

# **Property tax reform A Contribution To Home Ownership And Challenges For Government In Australia**

**Peer-reviewed paper**

**Vince Mangioni  
University of Technology, Sydney  
Vincent.mangioni@uts.edu.au**

**Abstract:** The 2009 review of Australia's tax system made recommendations for improving housing affordability, particularly in the capital cities of Australia. Among the recommendations made was the removal of conveyance stamp duty and replacing this impost with a recurrent tax on land spread across the holding period of property, of which the later provides steady and more consistent revenue for government.

This paper examines the relationship and emerging trends between State government taxes which impact on entry to homeownership and examines options for the move from transaction taxes to a recurrent tax on land. Through the analysis of conveyance stamp duty currently paid on the purchase price of property and a uniform recurrent tax on land, it is demonstrated that options exist for the transition from less efficient to more efficient taxation of property, while reducing a barrier to entering the housing market.

## Introduction

Tax reform is one of the factors identified as contributing to home ownership and housing affordability in the capital cities of Australia. While tax reform encompasses alternative policies including reforms to tax expenditure, the most recent review of Australia's tax system has proffered the replacement of conveyance stamp duty with a broad based State land tax, (Commonwealth of Australia 2009, Recommendation 51). This builds on the Productivity Commissions recommendation which identified stamp duty as a barrier to entry (2004:23).

While some relief is provided through First Home Owners Grants (FHOG), the replacement of transaction taxes such as conveyance stamp duty with a broad based land tax applicable to the principle place of residence, is a tax option currently expended by all States of Australia, (Yates<sup>1</sup> 2010:48). In line with the Commonwealths tax reform recommendations, Wood, Ong, Cigdem & Taylor (2012:24) have modelled the impact of replacing stamp duty with an annual land tax on property in Melbourne City. They found that land values would drop outside a 10 km radius of the city centre resulting from the capitalised cost of a recurrent land tax in contrast to upfront conveyance stamp duty. The transition from stamp duty to a land tax on the home has not yet been adopted in Australia however the ACT will commence this transition from 1 July 2014 (Quinlan, Smithies & Duncan 2012).

Tax expenditures are often cited as impacting home ownership, Table 1 lists the range of taxes currently applicable to property in one form or another in Australia and those which could be applicable to housing, but not imposed. Of particular note in Table 1 are taxes expended on negative gearing applicable to investment housing and capital gains tax expended on the owner occupied residence. While income tax offsets resulting from negative gearing on investor rental housing is often cited for reform, it accounts for less than 20 per cent of the tax revenue expended compared with owner occupied housing through land tax exemptions and capital gains tax (Yates 2010).

Of the \$45bn tax expended on the owner occupied residence, 25 per cent is attributable to expenditure on land tax while approximately 75 per cent is expended on the capital gains tax exemption, (Yates 2010:48). It is further suggested by Freebain (2010:203) that tax expenditure on the principle place of residence has contributed to over-investment on owner occupied housing, further contributing to pressures on housing affordability.

**Table 1: Taxation across tiers of government**

| Tax  | Local | State | Common wealth | Current in Australia |
|--|-------|-------|---------------|----------------------|
| Conveyance Stamp duty                          |       | X     |               | Yes                  |
| Developer contributions                        | X     |       |               | Yes                  |
| Planning/ betterment                           |       |       |               | No                   |
| Council rates                                  | X     |       |               | Yes                  |
| Land tax†                                      |       | X     |               | Yes                  |
| GST margin scheme                              |       |       | X             | Yes                  |
| Income tax offsets on rent <sup>^</sup>        |       |       | X             | Yes                  |
| Vendor duty (paid on sale)                     |       |       |               | No                   |
| GST on sale of new & non-residential property  |       |       | X             | Yes                  |
| Income tax on capital gains† (investment only) |       |       | X             | Yes                  |
| Estate tax / inheritance tax                   |       |       |               | No                   |
| GST on non-residential rents                   |       |       | X             | Yes                  |
| Water rates                                    |       | X     |               | Yes                  |
| Carbon tax/emissions trading scheme ETS        |       |       | X             | Yes                  |

†Tax expended on the principle place of residence, <sup>^</sup>Tax offset afforded through negative gearing

## Land tax and conveyance stamp duty within Australia's tax system


Within the mix of Australia's taxes, Figure 1 highlights the break-up of tax revenue as a percentage of total tax collected across all tiers of government. As noted, conveyance stamp duty on property accounts for approximately 5 per cent, while land taxes (State land tax and local government rates combined) account for approximately 5.5 per cent of total tax collected. Of further note in Figure 1, is revenue from income which accounts for 31 per cent, being the largest source of tax revenue. Tax from income has been impacted in the shorter term by the GFC, however of more structural significance, this source has been impacted by Australia's contracting workforce as shown in Table 2.

The ageing population and the decreasing labour participation rates within Australia, requires remedies which include fiscal reform (Productivity Commission 2006:XIII). This has resulted in governments maintaining taxation on income steady and where possible reducing taxes on labour to retain Australians in the workforce longer and to attract labour from abroad. The need for a uniform land tax as a means of raising government revenue must be seen in the context of an ageing population in Australia. This situation is most aptly summarised in the following when discussing the problem of funding the needs of an ageing population with a reduced number of income taxpayers.

The *2010 Intergenerational Report* again brought into focus that, GDP growth per person is projected to slow to an average of 1.5 per cent per year over the next 40 years. An increasingly large population of older Australians is expected to contribute to a substantial rise in Commonwealth Government spending as well, (Heferen 2011:1).

As tax revenue from income has stagnated since the GFC, so has the ability for the Commonwealth to increase funding to State and local government in Australia. This has intensified the importance for State and local government to grow own source tax revenues from property, as well as reforming less efficient taxes including conveyance stamp duty.

**Figure 1:** Tax revenue in Australia by category (Labour Consumption Capital)



Source: Commonwealth (2009)

**Table 2:** Ratio of working Australians to those over 65

| Year | No working : No over 65 |
|------|-------------------------|
| 1970 | 7.5 : 1                 |
| 2010 | 5 : 1                   |
| 2056 | 2.5 : 1                 |

Source: ABS cat. No. 3222.0

## **Tax Reform Options**

The case for tax reform may be made on a number of bases, of which the two main tax expenditures relate to the tax exemption of the owner-occupied residence for capital gains tax and land tax. This section considers a recurrent land tax in contrast to a potential capital gains tax on the home and more specifically as a replacement for less efficient conveyance stamp duty. It then examines the amortised cost of a land tax to home buyers determined on the average holding periods of housing in the capital cities of Australia.

### ***Land tax as a capital gains tax***

As discussed earlier, the tax expended on property is predominantly attributed to the principle place of residence in the absence of land tax and capital gains tax. Under the Capital Gains Tax (CGT) provisions of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997, s 118-110, the main residence is exempt from income tax on any capital gain made while maintained as the principle residence of the taxpayer. Arguably this exemption has led to the over capitalisation of the main residence at the expense of more productive investment, a situation that exists in New Zealand and in Australia, (Barrett & Veal 2012:584).

However, if a land tax was introduced that addressed both vertical and horizontal equity of taxpayers, the concession for owner-occupied housing can be tolerated (Yates 2010<sup>2</sup>:258). Tax on land overcomes any problems associated with the CGT exemption and the non-taxation of unrealised capital gains. The following provides a summary of the benefits of a land tax which incrementally accounts for increases in value:

In taxing economic rent, or the unearned incremental increases in the land values arising from increasing demand in light of restricted land supply, land taxes can be used as an alternative to replace capital gains tax on owner-occupied housing. As such, they are beneficial in helping to reduce the demand pressures that drive housing affordability problems. Also, by broadening the base and applying the tax on a per holding basis, rather than on aggregate land holding, the recommendation should result in a reduced land tax burden on rental investments properties and should remove one of the disincentives for large-scale (including institutional) investments in rental housing (Yates 2010:258)<sup>2</sup>.

