they will not outlive the redevelopment. The long time frames do not fit with people's ability to imagine and understand their own lives (e.g., the time they take with them), leading to a great deal of uncertainty and anxiety, particularly among older residents who fear they will live their final decades in uncertain circumstances. Further, these long time frames represent ongoing, protracted struggles that may cause what Pain (2019) describes as "chronic urban trauma," a slow violence inflicted over the long term.

Timeline uncertainty is a key problem in this experience of displacement for residents (Rogers, 2014), and there are several facets to this temporal uncertainty: there is a lack of clarity about when relocations will start, and when the redevelopment will be finished. Temporal uncertainty appears to add to the experience of alienation from place—attachments are, in a way, put on hold, and residents appear afraid to act in certain ways because of uncertainty over the duration of their stay.

Bill notes that because of the uncertain time frame,

> there is confusion in the community about whether the redevelopment is going to happen or not…people are wondering when things are going to happen, there's a lot of uncertainty. There was the announcement in December 2015, people were told they would begin moving in 2017, now it's been put off again. (Waterloo redevelopment group meeting, March 2017)

Valerie, another tenant representative, talked to us about the impact of the uncertainty on the residents:

> there's so much uncertainty. I've got people coming up to me asking if they should paint their apartment, but they don't know how long they're going to be here for. People have so many questions. I don't have the answers. People just want to know how long they'll be here for. It's very hard, facing this and not knowing when you'll need to move. (capacity building workshop, May 2017)

Residents feel an inability to plan for the maintenance and upkeep of their homes; they remain unsure about whether to invest energy, time, and emotional resources into maintaining home places and their relationship to them (i.e., the time tenants take with them has been ruptured).

There are also concerns among residents about the post-redevelopment situation, including the formation of new community and social ties. Incumbent residents are concerned that newcomers will not have the same long-term commitments to place that they have—that the newcomers will carry a different time and space with them in this place. Corinne says of these newcomers: "they'll all be rich international students, the students will never be part of the community—they're temporary" (tenant action group meeting, March 2017). Establishing new ties in a redeveloped neighborhood takes a great many years: for example, Clampet-Lundquist (2004) describes how, even 2–3 years after relocation, relocated tenants had failed to establish the kinds of meaningful connections that might help reduce their feelings of isolation and vulnerability. This is further complicated when, as in the case of Waterloo, some residents may be relocated several times, and new neighbors in private developments may not move in for many years after the redevelopment project begins. Clampet-Lundquist describes how residents felt themselves to be in a kind of temporal limbo that was preventing them from establishing roots and ties in their new neighborhood, given that they perceived their situation as temporary (Clampet-Lundquist, 2004, p. 437). Residents of Waterloo, especially the elderly and frail, are fearful that they will not live beyond the time it takes to reestablish

community connections in their new neighborhood. As the redevelopment proceeds over years and decades to come, their ability to maintain their connection to place and to take their space with them across the long redevelopment timeline will be continuously eroded.

5. Social, Cultural, and Economic Replacements

In this section, we interrogate how the objective and subjective notions of time and space outlined above are shaping social, cultural, and economic replacement in Waterloo. The estate renewal policies being implemented across NSW involve explicit plans to improve social mix, creating "new mixed communities" (NSW FACS, 2018) through bringing more professionals and middle-class families to the area. The government has indicated its intention to secure a 70:30 ratio of private to social housing on the estate, indicating that social housing residents will be greatly outnumbered on the new estate and that a large number of newcomers is likely (NSW FACS, 2018). Wholesale sociocultural upheaval is not, then, an unintended side-effect but rather the very point of the estate redevelopment at Waterloo. Social upheaval and neighborhood upgrading is of course common in instances of gentrification-induced displacement, where working-class residents are evicted from an area because of a range of pressures, and middle-class households take their place (Marcuse, 1985; Wacquant, 2008). Lees notes that the stigmatization of working-class and "underclass" residents of public housing estates through stereotyping and pathologizing tenants is a critical component of the process of implementing the new urban renewal, helping to justify their ultimate expulsion from valuable urban areas (Lees, 2013, p. 927).

