



Archived at the Flinders Academic Commons:

<http://dspace.flinders.edu.au/dspace/>

This is a copy of an article published in the *Journal of Urban Regeneration and Renewal*, which is available online by subscription at: <http://www.henrystewartpublications.com/jurr>

Please cite this article as: Jacobs, K. and Arthurson, K., 2007. What happens when the funding runs out? Exploring the utility of 'exit strategies' for Australian housing regeneration programmes. *Journal of Urban Regeneration and Renewal*, 1(2), 165-177.

© 2007 Henry Stewart Publications. Paper reproduced here with permission from the publisher.

What happens when the funding runs out? Exploring the utility of 'exit strategies' for Australian housing regeneration programmes

Received (in revised form): 26th July, 2007

Keith Jacobs

is a senior lecturer in the School of Sociology at the University of Tasmania. He is the author of 'The dynamics of local housing policy' (1999) and joint editor of a book 'Social constructionism in housing research' (2004) both published by Ashgate. He has published widely on regeneration and housing policy and is on the editorial board of the journal *Housing Theory and Society* and a research member for the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute. Further details of his publication record and career history can be accessed at the website: http://www.utas.edu.au/sociology/HACRU/Keith_Jacobs.htm

Kathy Arthurson

is a senior research fellow in the Institute for Social Research at the Swinburne Institute of Technology in Melbourne. She has published widely in the area of housing and regeneration policy. During the 1990s, she was employed as Manager, Housing and Social Policy in Department of Housing and Regional Development. Further details of her research interests and publications are available on the ISR website: www.sisr.net

Abstract One of the major challenges faced by state housing authorities engaged in housing estate regeneration programmes is to sustain the benefits that accrue from an initial injection of resources. Exit strategies is the term used to describe the set of policies that can be deployed by housing authorities to sustain regeneration at the end of a specific funded programme. This paper presents the findings of recent research to review current practices in developing exit strategies involving five Australian housing regeneration projects. The paper begins by discussing some of the international academic perspectives on housing regeneration. Then it reports on the five case study initiatives. The paper concludes with a discussion on some of the policy implications that emerge from the findings.

Keywords: *Public housing, urban regeneration, Australian housing policy, exit strategies, urban renewal*

INTRODUCTION

In Australia, public housing authorities have engaged in a series of reforms with a focus on adopting commercial practices and incorporating an increased role for the private sector in the delivery of public housing.¹ The major reason for these reforms is to overcome the deficit in funding provided by the

Commonwealth Government. Through the auspices of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement (CSHA), the principal mechanism for funding of social housing in Australia, funding to state housing authorities (SHAs) has declined in real terms by almost 15 per cent between 1990 and 2000.²

As in the UK, public housing in

Keith Jacobs
Private Bag 17, School of
Sociology, University of
Tasmania, Hobart TAS 7001
Australia.
e-mail:
keith.jacobs@utas.edu.au

Australia is targeted for those on low incomes. Data reveal that 90 per cent of the 346,000 households in public housing nationally rely on income support, and 45 per cent of all new tenants are classified as having special needs.³ The concentration of deprived households living in public housing in recent years can be attributed to a number of factors, including needs-based allocation policies, changing economic and labour market processes, the financing arrangements that have seen a move of resources away from public housing to private rental assistance and homeownership subsidies that encourage householders to purchase their homes.

The contemporary situation whereby public housing only caters to the highest need and complex tenants, coupled with reductions in funding, has created major difficulties for SHAs. Simultaneously, the maintenance costs associated with public housing are intensifying⁴ as much of the older public housing stock is in the form of large-scale estates that were built in the post-Second World War period to meet economies of scale and the shortage at that time of good-quality, low-cost housing.

The current problems resulted in numerous attempts by SHAs to regenerate Australian social housing estates during the 1980s, but a major challenge is to sustain the benefits that accrue from an initial injection of resources. Thus, the key themes that this paper addresses are: stakeholders' understandings of exit strategies, resident involvement in post-regeneration periods; and the limitations and obstacles that can impede success. First, however, it is helpful to provide the theoretical context for the current research through exploring some of the competing theories about housing regeneration and its capacity to secure long-term benefits.

HOUSING AND URBAN REGENERATION PARADIGMS

The range of views is considerable; including structuralist, neoliberal, environmental and social exclusion/inclusion perspectives. Each of these viewpoints is summarised in Table 1 and then discussed briefly as follows to provide a context for the policy issues surrounding housing regeneration and the background to the theoretical position that informed the empirical analysis.