A tax on all land including owner occupied homes is in effect a tax on the unrealised capital gain on the land. As the value of land increases so does the amount of land tax paid by the landowner as the tax incrementally captures the unrealised capital gain on the land. As the tax is levied on land value, houses and other improvements may still be over or under capitalised however, additional revenue would be collected from the increase in the value of the land.

It is contended that capital gains are mostly land gains misnamed and as such are a form of taxable rent, Gaffney (2009), in quoting Harry Kahn economist, it is estimated that unrealised capital gains are ten times the value of realised gains. This may well be the case in Australia where some residents are holding assets that have vast unrealised capital gains that will not be realised for many years to come, even though the 50 percent discount may apply (Div 115 Income Tax and Assessment Act 1979), Or in the case of the main residence, will never be subject to capital gains tax.

It is argued that a comprehensive tax system recognised unrealised ‘monetised’ gains as income and is capable of being subject to income tax (Cooper cited in Gaffney 2009). On this basis Gaffney (2009:347) argues for a land tax based on the accrual of value each financial year as a means of gaining ‘huge amounts of revenue that largely escapes taxation’. Accordingly, a ‘property tax based on land value, taxes both the current rent and the current unearned increment as it accrues’, (Ibid). From this perspective, a land tax is very effective because the economic rent from land, as advanced by Ricardo is the economic rent, as a result of increased land values. By having progressive rates of tax applying to the unimproved land value, both forms of rent are subject to tax, namely the rent from owning the land and the economic rent from increases in value.

One of the main objections for the imposition of land tax at progressive rates on all property owners is that some residents may be asset rich but income poor. This aspect of a land tax was recognised by the Commonwealth (2009). In the ACT property owners that are unable to pay their general rates are allowed to defer payment until the property is finally sold, a provision which further exists in the Local Government Act in Victoria. As has been stated above, the main group of land owners that are most disadvantaged by a higher tax on land are the self funded retirees and recipients of the Age Pension (Kelly 2003). However, it is timely to note that the Commonwealth government is aware of the problems facing those elderly Australians receiving an Age Pension and living in their own home.

Capacity to pay principle may be measured either on the wealth or income of the tax payer. In the case of land tax, it is determined on the value of land which reflects wealth, rather than the actual income of the taxpayer. It is highlighted by Kelly (2003:8) that over the lifetime of a taxpayer, the relativity between income and wealth may vary significantly. As highlighted in Figure 2, in the age bracket of 15-24 income is high relative to wealth, which changes in the mid-life bracket of 45-54 where net wealth exceeds income for the first time. In contrast, in the later age brackets of 65-74 and 75+, income is low relative to net wealth where mortgage debt on property has reduced or has been paid off and income reduces in retirement.

**Figure 2:** Changing relativity between income and net wealth over taxpayer’s lifecycle



**Source:** Kelly 2003 (cited by South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, 8)

## **Conveyance stamp duty and land tax: trends and future directions**

### **Home Purchasers**

The First Home Owners Grant (FHOG) was introduced in July 2000 to offset the impact of the Goods and Services Tax on new dwellings, and primarily focused on new home owners who had not previously been in the market, (Office of State Revenue 2009:1). This grant is administered by the States under their respective Duties legislation as set out in Table 3, which highlights that in three states the grant is applicable to new dwellings only, while in the other three States the legislation is silent on the type of housing the grant applies to.

Given the additional costs of construction resulting from the introduction of the GST, the focus of the FHOG scheme, was in fact to offset impacts of the higher cost of housing and encourage developers to continue to build. The increased cost of housing would be offset by the FHOG for the first home buyer segment and hence would not be impacted by the higher price resulting from the GST. However at the time of introducing the FHOG scheme, it applied to first home owners regardless of whether the housing was new or existing housing. The grant was amended in New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria during 2009 when the FHOG applied to new dwellings only.

Shortly after its introduction Kupke and Murano (2002) studied the impact of FHOG and identified that it was the single largest factor contributing to first home owners purchasing property. Subsequently, Irvine (2009) in citing surveys carried out by Bankwest and the Mortgage Finance Association of Australia found that only 6.2 per cent of first home buyers cited FHOG as the reason behind their home purchase. This is supported by Chancellor (2013:1) who states that currently only 20 percent of first home buyers purchase new property, removing access to this incentive for first-home purchaser in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland.

**Table 3:** Concessions for pensioners and first home buyers

| <b>State</b>      | <b>Legislation</b>           | <b>Provision</b>   | <b>Housing Type</b> |
|-------------------|------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| Victoria          | Duties Act 2000 – Division 5 | Pensioner and first home owner exemptions and concessions            | New                 |
| New South Wales   | Duties Act 1997 – Pt 8 Div 1 | First New Home   | New                 |
| Queensland        | Duties Act 2001 – Div 3      | Concessions for homes and first homes                                | New                 |
| Western Australia | Duties Act 2008 – Div 3      | First home owners concession   | Not specified       |
| South Australia   | Stamp Duties Act 1923        | s71c Concessional rates of duty in respect of purchase of first home | Not specified       |
| Tasmania          | Duties Act 2001              | s36G Exemptions and concessions                                      | New from 2014       |

**Source:** Various State Duties / Stamp Duties Acts

### **Government**

In addressing the need for State and local government to increase own source tax revenue in Australia, the Commonwealth has identified land tax and in particular, expansion of this tax to include the principle place of residence. At present 15 per cent of residential housing across Australia attracts State land tax, which is primarily due to the exemption applied to the principle place of residence and the land tax threshold applied to investment property expended by each State (Treasury NSW 2005/06). While the Commonwealth (2009) has recommended expanding land state land tax to include the principle place of residence, this recommendation has been opposed by local government

across Australia, whose primary source of revenue is from council rates (Local Government Association NSW 2007).

The alternative direction for addressing the needs of each State and local government in Australia is through expanding revenue from land tax, as tax effort from this revenue source has room for expansion. Australia ranks 9<sup>th</sup> among the leading 30 OECD countries in collection of land tax as a percentage of GDP (OECD 2010) and is ranked 26<sup>th</sup> in total tax collected as a percentage of GDP (Hendy and Warburton 2006:33). As shown in Table 4, Australia lags behind New Zealand and the larger economies of the United States, Canada and United Kingdom in the revenue collected from land tax. On this international comparison, the argument for increasing recurrent land taxes and reducing less efficient conveyance stamp duty is compelling.

**Table 4:** Global trends in property tax revenues

|                           | Percentage of total tax |             |               | Percentage of GDP |             |             | Rank in OECD countries |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
|                           | 1965                    | 2010        | % change      | 1965              | 2010        | % change    |                        |
| Denmark                   | 4.9                     | 2.9         | -41%          | 1.5               | 1.4         | -6.2%       | 10                     |
| <b>Australia</b>          | <b>6.8</b>              | <b>5.5</b>  | <b>-18.5%</b> | <b>1.4</b>        | <b>1.42</b> | <b>1.1%</b> | <b>9</b>               |
| Iceland                   | 1.7                     | 5.2         | 212%          | 0.4               | 1.9         | 320%        | 8                      |
| New Zealand               | 8.3                     | 6.6         | -20.9%        | 2.0               | 2.1         | 4.4%        | 7                      |
| Japan                     | 5.2                     | 7.7         | 49.3          | 0.9               | 2.1         | 131.6%      | 6                      |
| Israel                    | -                       | 7.2         | ...           | -                 | 2.3         | ...         | 5                      |
| France                    | 1.9                     | 5.7         | 200%          | 0.7               | 2.5         | 268%        | 4                      |
| United States             | 13.7                    | 12.2        | -11%          | 3.4               | 3.0         | -10.4%      | 3                      |
| Canada                    | 11.9                    | 10.1        | -15.5%        | 3.0               | 3.1         | 2.1%        | 2                      |
| United Kingdom            | 11.2                    | 9.8         | -13%          | 3.4               | 3.4         | -0.4%       | 1                      |
| <i>Unweighted average</i> |                         |             |               |                   |             |             |                        |
| <b>OECD-Total</b>         | <b>3.8</b>              | <b>3.25</b> | <b>-15.4%</b> | <b>0.95</b>       | <b>1.05</b> | <b>9.9%</b> | <b>Ranking</b>         |

**Source:** OECD Tax revenue statistics Series 4100

In monitoring the trends in tax revenue collected by State and local government across Australia over the past decade, data has been sourced from the Offices of State Revenue Annual Reports and tax revenue statistics compiled by the Australian Bureau of Statistics between 2001 and 2010. The tax revenues examined are State land tax, conveyance stamp duty and local government rates. These revenues are set out collectively in Figure 3 and are compared individually over a ten year period of 2000 to 2010, with a relative percentage change in revenue collected shown at years 2005 and 2010 in Table 6.