A planned uplift in population density on the Waterloo site is what allows this simultaneous remaining-in-place and sociocultural displacement. With thousands of new homes and residents planned for the area, residents will remain in place while an influx of new buildings and households occurs around them, transforming the area's social make-up without the incumbent residents moving. Given that this enormous upheaval will come despite a lack of physical relocation outside of the neighborhood, these events invite us to understand sociocultural displacement in new ways. The notion of replacement of the times and spaces tenants take with them seems particularly useful here to understand a situation in which incumbent residents remain in place while an overhaul of the neighborhood's entire social fabric is underway.

The effects of such processes are not evenly felt across the community, but have gendered, classed, and racialized dimensions. In particular, our fieldwork highlighted the racialized and classed dimensions of the effects of the renewal process, with incumbent tenants describing the renewal process as both "poor cleansing" (e.g., class effect) and "ethnic cleansing" (e.g., Aboriginal or multi-cultural—racial effect) of their place. In this section we describe the ways in which these classed and racialized effects are felt.

A particular concern exists among the local Aboriginal community for the loss or fragmentation of their community. The local Aboriginal community has undergone several successive displacements from the Redfern-Waterloo area (Shaw, 2000). Despite this, it remains a neighborhood of great importance for Aboriginal people across the country: "whatever happens in Redfern ripples across the country in other Aboriginal communities; this is so important as a place for all Aboriginal people" (Lauren, action group meeting, February 2017).

This ongoing pattern of displacements might best be understood in terms of what Fullilove and Wallace (2011) described as serial displacement; and it is certainly a product of the Australian manifestation of racial capitalism (Rogers, 2016a). Focusing on the experiences of African Americans in inner-city areas, Fullilove and Wallace elucidate a number of serious consequences that they find result from such processes of policy-induced serial displacement, including increased community disfunction, social fragmentation, poor health, and increasing experiences of interpersonal and structural violence (Fullilove & Wallace, 2011). Anderson et al., 2018, p. 651) note that contemporary urban housing struggles are understood by many Aboriginal community members as

an ongoing pattern of upheaval and displacement, colonization, and dispossession (see Sherwood-Spring & Monro, 2018).

The redevelopment is understood by the local Aboriginal community as another step in the systematic dispossession of their land and violence against their people: "they [the government] are subsuming our community, this is ethnic cleansing…they're bringing the ethnic cleansing down here [to Waterloo]" (Cathy, action group meeting, March 2017). In Waterloo, there exists a concern that the large influx of new residents will provide a means to transform the local Aboriginal community into a tiny minority with little voice or influence: "at this rate, students will outnumber community members…when I moved to Redfern in the 1970s there were 40,000 [Aboriginal] community members here; now there are 200 of us left…all this gentrification is just code for ethnic cleansing" (Cathy, action group meeting, February 2017). The Aboriginal community feels that displacement and dispersal—and, associated with this, disempowerment—of their community will take place despite the absence of physical removal from the neighborhood.

Manzo, Kleit, and Couch (2008) note that residents of public housing estates are often engaged in a "shared project of living"—a common experience of "getting by" (p. 1861)—that would be disrupted if the residents were relocated to dispersed housing units across the city. Social housing residents fear they will not be able to resume this shared project in their new communities: reintegrating the relationship to place that Waterloo tenants enjoyed prior to the redevelopment will be made almost impossible by the scale of the planned social upheaval. Residents of Waterloo have expressed concern that the new households, who will be owner-occupiers or private rental tenants, will not become part of the Waterloo community: "the students will never be part of the community, they're temporary" (Corinne, tenant action group meeting, March 2017). Unlike the Seattle, Washington, residents on whose perspectives Manzo et al. (2008) report, these Waterloo residents will not be physically removed from their neighborhood. Despite this, similar concerns abound regarding whether maintenance of their community will be possible once residents are living in a "new mixed community." Despite having a different physical form, the sociocultural experience of those staying put in Waterloo looks remarkably similar to those being displaced in Seattle. The tenants' relation to place will be transformed as incumbent residents experience political and cultural displacement at the hands of new households who will form the majority of residents once the redevelopment is completed.