Environmental perspectives

In the 1970s and 1980s, the environmental perspective was highly influential in relation to housing regeneration. Drawing on Coleman (1988), this perspective viewed some of the design features common in 1970s system-built social housing estates as a trigger for crime and anti-social behaviour. In view of the criticisms, the UK government embarked upon major design modifications to many large estates in the 1980s. Changes included turning areas of public space into private gardens, closing off overhead walkways and converting single level flats into two-storey maisonettes. While design is generally understood as an important causal factor to explain some of the problems associated with deprived neighbourhoods, however, it is now recognised that design alone is an insufficient policy instrument unless accompanied by other modes of intervention.

Structuralist perspectives

Some academic commentators take a structuralist perspective, pointing out the limitations of physical regeneration and area-based housing regeneration and, instead, stress the need for interventions that address wider social and economic

processes. Atkinson,⁵ for instance, argues that the fact that urban regeneration policies are embedded in specific institutional practices makes it difficult to overcome the more entrenched structural inequalities that exist. Similarly, Anderson and Sim6 describe how prevailing ideologies of successive national governments influence and constrain the practices of local agencies, including the local state. Atkinson⁵ and Badcock⁴ argue that short-term injections of funds targeted on housing estates for regeneration are likely to have limited effect unless accompanied by wider economic and social reform. From these perspectives, the pursuit of neoliberal fiscal policies to reduce public expenditure and maintain a low tax base have specific repercussions for deprived neighbourhoods, not least of which is a diminution of welfare resources in areas such as health, education and housing. Within this context, the utility of any area-based initiative to address problems of public housing estates will, at best, be marginal, as it will address only the symptoms not the causes.⁷

Other critics argue that the substantive problems associated with public housing stem from a set of policies, including priority allocation policies, that have resulted in overrepresentation of high need category applicants in public housing.. Furthermore, the commitment of governments of all persuasions to reduce overall welfare expenditure very often has significant implications for deprived localities such as public housing estates since it leads to a diminution of funds made available for spending on housing, health and education. For these reasons, critics (see, for instance, Kleinman⁸ and Moulart *et al.*⁹) argue that, at best, short-term injections of funds can only have a marginal impact in reducing the symptoms associated with neighbourhood decline. There is

evidence to support these criticisms. In the European context, Andersen,¹⁰ for instance, summarised the evidence from recent evaluations of regeneration projects in a number of different countries. He concluded that area-based approaches are unlikely to have long-term benefits unless accompanied by intervention, particularly in relation to structural long-term employment.

Social exclusion and inclusion perspectives

In recent years, regeneration policies have been subsumed within the framework of strategies for tackling social exclusion. The origins of this approach can be traced to French social policy in the mid-1980s.¹¹ In the UK, a more comprehensive programme to tackle deprived neighbourhoods was put in place, with the establishment of a social exclusion unit by the UK Labour Government in 1997. For policy makers, the attraction of the social exclusion paradigm is the recognition that problems are multi-faceted and require a set of policy responses in areas such as housing, labour markets and service delivery (health, education, policing).¹¹ Wider European Commission programmes, such as the 'Community Strategic Guidelines on Cohesion',¹² which is currently at the core of its urban agenda, seeks to encourage partnership approaches, resident participation and local practices to address unemployment and social exclusion.¹³⁻¹⁵ As much as €308bn has been set aside by the Commission to fund projects in all member states over the period 2007-2013.

Policies to tackle social exclusion, however, have also been subject to vigorous criticism, particularly in the UK. Atkinson and Kintrea¹⁶ cast aspersions on those strategies that result in public housing being replaced by

owner-occupied housing. Burchardt *et al.*¹⁷ provide data on four different attributes that are commonly associated with social exclusion (incomes, socially valued activity, collective engagement and social interaction). Their work highlights that local income is the most significant factor in social exclusion, although the causal relationship between low income and its effect on other attributes is difficult to specify with any precision. Byrne¹⁸ also highlights income inequality as the most significant causal factor. As he writes, 'income inequality matters in any consideration of social exclusion because income is both the basis of social participation through consumption and a reflection of the power of people in their economic roles'. The implication is that estate-based physical regeneration policies are an insufficient policy instrument to address the wider problems associated with social exclusion (see, for instance, Kleinman⁸ and Randolph and Judd¹⁹). Overall, the studies suggest that addressing income inequality through tax breaks, income redistribution and work incentives are some of the most effective ways of addressing inequality and exclusion, lending support to structuralist perspectives.