The overall trend across Australia and in each State is that conveyance stamp duty is an important revenue source for State government and with the exception of South Australia is the dominant source of tax revenue derived from property. Further noted from trends in stamp duty is the volatility and fluctuations in revenue compared with rates and land tax. It is impacted by turnover and trends in the property market. While it has distinct advantages in that its assessment is simple as it is determined on the transaction price of property, this revenue is subject to more volatility than State land tax which are re-determined annually.


Of note in Table 6, is that following the beginning of the Global Financial Crisis of 2007/08, is that State land taxes have increased as a percentage of conveyance stamp duty as at 2010. This is of particular importance, as it emphasizes a small but observable shift towards land tax in underpinning revenue volatility from conveyance stamp duty.

Of the three sources of revenue, State land tax raises the lowest amount of tax and is applied to the narrowest range of property due to the exemption of the principle place of residence and the threshold applicable to all other property, both exemptions apply across all States. The total land tax revenue derived from state land tax across Australia for residential property is less than 25 per cent of the State land tax collected (Treasury NSW 2005/06). Local government rates in contrast to land tax are paid on over ninety eight per cent of all property in Australia, it has the broadest base and lowest tax expenditure (Productivity Commission 2008:38)

Revenue from rates and land tax are the least volatile of the three sources as shown in Figure 3, as these revenues are tied to land values which are assessed annually for land tax and assessed three yearly for council rates. Annual adjustments to rate revenue are made by adjusting the rate in the dollar applied to the land value. In contrast, land values used to assess state land tax are reassessed annually except in Victoria, where they are assessed bi-annually, (Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government 2013:33). While land value is used in each state to assess land tax, council rates are determined on a number of different bases in each State, which include land value, improved value and assessed annual value.

In contrast to other OECD countries Australia has capacity to improve its tax effort derived from recurrent land taxes, particularly in light of its overall lower ranking in total taxes collected. This provides an opportunity for the States to progressively increase land tax while reducing conveyance stamp duty and marginally increase their total tax effort as a percentage of GDP and as a percentage of total tax collected.

**Figure 3: Comparison between tax revenues from land taxes and conveyance stamp duty Australia**



Source: ABS Taxation Statistics 2000 – 2010 (see Table 5 for annual figures)



## **From conveyance stamp duty to land tax: A framework for change**

In assessing the replacement of conveyance stamp duty on the purchase price of property, with a recurrent tax on land, a comparison of each tax is now made. In undertaking this analysis, a before and after approach is used to compare the amount of stamp duty paid in each of the six capital cities based on the average purchase price compared with the proposed regime of a 1 per cent annual tax on land value as proposed by the Productivity Commission (2004:100).

In undertaking this comparison, the average cost of housing in each capital city as at September 2012 is used to assess stamp duty. This is then compared with the average residential land value for housing in each capital city, to which the Productivity Commissions recommendation of a 1 per cent rate should be applied. The proposed annual land tax paid on 1 per cent is divided into the amount of stamp duty currently paid in each capital city to equate the number of years it takes the land tax to equal the amount of stamp duty currently paid. This is set out in column 6 of Table 5 for each capital city.

The second analysis is of the number of years the proposed land tax takes to equal the stamp duty currently paid compared against the actual average holding period of residential housing in each capital city. This is carried out by comparing the number of years in Column 6 with the actual averaging holding periods (No of years) for houses and units in each capital city shown in Columns 8 and 10 of Table 5. The holding periods are also shown as at 2002 for each houses and units, see Columns 7 and 9, which further highlight the emerging trend in holding patterns of housing in each city over the past 10 years.

The information used in Table 5 is derived from several sources which include, holding periods of houses and units are sourced from RP Data, Property Analysts (2013). The median cost of housing is determined from ABS housing data (2012) and the average land values are determined from the Valuers-General land value benchmarks. There are limitations acknowledged in the approach used, the main limitation being the use of the average cost of housing which is used to account for a broad and diverse range of housing in each city. Another limitation is that the land tax is determined on land value as at 2012 and does not account for annual growth or changes over the holding periods.

As set out in Table 5, the equivalent years in column 6 as at 2012 varies across the capital cities with Brisbane recording the lowest equivalent years at 7.85 and Melbourne recording the highest equivalent years at 10.73. In the case of the holding periods of houses in Column 8, compared with the equivalent years in Column 6, four of the six capital cities have holding periods within 10 per cent of the equivalent years, with Brisbane and Adelaide being the exceptions. In these two cases Brisbane is more than 15 percent higher than the Equivalent Years, with Adelaide being 20 percent lower than the Equivalent Years.

The second point of note is the differential between houses and units, with the holding periods of units in all capital cities resulting in a lower equivalent years based on the current stamp duty below the equivalent years at 2012. While the analysis undertaken in Columns 2, 3, 4 & 5 is based on 2012 average housing prices and land values, a direct comparison cannot be made between 2002 and 2012, however it is noted that as at 2002, no city recorded houses or units having equivalent years above the 2012 equivalent years of a one percent land tax. A further observation noted in Table 5, is

the increasing trend in the holding period of both units and houses in all capital cities. This is a consistent trend from 2002 to 2012 with each cities equivalent year's in 2007 (not shown) is approximately midway between those shown for both units and houses.

While it may be argued that amortising the cost of stamp duty over the holding period of housing as a recurrent land tax it is still a cost to the purchaser, being an upfront cost accounting for approximately 3.5 to 4 percent of the average cost of housing. Further, an up-front stamp duty reduces the relativity of a home buyers deposit against the purchase price and requiring more home buyers to pay mortgage insurance where the cost of housing exceeds 80 percent of the purchase price (APRA 2005).

Further, as was discussed under the previous section, only 20 per cent of first home buyers purchase new property and qualify for the States first home owner's grant, in NSW, Victoria and Queensland. Tasmania will move its FHOG to new dwellings in 2014. On this basis the analysis in Table 5 is undertaken exclusive of the First Home Owners Grant, of which this grant sits within the legislative provisions of each State's duties Act shown in Table 3.

## **Conclusion**

It has been emphasised that conveyance stamp duty is an additional cost for home buyers and over the past 10 years a number of recommendations have been made for this impost to be replaced with a broad based recurrent land tax applicable to all residential property. It has been further shown that land tax revenue is comparatively low in Australia as a percentage of GDP, in which scope exists to increase this source of revenue while reforming less efficient conveyance stamp duty. This recommendation is particularly important in view of tax revenue stagnation from central government, which has traditionally been used to finance state and local government in Australia.

The examination of tax revenues from land tax and conveyance stamp duty between 2000 and 2010 shows that following the Global Financial Crisis, all States with the exception of Victoria, have increased revenue from land tax compared with revenue from conveyance stamp duty. In addition to highlighting the differences and changes in revenue, it is demonstrated that recurrent land taxes are a less volatile and not susceptible to fluctuations evident in revenue from conveyance stamp duty.

The move to a tax on land has distinct advantages and challenges in the transition stage for government. As shown in Table 5 Column 6, a one per cent land tax would raise a fraction of the revenue in contrast to conveyance stamp duty in the earlier years of collection. In contrast, if it were applied to all housing from the date of imposition, it may be defined as a pure land tax capturing the incremental increases in value while removing the imposition of stamp duty and the additional cost of entering the housing market.