Hyra (2015), in a article focused on a gentrifying neighborhood in Washington, DC, describes the political and cultural displacement that incumbent residents experience upon the influx of higher income newcomers. Incumbent residents experience a decrease in their political power as newcomers—often with stronger political capital, higher education levels, or more influence—exert greater influence on political processes and community. Cultural practices, too, may be threatened: previous research has documented that the types of cultural practices that define life in social housing for many—hanging out on stoops, hosting large neighborhood barbecues—are seen as alien to middle-class practices, and are often stamped out by the management of mixed-income communities (Fraser, Burns, Bazuin, & Oakley, 2012). Fraser et al. (2012) report that private residents view practices such as sitting out as indicators that the social order could deteriorate over time because of poor behavior on the part of social housing residents, and so new residents tend to take measures to prevent these behaviors. Cathy, a public housing tenant in Waterloo, notes that people have grown accustomed to living in the Waterloo community, and that the community is very tolerant of its members: "this is a unique place, there's nowhere else like this…. We live together quite harmoniously compared to other places" (tenant action group meeting, June 2017). Incumbent residents are concerned that new members of the community might look down on social housing residents or might be intolerant of their behavior, making it difficult for residents to continue their cultural and social practices.

Familiarity, networks, and connections are likely to be disrupted even though the residents will not move from the neighborhood and most of the members of their networks will remain, physically, in the area. The experiences of Waterloo residents point to a need to understand these networks not

only as rooted in place but as rooted in *a particular arrangement of things* in place: when those arrangements are irreversibly disrupted, we cannot expect the networks and connections that previously existed to remain the same, even if they are located in the same physical space. The presence of several thousand new residents, with very different household incomes, education levels, political values, and cultural practices to the incumbent residents of the public housing estate, will get in the way of current residents as they attempt to resituate their attachment to place on the redeveloped estate.

By allowing public housing tenants to remain in place, the state government might hope to avoid the class conflicts inherent in processes of state-led renewal that lead to the physical relocation of poorer residents. However, the upheaval of their low-income community and the subsuming of their space by middle-class households appears to be much the same experience for tenants, despite remaining in place. Residents see the neighborhood change as a sign that they, being poor and disadvantaged, are the subject of a policy that aims to minimize their presence in the neighborhood through dilution—such that in addition to claims of "ethnic cleansing" mentioned above, they feel the redevelopment is an attempt to reduce them to a minority or remove them from the area altogether: "it's not just ethnic cleansing, it's *poor* cleansing" (Catriona, action group meeting, September 2017).

The Communities Plus program—the banner under which the redevelopment is planned and implemented—aims to implement "social mixing" (NSW FACS, 2018). The underlying logic of social mix programs is that they will improve the life chances of incumbent residents through proximity to wealthier households with supposedly greater social capital. At core, this is about changing the space tenants take with them and changing what the buildings ideologically stand for in the minds of tenants. In the minds of residents such as Hannah, this is experienced as an assault on their community identity: "[this redevelopment is] slum clearance—we're to be cleansed by living next to yuppies" (tenant action group meeting, May 2017).

Hyra describes an experience of economic displacement despite remaining in place (2015, p. 1760): in the gentrifying U Street neighborhood of Washington, DC, new businesses such as "sit-down restaurants" replaced the go-go nightclubs that played Caribbean music popular with the local community, and the changed services and retail alienated incumbent residents from their neighborhood (Hyra, 2015, p. 1760). Similarly, in Waterloo, residents are concerned about the economic transformation of the area, including a shift in the types of local businesses in the area. Changes in businesses will likely have implications for the affordability of the area as well as the distance residents will have to travel to access key services, in particular free or affordable medical care, mental health care, and pharmaceuticals. In Waterloo, as Corinne notes, "services are targeted to areas on the basis of high need, but Waterloo won't be 'high needs' any more after the redevelopment, so the funding will go elsewhere and we won't have the services we need" (tenant action group meeting, May 2017).

Economic transformation at a larger scale is also a concern to residents. Private leasing or ownership of land, and the private development of buildings, represents a major shift in economic function in Waterloo. The sale or leasing of public land at the site is not experienced by residents as an inconsequential shift in ownership but as a major transformation of the economic arrangements that govern their space. Residents feel that the sale of public assets is "just not right" (tenant action group meeting, May 2017) and that it will set the area on an irreversible course of change.