Neoliberal perspectives

Another perspective is that governments should actually seek ways of strengthening market mechanisms. Saunders and Tsumori²⁰ argue, for example, that the operation of the housing market encourages first-time homebuyers to seek out cheaper property in deprived areas. This process frequently referred to as gentrification can result in additional resources to deprived neighbourhoods and other beneficial outcomes. For instance, local schools in newly gentrified neighbourhoods benefit

from an intake of middle-class pupils and, in turn, there are more employment opportunities for the local workforce through increased demand for business services. Proponents of market mechanisms, such as Saunders and Tsumori, argue that the most effective policies are those that seek to assist poor residents to leave deprived neighbourhoods. They criticise contemporary welfare policies that inadvertently reinforce a dependency culture and suggest that tax credits and other mechanisms to encourage the long-term unemployed to take up work should be considered.

This paper has provided summaries of the competing theories that inform housing regeneration policies to make explicit the rationales that inform contemporary policy. It is also helpful for discussing the authors' own theoretical orientation, adopted in reporting the case study analysis, which is generally akin to a structuralist perspective. The authors therefore share the concerns of commentators such as Moulaert *et al.*⁹ that managerial responses to housing regeneration are not in themselves capable of addressing the negative effects of neoliberal economic policies. In particular, the primacy accorded to reign in welfare expenditure has repercussions for economically deprived public housing neighbourhoods. While sympathetic to a structuralist perspective for *understanding* the interface between policy and the wider economy, however, the authors recognise that housing agencies' have no alternative but to pursue area-based solutions to housing-related problems. In this respect, they are supportive of social inclusion policies that prioritise additional funds for service delivery and housing regeneration.

The next section describes the aims of the current research study and the methodology that was deployed.

CASE STUDIES: AIMS AND METHODS

The aim of the case studies was to explore the degree to which exit strategies and related notions about sustaining the benefits of regeneration are being factored into contemporary regeneration programmes. Five regeneration projects formed the case studies for the research, as detailed in Table 1.

The case study projects were specifically chosen on the basis that they contain recent and current examples of contemporary practices embracing regeneration, resident participation and mixed development schemes. The case studies therefore provide a platform for discussing challenges that arise in sustaining the benefits of regeneration projects not just in Australia, but elsewhere. The data collection in each case study consisted of eight semi-structured interviews with housing and regeneration professionals and one focus group discussion with tenants and community representatives (ten interviewees per discussion).

Interpretative methods²¹ were used to provide a richness and depth of understanding about how senior housing officers and tenants view the practical and strategic issues involved in the development of exit strategies. In setting up the focus groups, consultation was undertaken with the SHAs and tenant peak bodies to ensure that the recruitment was broadly representative of the estates. Focus groups provided an appropriate method for gauging the long-term aspirations and expectations of the regeneration process among tenants/community representatives and also to hear their perspectives of how they felt the benefits could be best sustained after the regeneration process has formally finished. Tenants' and community

representatives' views were also sought on the capacity to provide an input into regeneration programmes and the issues that were most important to them. The value of focus groups, for these purposes, was that they enabled a range of views to be identified as they generated interactive discussion about the scope and limitations of tenant involvement. All interviews and focus groups were tape-recorded to ensure accuracy of data collection.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted with SHA officers involved in regeneration policy and strategy development, and regional/local housing managers with direct input into the case study regeneration projects on the ground. The interviews explored how current practices were organised and sought to understand the complex roles performed by key actors in regeneration policy, and to elicit their views on current practices and discuss with them the kind of work that was necessary to develop coherent exit strategies.

FINDINGS

The findings are summarised thematically under headings that encapsulate the range of regeneration practices utilising some quotations to illustrate the findings, beginning with a discussion on the expectations of regeneration outcomes, before moving on to discuss how exit strategies are understood, followed by the role of community involvement in their development and, finally, the problems that may arise with implementing exit strategies.