On this basis as was discussed under the above section on 'land tax as an alternate capital gains tax,' the imposition on land would be capitalised into the value of property and would act as an incremental capital gains tax. Tax currently expended by the commonwealth on capital gains on the principle place of residence is an important rationale for the introduction of a broad based land tax which incrementally accounts for capital gains largely attributable to the land value component of property. Further it would temper over-investment in the home, which has also been identified as a contributing

factor to the cost of housing and provides a less volatile and more predictable source than conveyance stamp duty for the State.

It was further exhibited that holding periods of housing have increased over the past 10 years and based on a one per cent land tax rate applied to all land including the home, the amortised cost of stamp duty is within 10 percent of stamp duty currently applied to the median cost of housing in most capital cities. This provides the opportune time to commence the transition from less efficient to more efficient tax alternatives which remove upfront barriers to entry which impact on deposits and further contribute to additional mortgage lending insurance for first home buyers.

Under an alternative land tax structure, concessions would still be available to first home buyers and if the objective were to be extended to empty nesters trading down, in which the concession may apply in the form of a land tax free period. For first home buyers that qualify, this would be at the beginning of the holding period of the home, and for empty nesters, this would be in the form of a refund at the end of the holding period of their home.

## References

- Australian Prudential Regulation Authority (2005). Survey Results - Residential valuation practices by ADI's and LMI's. Sydney, Commonwealth Government.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2012) *Housing costs and index per Capital Cities of Australia*, Series 6416
- Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government (2013), *In our hands: strengthening local government revenue in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, University of Technology Sydney, January 2013.
- Barrett, J. and Veal, J. (2012), *Land Taxation: a New Zealand perspective*, eJournal of Tax Research 573, 584.
- Chancellor, J. (2013), Victorian first home buyers grant jumps from \$7000 to \$10,000 but only for new houses and apartments. Property Observer 29 April 2013.
- Commonwealth of Australia (2009) *Australia's Future Tax System – Final Report*, December 2009 BARTON, ACT.
- Cooper, G (1994) An Optimal or Comprehensive Income Tax?, 22 *Federal Law Review* 414 Australian National University, ACT.
- Freebairn, J. (2012) State taxes on housing in Australia, Ch 7. Ed. Stewart, M. Australian Tax Research Foundation.
- Gaffney, M. (2009) 'The Hidden taxable capacity of land: enough and to spare', (2009) 36(4) *International Journal of Social Economics* 328.
- Heferen, R. (2011), Beyond the Tax Forum, Revenue Group Commonwealth Treasury, Speech 5 Dec 2011, Barton ACT.
- Kelly, S. 2003, Self Provision in Retirement? Forecasting Future Household Wealth. Paper presented at the International Micro simulation Conference on Population Aging and Health, Canberra, 8 December.
- Irvine, J. (2009) 'First-home incentive is deterring more buyers', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 July.
- Kupke, V. and Murano, W. (2002) 'The implications of changes in the labour market for the homeownership aspirations, housing opportunities and characteristics of first home buyers,' AHURI Final Report No. 18, pp.1-56
- Lawless, T. (2013), *Australian home owners holding on to their homes for longer*. RP Data 21 March 2013. <http://propertyupdate.com.au/australian-home-owners-holding-on-to-their-homes-for-longer/>
- Local Government Association of NSW and Shires Association of NSW (2007), Assessing Local Government Revenue Raising Capacity July, 2007, Submission to Productivity Commission Inquiry.
- NSW Treasury (2005) *2005/06 Half-Yearly Budget-Review*. Premier and Treasurer of NSW Sydney.
- Office of State Revenue (2009), First Home Owners Boost Fact Sheet, retrieved from [http://www.finance.wa.gov.au/cms/uploadedFiles/State\\_Revenue/FHOG/First\\_Home\\_Owners\\_Boost\\_fact\\_sheet\(1\).pdf](http://www.finance.wa.gov.au/cms/uploadedFiles/State_Revenue/FHOG/First_Home_Owners_Boost_fact_sheet(1).pdf)
- OECD 2010, *Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development Revenue Statistics 1965-2010*, Table 22-23.
- Productivity Commission (2004) *First Home Ownership*, Report No 28, Commonwealth of Australia, Melbourne.
- Productivity Commission (2006) *Workforce Participation Rates – How Does Australia Compare?* Commonwealth of Australia, Dec 2006, Melbourne Victoria.
- Productivity Commission (2008) *Assessing Local Government Revenue Raising Capacity*, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.
- Quinlan, T. Smithies, M. & Duncan, A. (2012) *ACT Tax Review*, Report to the Treasurer ACT. Treasury Directorate ACT, Canberra.
- Rolfe, J. (2013) *Premiums go through the roof on Lenders Mortgage Insurance*, News Limited Network, July 06, 2013.
- Warburton, R.F.E. and Hendy, A.O. (2006), *International Comparison of Australia's Taxes* Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra ACT.
- Wood, G. Ong, R. Cigdem, M. and Taylor, E. (2012) The spatial and distributional impacts of the Henry Review Recommendations on stamp duty and land tax. Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, AHURI Final Report No. 182 Feb. 2012.
- Yates, J.<sup>1</sup> 2010. Tax expenditures and housing, Ch 2. Housing and Tax Policy, Ed. Stewart, M. Australian Tax Research Foundation.
- Yates, J.<sup>2</sup> 'Housing and Tax: The Triumph of Politics over Economics' in Chris Evans, Richard Krever & Peter Mellor (eds), *Australia's Future Tax System: The Prospects After Henry* (Thomson Reuters 2010).


**Table 5: Comparative analysis of stamp duty versus a 1 per cent land tax on housing in the capital cities**

| 1           | 2                        | 3                       | 4          | 5                               | 6   | 7                          | 8                          | 9                         | 10                        |
|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2012        | 2012 Ave Cost of Housing | 2012 Average land value | Stamp Duty | Prod Comm Land Tax (1 per cent) | Prod Comm Equivalent Years (1.0 per cent) | Ave Hold Period House 2002 | Ave Hold Period House 2010 | Ave Hold Period Unit 2002 | Ave Hold Period Unit 2010 |
| Sydney      | \$580,000                | \$232,000               | \$21,590   | \$2,320                         | 9.31                                      | 6.60                       | 10.10                      | 5.70                      | 8.20                      |
| Melbourne   | \$470,900                | \$188,360               | \$20,224   | \$1,884                         | 10.73                                     | 8.40                       | 10.80                      | 6.80                      | 9.2                       |
| Brisbane    | \$437,000                | \$174,800               | \$13,720   | \$1,748                         | 7.85                                      | 7.20                       | 9.20                       | 6.10                      | 7.7                       |
| Adelaide    | \$386,000                | \$154,400               | \$15,630   | \$1,544                         | 10.12                                     | 4.50                       | 8.10                       | 4.20                      | 7.9                       |
| Perth       | \$491,000                | \$196,400               | \$17,338   | \$1,964                         | 8.83                                      | 5.60                       | 8.20                       | 5.00                      | 7.7                       |
| Hobart      | \$320,000                | \$128,000               | \$10,735   | \$1,280                         | 8.39                                      | 6.10                       | 8.70                       | 6.10                      | 8.1                       |
| Average Yrs |                          |                         |            |                                 | 9.20                                      | 6.40                       | 9.18                       | 5.65                      | 8.13                      |