As land is transferred, whether through sales, leases, or management agreements, from public to private ownership, the arrangements that underpin tenants' relationship to this place change too. Tenants' relationship to place is both consciously and unconsciously mediated through the public ownership of space in Waterloo that facilitates and protects their access to this space, at least to a certain extent. Transfer of land to private ownership threatens to change access to and provision of both public space and community and private spaces, and will disrupt tenants' ability to maintain connections to place despite remaining within the neighborhood.

6. Conclusion

This analysis prompts several policy and scholarly questions. In the public policy sphere, there is a need to pay more attention to the spatial scale in question when seeking to understand experiences of displacement. Government and policy discourse around displacement tends to focus on the neighborhood as the scale at which displacement occurs. This focus, however, similarly silences and ignores the experiences of those who experience displacement within their neighborhood: those low-income residents who find themselves unable to reintegrate the space they take with them as they are subjected to processes of urban renewal, despite remaining in the same postcode.

Policymakers in Australia are beginning to accept that housing inequity is a structural issue, but there is still much debate about which structure to focus on. State-led redevelopments that allow residents to remain in place tend to be presented by governments as less egregious than processes that physically remove residents. However, it is not the benevolence of the state that grants residents the right to stay in place, but the characteristics of land values across space in the global city that allow for an increase in density, providing room for both social and private housing on redeveloped sites. Clearly, land-use policy, public housing policy, and broader taxation settings around home ownership in Australia represent an important structural context for addressing housing inequity. But embodied displacement is also a heavily racialized and classed process in Redfern/Waterloo, and this necessarily draws in the policy levers around Aboriginal land rights and Aboriginal self-determination, therefore making the violent history of Aboriginal dispossession of the land an important contemporary structural context too. As this shows, there is no easy structural fix to housing inequity in Australia, with our analysis suggesting that the sites for policy change are expansive and it may in fact be problematic to target only a few key policy areas to address the housing problem in Sydney.

In terms of scholarly questions, the experience of residents in Waterloo should serve as a reminder to urban scholars examining urbanization and renewal processes to incorporate a nuanced understanding of time, space, and place as we consider eviction and displacement in the global city. Understanding displacement only as movement through Cartesian space serves to ignore the experiences and silence the perspectives of low-income residents who are displaced—whose relationship to space is fundamentally, and perhaps irreparably, disrupted—by processes of urban renewal, racial capitalism, etc., despite being granted the right to remain in place.

We explored this through the notion of *embodied displacement* to attend to a more nuanced understanding of place for residents of social housing undergoing upheaval because of redevelopment. As documented by Hulse and Reynolds (2017), this is a phenomenon not limited to those in areas undergoing renewal, but also experienced by other residents of the global city—particularly those living in rental housing and in precarious circumstances. The analysis we have undertaken here recognizes that an absence of physical relocation from a neighborhood does not equate to an absence of displacement. We do not suggest that embodied displacement supplant displacement in urban scholarship, but rather that it be used in addition to displacement to address and capture the diversity of experiences of loss of place (both temporal and spatial) that are inflicted upon residents —in particular, low-income renters—of the global city.

If urbanization is a process, rather than an event, then we should approach public housing redevelopments as a part of this ongoing history and not simply a renewal event that needs to be managed in the present. In Sydney, the move from the physical relocation of public housing residents to the social, cultural, and economic replacement of almost every facet of their lives should not be taken as isolated events occurring at different points in time. Rather, they should be understood as steps in a long and ongoing state-led process of urban transformation, and for low-income Aboriginal people as a process of ongoing colonization and land dispossession. We need to think about how the people of our cities—and especially the most vulnerable in our cities—will or will not adapt to this change. Indeed, some of the most vulnerable in our cities may not have the skills,

knowledge, capacities, or resources to adapt. Should we simply leave them to the highly classed and racialized neoliberal forces of the city, or do we need to create a new structural context within which every member of our communities can deal with the transformation of our cities?

Notes

1. This language is from the letter sent to tenants to announce the redevelopment, by the Minister for Social Housing Brad Hazzard, on December 15, 2016.
2. All names have been changed in the analysis.

Acknowledgments

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on Contributors

Laura Wynne is a Senior Research Consultant at the Institute for Sustainable Futures.

Dallas Rogers is a Senior Lecturer in Urbanism at the University of Sydney.

ORCID

Laura Wynne   http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5654-3464
Dallas Rogers   http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9359-8958

References

Allport, C. (1988). The human face of remodelling: Postwar "Slum" clearance in Sydney. *Urban Policy and Research*, *6*(3), 106–118.

Andersen, M., Williamson, A., Fernando, P., Eades, S., & Redman, S. (2018). "They took the land, now we're fighting for a house": Aboriginal perspectives about urban housing disadvantage. *Housing Studies*, 33(4),635-660.

Arthurson, K., Darcy, M., & Rogers, D. (2014). Televised territorial stigma: How social housing tenants experience the fictional media representation of Estates in Australia. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, *46*(6), 1334–1350.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2017). 2016 Census QuickStats: Waterloo, NSW. *Published 23/10/2017*. Retrieved from http://quickstats.censusdata.abs.gov.au/census_services/getproduct/census/2016/quickstat/SSC14183?opendocument

Bijen, G., & Piracha, A. (2017). Future directions for social housing in NSW: New opportunities for 'place' and 'community' in public housing renewal. *Australian Planner*, *54*(2), 153–162.

Bourdieu, P. (1979) *Outline of a theory of practice*. Nice, R. (Trans.). London: Cambridge University Press.

Brickell, K., Arrigoitia, M. F., & Vasudevan, A. (2017). Geographies of forced eviction: Dispossession, violence, resistance. In Brickell K, Arrigoitia MF, & Vasudevan A (Eds.) *Geographies of forced eviction* (pp. 1–24). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Burgmann, V. (2000). The social responsibility of labour versus the environmental impact of property capital: The Australian green bans movement. *Environmental Politics*, *9*(2), 78–101.

Clampet-Lundquist, S. (2004). HOPE VI relocation: Moving to new neighborhoods and building new ties. *Housing Policy Debate*, *15*(2), 415–447.

Darcy, M. (2010). De-concentration of disadvantage and mixed income housing: A critical discourse approach. *Housing, Theory and Society*, *27*(1), 1–22.

Davidson, M. (2009). Displacement, space and dwelling: Placing gentrification debate. *Ethics, Place and Environment*, *12*(2), 219–234.

Davidson, M., & Lees, L. (2005). New-build "gentrification" and London's Riverside renaissance. *Environment and Planning A*, *37*(7), 1165–1190.

Elliott-Cooper, A., Hubbard, P., & Lees, L. (2019). Moving beyond Marcuse: Gentrification, displacement and the violence of un-homing. *Progress in Human Geography*. doi:10.1177/0309132519830511

Fraser, J. C., Burns, A. B., Bazuin, J. T., & Oakley, D. A. (2012). HOPE VI, colonization, and the production of difference. *Urban Affairs Review*, *49*(4), 525–556.

Fullilove, M. T., & Wallace, R. (2011). Serial forced displacement in American cities, 1916-2010. *Journal of Urban Health*, *88*(3), 381–389.

Gieryn, T. F. (2000). A space for place in sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 463–496.

Hamnett, C. (2003). Gentrification and the middle-class remaking of inner London, 1961-2001. *Urban Studies*, *40*(12), 2401–2426.

Hill PDA. (2016). Chatswood to Sydenham environmental impact statement. Technical Paper 3. Retrieved from https://www.sydneymetro.info/sites/default/files/document-library/103_Sydney_Metro_C2S_EIS__Technical_Paper_3_Local_Business.pdf

Hubbard, P., & Lees, L. (2018). The right to community?: Legal geographies of resistance on London's gentrification frontiers. *City*, *22*(1), 8–25.

Hulse, K., & Reynolds, M. (2017). Investification: Financialisation of housing markets and persistence of suburban socio-economic disadvantage. *Urban Studies*, 004209801773499. doi:10.1177/0042098017734995

Hyra, D. (2015). The back-to-the-city movement: Neighbourhood redevelopment and processes of political and cultural displacement. *Urban Studies*, *52*(10), 1753–1773.

Keenan, S. (2017.) A Border In Every Street. Blog, 'The Disorder of Things'. Retrieved from https://thedisorderofthings.com/2017/06/29/a-border-in-every-street/

Lees, L. (2013). The urban injustices of new labour's "new urban renewal": The case of the Aylesbury estate in London. *Antipode*, *46*(4), 921–947.