**Table 6: Percentage of Land tax revenue as a percentage of stamp duty revenue in Australia 2000 – 2010**

|                            | 2001        | 2002  | 2003  | 2004   | 2005        | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010        |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------------|
| Qld stamp duty             | 700         | 1,056 | 1,382 | 1,863  | 1,728       | 1,949  | 2,542  | 2,912  | 1,806  | 1,978       |
| Qld Land taxes             | 230         | 231   | 279   | 313    | 419         | 404    | 485    | 610    | 838    | 1,033       |
| Qld Municipal rates        | 1,210       | 1,281 | 1,369 | 1,461  | 1,559       | 1,736  | 1,925  | 2,096  | 2,285  | 2,438       |
| <b>% change in revenue</b> | <b>32.9</b> |       |       |        | <b>24.3</b> |        |        |        |        | <b>52.2</b> |
| Vic stamp duty             | 1,284       | 1,885 | 2,116 | 2,446  | 2,337       | 2,671  | 2,961  | 3,706  | 2,801  | 3,604       |
| Vic Land taxes             | 525         | 515   | 655   | 837    | 848         | 780    | 989    | 865    | 1,238  | 1,178       |
| Vic Municipal rates        | 1,543       | 1,676 | 1,827 | 2,001  | 2,170       | 2,294  | 2,500  | 2,724  | 2,927  | 3,159       |
| <b>% change in revenue</b> | <b>40.9</b> |       |       |        | <b>36.3</b> |        |        |        |        | <b>32.7</b> |
| NSW Stamp duty             | 2,267       | 3,119 | 3,677 | 3,918  | 3,282       | 3,237  | 4,166  | 3,938  | 2,736  | 3,739       |
| NSW Land taxes             | 929         | 1,001 | 1,136 | 1,355  | 1,646       | 1,717  | 2,036  | 1,937  | 2,252  | 2,296       |
| NSW Municipal rates        | 2,168       | 2,236 | 2,347 | 2,424  | 2,521       | 2,638  | 2,776  | 2,935  | 3,030  | 3,166       |
| <b>% change in revenue</b> | <b>41</b>   |       |       |        | <b>50.2</b> |        |        |        |        | <b>61.4</b> |
| WA Stamp duty              | 624         | 647   | 833   | 1,207  | 1,218       | 1,906  | 2,037  | 2,243  | 1,008  | 1,615       |
| WA Land tax                | 221         | 226   | 260   | 280    | 315         | 313    | 386    | 415    | 562    | 519         |
| WA Municipal rates         | 669         | 705   | 754   | 801    | 869         | 928    | 1,001  | 1,088  | 1,220  | 1,317       |
| <b>% change in revenue</b> | <b>35.4</b> |       |       |        | <b>25.9</b> |        |        |        |        | <b>32.1</b> |
| SA Stamp duty              | 295         | 354   | 428   | 578    | 561         | 600    | 721    | 909    | 721    | 787         |
| SA Land tax                | 140         | 140   | 157   | 198    | 256         | 291    | 332    | 375    | 510    | 553         |
| SA Municipal rates         | 545         | 589   | 641   | 683    | 738         | 785    | 834    | 886    | 958    | 1,019       |
| <b>% change in revenue</b> | <b>47.5</b> |       |       |        | <b>45.6</b> |        |        |        |        | <b>70.3</b> |
| Aust Stamp Duties          | 5,340       | 7,283 | 8,745 | 10,388 | 9,472       | 10,788 | 12,923 | 14,289 | 9,526  | 12,294      |
| Aust Land taxes            | 2,103       | 2,172 | 2,553 | 3,059  | 3,583       | 3,613  | 4,358  | 4,346  | 5,565  | 5,767       |
| Aust Municipal rates       | 6,441       | 6,808 | 7,276 | 7,726  | 8,237       | 8,788  | 9,476  | 10,194 | 10,938 | 11,645      |
| <b>% change in revenue</b> | <b>39.4</b> |       |       |        | <b>37.8</b> |        |        |        |        | <b>46.9</b> |

**Source:** Local Government Association of Australia, ABS Taxation Statistics 2000-2010. 2008 denotes commencement of the GFC.



# SOAC Conference Proceedings and Powerpoint Presentations

## Editors Foreword

**Title:** State of Australian Cities Conference 2013: Refereed Proceedings

**Year of publication:** 2013

**Editors:** Kristian Ruming, Bill Randolph and Nicole Gurrán

**Publisher:** State of Australian Cities Research Network

**ISBN:** 1 74044 033 1

## Editors' Foreword

Ten years since the original State of Australian Cities (SOAC) conference, SOAC 2013 was the largest conference to date, with over 180 papers published as part of these proceedings. All papers presented at the SOAC 2013 and subsequently published as part of the proceedings have been subject to a double blind refereeing process. All papers have been reviewed by at least two referees. In particular, the review process assessed each paper in terms of its policy relevance and the contribution to the conceptual or empirical understanding of Australian cities. The review process ensured the highest academic standards. The Editors wish to thank referees and contributors for their efforts in responding to tight publication timelines. The breadth and quality of papers included as part of these proceedings is testament to the strength of Australian urban studies.

Kristian Ruming, Bill Randolph and Nicole Gurrán

Sydney

19 December 2013

## Economy

[Sufficiency of Employment Self-Sufficiency Targets in Reducing the Need to Travel – Presentation](#)

*Sharon Biermann and Kirsten Martinus*

[Growth of the Creative Economy in Small Regional Cities: A case study of Bendigo - \*Presentation\*](#)

*Andrew Bishop and Sun Sheng Han*

[Selling Newcastle to the World, or to Newcastle? A case study of the official and unofficial rebranding of Newcastle, NSW](#)

*Laura Crommelin*

[The Role for the UPE Project in Australia](#)

*Kathryn Davidson*

[Canberra 2013 Planning and Urban Development Challenges at the Centenary of the National Capital](#)

*Karl Fischer and James Weirick*

[Airports as Development Generators: A reconnaissance of employment trends in the Sydney airport region 1996–2011 – \*Presentation\*](#)

*Robert Freestone and Andrew Tice*

[A City that Makes Things: Reconstituting manufacturing](#)

*Chris Gibson and Andrew Warren*

[The Devil is in the Detail: What's behind manufacturing growth and decline in Melbourne, 2001–2011 – \*Presentation\*](#)

*Anthony Kent and Kathleen Hurley*

[Sydney's Housing Markets During the GFC: How was globalisation mediated? – \*Presentation\*](#)

*Heather MacDonald*

[What Impact does Workplace Accessibility Have on Housing Prices? Sydney 2006 – 2011 – \*Presentation\*](#)

*Heather MacDonald, Alan Peters, Natalya de Pooter, and Ji Yuan Yu*

[Property Tax Reform A contribution to housing affordability and challenges for government in Australia](#)

*Vince Mangioni*

[Accelerating Regional City Growth in Victoria: Evidence and policy approaches – \*Presentation\*](#)

*Chris McDonald, Shishir Saxena and Vinnie Maharaj*

[Intra-metropolitan Housing Supply Elasticity in Australia: A spatial analysis of Adelaide – \*Presentation\*](#)

*Ralph B. McLaughlin, Anthony Sorensen and Sonya Glavac*

[Road Costs Associated with Differing Forms of Urban Development](#)

*Martin Nichols*

[Adjustment to Retrenchment – A case of challenging the global economy in the suburbs? – \*Presentation\*](#)

*Johannes Pieters*



[The Urban Boundary: An economic activity perspective of South-East Queensland – Presentation](#)

*Lavinia Poruschi*

[Why has Melbourne Closed the Gap on Sydney Since 2000?](#)

*Glen Searle and Kevin O'Connor*

[Waves of Suburban Economic Development: Outer Western Sydney's next ride – Presentation](#)

*Samantha Sharpe and Dustin Moore*

[Corporate Clustering in Australian Cities: An analysis of the geographic distribution of ASX-listed headquarters](#)

*Thomas Sigler*

[Master Planned Estates, Living Experience, and the Experience Economy – Presentation](#)

*Paul Smith*

[An Open-Source Tool for Identifying Industrial Clusters in a Data-Poor Environment](#)

*Sophie Sturup, Jennifer Day and Yiqun Chen*

[Tipped Off: Residential amenity and the changing distribution of household waste disposal in Melbourne - Presentation](#)

*Elizabeth Taylor*

[Liveable Housing Design: Who will take responsibility? – Presentation](#)