Lees, L., & Ferreri, M. (2016). Resisting gentrication on its final frontiers: Lessons from the Heygate estate in London (1974-2013). *The International Journal of Urban Policy and Planning*, *57*(September), 14–24.

Lewicka, M. (2011). Place attachment: How far have we come in the last 40 years? *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *31*, 207–230.

Malpas, J. (1999). *Place and experience: A philosophical topography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manzo, L. C., Kleit, R. G., & Couch, D. (2008). "Moving three times is like having your house on fire once": The experience of place and impending displacement among public housing residents. *Urban Studies*, *45*(9), 1855–1878.

Marcuse, P. (1985). Gentrification, abandonment, and displacement: Connections, causes, and policy responses in New York City. *Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law*, *28*(1), 195–240

Massey, D. (1993). Politics and space/time. *New Left Review*, *196*, 65–84.

Massey, D. (1995). The conceptualization of place. In D. Massey & P. Jess (Eds.), *A place in the world?: Places, cultures and globalization* (pp. 45–85). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

NSW Communities Plus Program. (2018, August). Waterloo redevelopment options brochure. Retrieved from https://www.communitiesplus.com.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/628335/Waterloo-Redevelopment-Options-Brochure.pdf

NSW FACS. (2015). *Letter to Waterloo tenants from the Honorable Brad Hazzard*. Minister for Social Housing. GFACS15/8663. Sydney.

NSW FACS. (2016, November) Communities plus newsletter Waterloo: Retrieved from https://www.communitiesplus.com.au/s/Waterloo-Community-Plus-Newsletter-Waterloo-Nov-16.PDF

NSW FACS. (2018). Communities plus website. Retrieved from https://www.communitiesplus.com.au/major-sites/waterloo

Pain, R. (2019). Chronic urban trauma: The slow violence of housing dispossession. *Urban Studies*, *56*(2), 385–400.

Pawson, H., & Pinnegar, S. (2018). Regenerating Australia's public housing estates. In K. Ruming (Ed.), *Urban regeneration in Australia; policies, processes and projects of contemporary urban change* (pp. 311–332). London: Routledge.

Porter, L., Martí-Costa, M., Torvà, M. D., Cohen-Bar, E., Ronel, A., Rogers, D., … de Hoop, H. (2013). Finding hope in unpromising times: Stories of progressive planning alternatives for a world in crisis. *Planning Theory & Practice*, *14:4*, 529.

Rogers, D. (2014). The Sydney metropolitan strategy as a zoning technology: Analyzing the spatial and temporal dimensions of obsolescence. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *32*(1), 108–127.

Rogers, D. (2016a). *The geopolitics of real estate: Reconfiguring property, capital and rights*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Rogers, D. (2016b). Monitory democracy as citizen-driven participatory planning: The urban politics of redwatch in Sydney. *Urban Policy and Research*, *34*(3), 225–239.

Rogers, D., & Darcy, M. (2014). Global city aspirations, graduated citizenship and pullic housing: Analysing the consumer citizenships of neoliberalism. *Urban, Planning and Transport Research*, 37–41. doi:10.1080/21650020.2014.906906

Rogers, D., Darcy, M., & Arthurson, K. (2017). Researching territorial stigma with social housing tenants: Tenant-led digital media production about people and place. In P. Kirkness & A. Tijé-Dra (Eds.), *Negative neighbourhood reputation and place* (pp. 178–193). London: Routledge.

Shaw, W. S. (2000). Ways of whiteness: Harlemising Sydney's aboriginal Redfern. *Australian Geographical Studies*, *38*(3), 291–305.

Sherwood-Spring, J., & Monro, L. (2018). Survival guide. Retrieved from http://www.radioskidrow.org/projects/survival-guide

Slater, T. (2013). Expulsions from public housing: The hidden context of concentrated affluence. *Cities*, 35(1),384–390.

Sydney Echo. (1890). *The suburbs of Sydney. No. VIII-Waterloo and Alexandria*. Sydney Echo, 12 June, 1890. Mitchell Library, Newspaper Cuttings, Volume 159, pp. 35.7.

Wacquant, L. (2008). Relocating gentrification: The working class, science and the state in recent urban research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *32*(1), 198–205.