*Margaret Ward, Jill Franz and Barbara Adkins*

[An Analysis of Commuting Patterns in Sydney, 2006–2011, Using Spatial Interaction Models](#)

*Martin Watts*

## Social

[A tale of two cities – patterns of population growth and change in Sydney and Melbourne – Presentation](#)

*Simone Alexander*

[A Good Place to Raise a Family? Comparing parents', service providers, and media perspectives of the inner and outer suburban areas of Melbourne – Presentation](#)

*Fiona Andrews, Sarah Barter-Godfrey, Stephanie Rich, Ruth Klein & Julia Shelley*

[Acknowledging the Health Effects of Poor Quality Housing: Australia's hidden fraction](#)

*Emma Baker, Laurence Lester, Andrew Beer, Kate Mason and Rebecca Bentley*

[How Common – Sex, malls, and urban parks](#)

*Spike Boydell*

[“We are a Family – It makes sense to live together”](#): Multigenerational households in Sydney and Brisbane – *Presentation*

*Hazel Easthope, Edgar Liu, Ian Burnley & Bruce Judd*

[If I Come Back in a Few Years and Nothing has Changed, I'll be MAD!](#): Lessons in co-planning with children from the CATCH/iMATCH Citizen Kid's Planning Group – *Presentation*

*Andrea Cook, Carolyn Whitzman and Paul Tranter*

[Can I Touch This?](#)

*Melissa David and Mellini Sloan*

[How and Why does Community Opposition to Affordable Housing Development Escalate? “Unsupported development” in Parramatta, NSW](#)

*Gethin Davison , Crystal Legacy, Edgar Liu, Ryan van den Nouwelant and Awais Piracha*

[Measuring Social Interaction and Community Cohesion in a High Density Urban Renewal Area: The case of Green Square – Presentation](#)

*Hazel Easthope and Nicole McNamara*

[The Role of Fun in City Centre Revitalisation Projects: Children and fountains](#)

*Claire Freeman*

[The Loss of Low Cost Coastal Holiday Accommodation – Causes, cases and consequences - Presentation](#)

*Helen Gilbert*

[Promoting Positive Aging: University campuses as a model – Presentation](#)

*Tracie Harvison*

[Measuring the Changing Face of Global Sydney – Presentation](#)

*Richard Hu*

[Digital Suburbs? Some policy implications of greater domestic connectivity](#)

*Louise Johnson*

[Understanding Downsizing in Later Life and its Implications for Housing and Urban Policy – Presentation](#)

*Bruce Judd, Edgar Liu, Hazel Easthope and Catherine Bridge*

[The Wander Years: Estate renewal, temporary relocation and place\(lessness\) in Bonnyrigg, NSW – Presentation](#)

*Edgar Liu*

[Darwin After Dark: Illuminating suburban atmospheres](#)

*Michele Lobo*

[Integrated Planning for Healthy Communities: Does Victorian state legislation promote it?](#)

*Melanie Lowe, Carolyn Whitzman and Billie Giles-Corti*

[Getting to Yes: Overcoming barriers to affordable family friendly housing in inner Melbourne – Presentation](#)

*Martel, A., Whitzman, C., Fincher, R., Lawther, P., Woodcock, I. and Tucker, D*

[Ethical & Political Consumption and Opportunities for Change in Australian Shopping Centre Design](#)

*Kirsty Mate*

[Vertical Mixed Use Communities: A compact city model?](#)

*Iderlina Mateo-Babiano and Sébastien Darchen*

[Pedagogy of Oppressed Community Engagement: Socially inclusive visioning of sustainable urban regeneration – Presentation](#)

*Helen Meikle and David Jones*

[Planning for Organized Sport in the Fringe Suburbs of Australia Cities: A case study of Perth – Presentation](#)

*Garry Middle, Marian Tye, Diane Costello, Dave Hedgcock and Isaac Middle*

[The Yard goes on Forever: Community initiatives in maintaining and revitalizing local open space](#)

*David Nichols and Robert Freestone*

[New Housing Development at Hobsonville: Promoting and buying into a “natural” community – Presentation](#)

*Simon Opit and Robin Kearns*

[Developing a Typology of Socio-spatial Disadvantage in Australia – Presentation](#)

*Hal Pawson and Shanaka Herath*

[Negotiating the Complexities of Redevelopment Through the Everyday Experiences of Residents: The incremental renewal of Bonnyrigg, Sydney – Presentation](#)

*Simon Pinnegar*

[Sustainable Housing in Aged Care Facilities – Presentation](#)

*Kate Ringvall and Julie Brunner*

[Perceptions of Place – Evaluating experiential qualities of streetscapes](#)

*John Rollo and Suzanne Barker*

[Predictors of Overall Living Satisfaction in Medium Density Housing: Results from a household survey – Presentation](#)

*Jeeva Sajan*

### Feeding the City – Food production on the fringe and within the urban area

*Ian Sinclair*

### Can the Universal Concept of Community Policing be Applied in Different Jurisdictions? A cross comparative analysis of policing in Sydney, Bosnia and New York

*Kenan Smajovic and Awais Piracha*

### Planning and Building Healthy Communities - *Presentation*

*Susan Thompson, Emily Mitchell and Belinda Crawford*

### Who Lives in Retirement Villages; Are they wealthy enclaves, ghettos or connected communities?

*Lois Towart*

### The Food Security of the Australian Capital Region

*Rachael Wakefield-Rann and Robert Dybal*

### Rethinking Accessibility in Planning of Urban Open Space. Using an Integrative Theoretical Framework

*Dong Wang, Iderlina Mateo-Babiano and Gregory Brown*

### Can Outer Suburbs Become 20 Minute Cities? – *Presentation*

*Carolyn Whitzman, Danita Tucker, Andrew Bishop, Andreeanne Doyon, Cait Jones, Tamara Lowen and Elissa McMillan*

### Housing Affordability for Key Workers Employed in the City of Melbourne

*Gareth Williams and Bethanie Finney*

### Producing Multicultural Belonging: The possibilities and discontents of local public spaces in suburban Sydney

*Rebecca Williamson*

### Children's Accounts of Confronting City Street Life: Can the inner city be truly child-friendly?

*Karen Witten, Robin Kearns and Penelope Carroll*

### The role of streets within placemaking in cross-cultural contexts: case studies from Adelaide and Georgetown, Malaysia

*Alpana Sivam and Sadasivam Karuppannan*

### Renewing Tonsley, Regenerating Adelaide – The making of Australia's most competitive city

*Megan Antcliff and Ingo Kumic*

## Environmental

### Creating a Liveable City – The role of ecosystem services – *Presentation*

*Phillip James Birtles, Jenna Hore, Michael Dean, Rebecca Hamilton, John Dahlenburg, Jo Ann Moore and Michele Bailey*

[Rooted: Planning and food security in Australian cities – Presentation](#)

*Paul Burton*

[Sustainability Through Community: Social capital in the inner urban eco-community – Presentation](#)

*Liam Cooper*

[Media Representations of Nature in the City](#)

*Kathryn Eyles*

[Climate change vulnerability and adaptation: voices from the community services sector in Victoria – Presentation](#)

*Hartmut Fünfgeld, Alianne Rance, Philip Wallis, Sophie Millin, Karyn Bosomworth and Kate Lonsdale*

[Six Million in Melbourne or a Network of Sustainable Midi-Cities? – A thought experiment](#)

*R.J. Fuller and L. Trygg*

[Green Resources in an Urbanising Sea Change Landscape – Presentation](#)

*Renee Fulton*

[Comparing Food Efficient Design and Planning of Built Environments in Sydney and Miami – Presentation](#)

*Sumita Ghosh*

[Development and Trial of an Automated, Open Source Walkability Tool Through AURIN's Open Source Portal – Presentation](#)

*Billie Giles-Corti, Gus Macaulay, Nick Middleton, Bryan Boruff, Carolyn Whitzman, Fiona Bull, Iain Butterworth, Hannah Badland, Suzanne Mavoa, Rebecca Roberts and Hayley Christian*

[A New Way of Living with Nature? Zones of friction and traction in Nangari Vineyard Estate, South West Sydney](#)

*Charles Gillon*

[Comparing Local Government Adaptation Responses to Climate Change in Australia and Sweden – Presentation](#)

*Leigh Glover and Mikael Granberg*

[Slip Sliding Away: Auckland's response to the political erosion of climate change mitigation initiatives](#)

*Julia Harker, Patricia Austin, Megan Howell, Stephen-Knight Lenihan and Prue Taylor*

[The Wicked Muse: Partnering creative practice, local communities and sustainability – Presentation](#)

*Viveka Hocking*

[The Paradox of Paradise: Declining government responses to the increasing risks of climate change for the Gold Coast – Presentation](#)

*Michael Howes and Aysin Dedekorkut-Howes*

[Beyond Birdies – Enhancing biodiversity on urban golf courses – Presentation](#)

*Brent Jacobs, Louise Boronyak, Nicholas Mikhailovich, Jeanie Muspratt*

[The Power to Save: An equity analysis of the Victorian Energy Saver Incentive in Melbourne – Presentation](#)

*Victoria Johnson and Damian Sullivan*

[Decision Making in the Face of the Rising Tide – Presentation](#)

*Kellett J, Balston J, Li S, Wells G and Western M*

[Finding Appropriate Participation in Urban Planning for Reduction of Disaster Risks](#)

*Maria Kornakova and Alan March*

[Mapping CO2 Emission from Commuting in Regional Australia](#)

*Simone Leao and Alan March*

[‘Towards a Resilient Sydney’ – Climate change adaptation planning for Sydney – Presentation](#)

*Christopher Lee, Norma Shankie-Williams and David Mitchell*

[Urban Structure and Evacuation Times in a City Fringe Bushfire: Modelling three scenarios in Bendigo, Victoria](#)

*Jorge Leon and Alan March*

[Towards a Greater Understanding of Healthy Food Accessibility in Melbourne: Part II](#)

*Margalit Levin and Yiqun Chen*

[Urban Planning for Disaster Risk Reduction: Establishing second wave criteria](#)

*Alan March and Jorge Leon*

[Doing Adaptation Differently? Does Neoliberalism Influence adaptation planning in Queensland – Presentation](#)

*Lachlan McClure and Douglas Baker*

[A Tale of Two Cities: Sydney and Melbourne’s growth strategies and the flawed city-centric approach](#)

*Paul McFarland*

[Sustainability, Vulnerability, Resilience and Change: The efficacy of comparative urban metrics for city development in Australia – Presentation](#)

*Phil McManus*

[Low Carbon Urban Transitions: A Melbourne case study – Presentation](#)

*Susie Moloney and Ralph Horne*

[The Importance of House Size in the Pursuit of Low Carbon Housing – Presentation](#)

*Trivess Moore, Stephen Clune and John Morrissey*

[Industry Constructions of Waste in Building Life-Cycles: Zero waste and beyond? – Presentation](#)

*Jasmine Palmer, Lou Wilson, Stephen Pullen, Keri Chiveralls, Jian Zou and George Zillante*

[Uniting Urban Agriculture and Stormwater Management: The example of the 'vegetable raingarden'](#)

*Paul Richards*

[You Can Kiss my Yasi – Recovering in time compression](#)

*Serrao-Neumann, S., Crick, F. and Low Choy, D*

[Changing Water Values in Urban Waterway Naturalisation: Findings from a Sydney case study – Presentation](#)

*Jacqueline Soars and Fiona Miller*

[Integrated ETWW Demand Forecasting and Scenario Planning for Precincts \(ETWW: energy, transport, waste and water\) – Presentation](#)

*Michael Taylor*

[A Review of International Low Carbon Precincts to Identify Pathways for Mainstreaming Sustainable Urbanism in Australia](#)

*Thomson G, Matan A and Newman P*

[Ecosystem Guidelines for the Conservation of Aquatic Ecosystems of the Georges River Catchment: A method applicable to the Sydney Basin – Presentation](#)

*Carl Tippler, Ian. Wright, Peter Davies and Alison Hanlon*

[Visions and Pathways for Low-to Zero Carbon Urban Living – Australia 2050](#)

*Paul Twomey and Chris Ryan*

[Low Carbon Residential Refurbishments in Australia: Progress and prospects – Presentation](#)

*Nicola Willand and Ralph Horne*

[Carbon Mitigation Actions by Peri-urban and Regional Cities in Queensland – Presentation](#)

*Heather Zeppel*

[Assessing Household Energy Consumption in Adelaide and Melbourne](#)

*Sadasivam Karuppanan and Sun Sheng Han*

## Structure

[Urban Form and Design Outcomes of Heritage Planning Policies in Inner Melbourne – Presentation](#)

*Robyn Clinch*

[City Without a Plan: How the Gold Coast was shaped](#)

*Aysin Dedekorkut-Howes*

### Re-assembling the Car-dependent City: Transit – oriented intensification in Melbourne

*Kim Dovey, Ian Woodcock, Shane Murray and Lee-Ann Khor*

### Activity Corridor Intensification in Perth and the role of Design Based Research

*Anthony Duckworth-Smith*

### Working with Housing Variance to Model Urban Growth Futures within Inner Metropolitan Melbourne – *Presentation*

*Yolanda Esteban and John Rollo*

### GDP and City Population in the Development Performance of City Structures – *Presentation*

*Michelle Leong Glastris*

### Shaping Modern Cities: Structural continuity and change in Carlton, Melbourne 1870-1970 – *Presentation*

*Lucy Groenhart, Gavin Wood and Joe Hurley*

### Don't be so Dense: Measuring urban structure and form – *Presentation*

*Michael Grosvenor*

### Future Intensive: Obstacles and opportunities to achieving compact urban form in Auckland

*Errol Haarhoff, Lee Beattie, Jenny Dixon, Ann Dupuis, Penny Lysnar and Laurence Murphy*

### Connecting Transit with Urban Development to Achieve 21st Century Goals for Perth

*Cole Hendrigan*

### From Disparate Association to Planning Doxa

*Jean Hillier*

### The sustainable design of Water's Edge Public Spaces in the Asia Pacific region: smaller scale Australian examples and case studies in Sydney, Hong Kong and Singapore

*Mabel John, Steffen Lehmann and Alpana Sivam*

### Reinventing Jillong: Current regeneration initiatives challenging the identity and place of Geelong – *Presentation*

*David Jones and Helen Meikle*

### Planning Community Infrastructure in a Fast Changing Urban Environment: Measuring the social outcomes

*Kate Kerkin*

### New Urban Territories: Spatial assemblies for the 20-minute city

*Lee-Anne Khor, Shane Murray, Kim Dovey, Ian Woodcock, Rutger Pasman*

### Nothing Gained by Only Counting Dwellings per Hectare: A hundred years of confusing urban densities

*Elek Pafka*



### [Infill Design Opportunities](#)

*Lee-Anne Khor, Byron Meyer, Nigel Bertram, Shane Murray and Diego Ramirez-Lovering*

### [From Hope to Productivity: The funding crisis in the NSW heritage sector – Presentation](#)

*Paul Rappoport and Robert Freestone*

### [Street Network Analysis for Understanding Typology in Cities: Case study on Sydney CBD and suburbs](#)

*Somwrita Sarkar*

### [Teleworking and Spatial Trends in Australian Cities: A critical review of current literature – Presentation](#)

*Abbas Shieh and Glen Searle*

### [Modelling as Alchemy? Reflections from a PSS developer on the politics of land use models – Presentation](#)

*Regan Solomon*

### [Public Use Zone: A new paradigm for suburban rail station design for Australian cities](#)

*Simon Wollan and Ian Woodcock*

### [Coding for Corridors: Prospects for tram corridor intensification in Melbourne](#)

*Ian Woodcock, Kim Dovey, Lucinda Pike, Elek Pafka, Shane Murray, Lee-Anne Khor, Rutger Pasman and Tom Morgan*

## Governance

### [‘We Don’t Have Access to That’: Social mix and the right to the city – Presentation](#)

*Kathy Arthurson, Iris Levin and Anna Ziersch*

### [Housing Affordability in Auckland: Looking behind the rhetoric – Presentation](#)

*Patricia Austin*

### [Advancing Community Engagement Practice for Strategic Urban Planning: Learning from allied and remote disciplines – Presentation](#)

*Suzanne Barker*

### [Arbitrating Relatively Good Design: The aesthetic governance of Australia’s cities](#)

*Chris Beer*

### [Embedding Urban Growth Modelling in Planning Practice – Presentation](#)

*Andre Brits*

### [Melbourne’s North and West Metropolitan Regional Management Forum: Building community capacity through the Regional Health and Wellbeing Implementation Strategy - Presentation](#)

*Iain Butterworth*

[Examining Three Planning Pathways in the Mediation of Resident Opposition to Compact City – Presentation](#)

*Nicole Cook, Joe Hurley and Elizabeth Taylor*

[The Ethical Dilemmas of Local Government Planners in Western Australia.](#)

*Tim Perkins and Julie Crews*

[The Dynamic of Climate Change Policy in a Multi-level Governance Environment.](#)

*Anne Dansey*

[Streamlining the Planning Process and Supporting Local Identity and Character – Can the two exist? – Presentation](#)

*Peter Davies and Neil Selmon*

[Federal Policy for Australia's Cities: The 2011 National Urban Policy in historical and comparative perspective](#)

*Jago Dodson*

[System and Strategy: Recent trends in governance and planning systems in Australia – Presentation](#)

*Michael Buxton, Lucy Groenhart*

[Certainty and Outcomes: Some local planning illusions – Presentation](#)

*David Fingland*

[Governance of Public Land Acquisition for Regional Open Space in Perth and Sydney](#)

*Neil Foley, Peter Williams*

[Finding Solutions to the Commonwealth's Regulation Gap](#)

*Laura Goh*

[Simpler, Faster, Cheaper? Australia's urban aspirations and the planning reform agendas – Presentation](#)

*Robin Goodman, Paul Maginn, Nicole Gurrán and Kristian Ruming*

[Climate Justice in the Australian City](#)

*Jean Hillier, Diana MacCallum, Wendy Steele, Donna Houston and Jason Byrne*

[Governance in Local Government University Partnerships: Smart, local and connected? – Presentation](#)

*Richard Howitt*

[Spinning the Wheel: Examining decision making process and outcomes in development assessment](#)

*Brendan McRae and Joe Hurley*

[I Think Planning is About Chipping Away at Stuff: The voices and activities of public service planners working in Melbourne – Presentation](#)

*John Jackson*

Understanding the Role and Expectations of Local Government Planners in the Contemporary Political Environment:  
A South Australian perspective

*Anna Leditschke, Rowena Butland and Matthew W. Rofe*

Democratic Infrastructure? Delivering affordable housing under Australia's social housing initiative – *Presentation*

*Crystal Legacy, Gethin Davison, Edgar Liu, Ryan van den Nouwelant, Awais Piracha*

Developing Effective Urban Open Space Policies Using Excludability, Rivalry and Devolved Governance

*Andrew MacKenzie, Leonie J. Pearson and Craig J Pearson*

Governing Carbon in the Australian City: Local government responses – *Presentation*

*Pauline McGuirk, Robyn Dowling and Harriet Bulkeley*

Cornerstone or Rhinestone: The fate of strategic planning in the post-political age

*David Mitchell*

Community Relations and Community Governance around Condominium Living: Towards a collaborative approach to  
condominium law reform and urban vitality

*Clare Mouat, Rebecca Leshinsky*

Governance Performance in Multi-Scalar Large Institutional Networks: Evaluating transport institutions in Australia's  
metropolises

*Michael Neuman, Nicholas Low, Carey Curtis, Michael Taylor, Glen Searle*

Empowering the Professional Judgement of Planners: A study of Australian discretion in international comparison

*Marsita Omar and Alan March*

Comparative Policy Analysis in Australian Water and Electricity Demand Management – *Presentation*

*Walter Reinhardt*

Higher Density Development in Sydney: Public perception and policy awareness – *Presentation*

*Kristian Ruming*

The Influence of Neoliberalism in the Context of Population Decline: An analysis of planning strategies in Broken Hill,  
NSW

*Laura Schatz*

Public Housing Estate Redevelopments in Australian Inner Cities and the Meanings of Social Mix

*Kate Shaw*

Contested Decision Making in Commemorative Planning and Regulation

*Quentin Stevens, Karen Franck and SueAnne Ware*

[Plan Melbourne: A Critique and a Review of Its Implications for Housing](#)

*Richard Tomlinson*

[Web Based Communication and Online Social Networking in the NSW Planning System 2 – Presentation](#)

*Wayne Williamson*

## Movement

[Towards the Socioeconomic Patterns of the National Broadband Network Rollout in Australia](#)

*Tooran Alizadeh*

[The Role of Adelaide's Transit Oriented Developments Towards Creating a Low Carbon Transit Future City](#)

*Andrew Allan*

[Access, Health and Independence: Walkability and children's quality of life – Presentation](#)

*Courtney Babb and Carey Curtis*

[Are Master-planned New Urbanist Suburbs a 'Solution' for Sustainable Travel to Schools? Comparing children's travel in select Australian primary schools](#)

*Matthew Burke, Carey Curtis, Carolyn Whitzman, Paul Tranter, Christine Armit and Mitch Duncan*

[Lifting the Barriers: Planning for increased mobility and accessibility through the Adelaide CBD – Presentation](#)

*Rowena Butland and Madeleine Rains*

[The Challenges of Planning for Autonomous Mobility in Australia](#)

*Robyn Dowling and Jennifer Kent*

[Transitions to Independent Mobility Among Children and Young People – Presentation](#)

*Anne Hurni*

[Journey to Work Patterns in Regional Victoria - Presentation](#)

*Erwin Lagura and Christina Inbakaran*

[Private Car Use as Resistance to Alternative Transport: Automobility's interminable appeal – Presentation](#)

*Jennifer Kent*

[Using Multi-modal Travel and Cost Analysis to Re-evaluate Transport Disadvantage for the Brisbane Metropolitan Area](#)

*Tiebei Li, Jago Dodson, Neil Sipe*

[Active Transport – Comparative analysis Melbourne - \*Presentation\*](#)

*David Mckenzie and Christina Inbakaran*

[Understanding Australian Parents' Attitudes About their Children's Travel Behaviour: Results from the CATCH and iMATCH projects](#)

*Farinaz Moghtaderi, Matthew Burke, Paul Tranter and Christine Armit*

[Critical Infrastructure in Australia](#)

*Jaime Olvera-Garcia, Wendy Steele, Emma Browne and Anne-Sophie Iotti*

[City Cycling at the Crossroads Can Australia learn from Northern Europe? – \*Presentation\*](#)

*Warwick Pattinson and Carolyn Whitzman*

[Smarter Ways to Change: Learning from innovative practice in road space reallocation – \*Presentation\*](#)

*Helen Rowe*

[Improving Accessibility in Growing Australian Cities – \*Presentation\*](#)

*Jan Scheurer, Kristien Bell*

[The Impact of Shopping Centre Attributes on the Destination Preferences of Trip Makers in Brisbane](#)

*Maryam Shobeirinejad, Tim Veitech, Neil Sipe and Matthew Burke*

[Beyond Economicism: Challenging the concept of the Australian global city](#)

*Wendy Steele and Michele Acuto*

[Children's Cycling for Transport in Selected Australian Urban Environments: Model shares and determinations of significance](#)

*Kala Wati, Matthew Burke, Neil Sipe and Jago Dodson*

[Effects of Raising Fuel Price on Reduction of Household Trouble GHG Emissions: A case study of Sydney](#)

*Junjian Zhao, Alan Peters and Peter Rickwood*