Conceptualising regeneration – expectations

Across every case study site, there was a perception among interviewees that the

Table 1: Housing and urban regeneration paradigms

Paradigm	Rationale	Prescription	Examples	Comments
Structuralist perspectives	Market-based government policies accentuate spatial inequality Global and economic restructuring is a major cause of inequality	More interventionist role for Government More resources for deprived communities Fiscal redistributive policies	No recent examples but actively promotes universal modes of social housing provision rather than selective targeting	Critique highly influential in academic quarters but little practical influence in contemporary policy making
Neoliberal perspectives	Underclass and cycle of disadvantage theories	Lower tax base to encourage business investment, public housing for only those with acute needs switch of resources to individual subsidies rather than bricks and mortar	Home ownership first time buyers grant Commonwealth rental subsidies in preference to public housing provision Tight controls on government subsidies Encouragement of private finance/control as an alternative investment stream in regeneration	Policies generally supported by Commonwealth Government. In particular, the targeting of resources to those most in housing need Underlying assumption that public housing reinforces social disadvantage Privatisation (ie asset disposal) Support for individuals to exit public housing
Environmentalist perspectives	Physical layout of public estates accentuates crime and anti-social behaviour	Focus on design and physical improvement to housing	Modification to ameliorate poor design, eg system built housing estates	Influential in the 1980s but now mostly seen as a limited response
Social exclusion/inclusion perspectives	Problems within public housing localities are multi-faceted and require a range of policy interventions that are focussed at the level of neighbourhood Lack of 'joined up government' thinking and action	Area-based policies aimed at addressing social exclusion, including urban regeneration projects and mixed development schemes	New Social inclusion Units SHAs area regeneration programmes Tenant empowerment policies to enhance social capital Employment and training schemes	Model deployed in the UK and European Community. Now being promoted by some Australian SHAs

Table 2: Key characteristics of the case study regeneration projects

Project	Location	Start date	Key aspects	No. of social housing	Aims of project
Minto	NSW — Campbelltown in South Western Sydney	Designated for regeneration in mid-2003 — 10 to 15 year project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Early stage regeneration project — Public/private partnership 	398 dwellings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Reduce social housing to 30 per cent (800 private dwellings, 320 social housing)
Windale	NSW, Southern Newcastle	2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Has an Exit Strategy in form of Transition Plan — Whole of government project — Led by Premier's Department with Department of Housing involved 	1,600 social housing (77 per cent of total housing)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Not physical regeneration — aims to build community cohesion
The Parks	SA	1999 — 10 to 15 year project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Public-private partnership — Managed by private developer 	2,960 public housing dwellings (60 per cent of total housing in area)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Provide a better range of housing and mix of tenures — Employment and training activities — Improving local services and facilities
Salisbury North	SA	Mid 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Pilot project for 'whole of govt service delivery approach 	1,390 public housing dwellings (37 per cent of total)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Reduce public housing to 15 per cent through upgrading/ demolition/sale — Improve physical amenity of housing and n/hood — Employment and community development strategies
Bridgewater Urban Regeneration Project	Hobart, TAS	Initial physical regeneration in late 1990s UR project 1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Broad-acre estate — Resident-led to accompany earlier physical regeneration programme 	1,438 dwellings Over 45 per cent public rental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Foster tenant empowerment

What happens when the funding runs out?

neighbourhood, as a direct result of the regeneration activities, would experience the following improvements:

- greater level of stability among its public housing residents (ie reduced turnover)
- broader social mix
- reduced stigmatisation
- decreased anti-social behaviour
- improved quality of life for residents
- increased property values for homeowners
- higher levels of social capital and involvement in communal activities.

The comments below typify the views of housing professionals and tenants:

‘It will be a lot more attractive area to live in and I imagine that a lot of the social issues evident over the last decade will be lessened.’ (Housing officer, SA Salisbury North)
‘[will] re-establish community strengths and build social capital through the process.’ (Regeneration manager, NSW Minto)

Despite these expectations, none of the case study regeneration projects in South Australia (SA) or New South Wales (NSW) have formal exit strategies in place to assist in maintaining the benefits of regeneration.

In Tasmania (TAS), the perspective of interviewees was slightly different from those in NSW and SA, given that the former were engaged in what could be conceived of as an ‘active’ post-regeneration strategy. It is possible that this difference is because BURP (Bridgewater Urban Renewal Project) is a resident-led initiative. There was a general understanding that exit strategies involved ensuring that the benefits of regeneration activities were sustained in the longer term. Given this context, it is not surprising that the following view was typical of those offered.

‘This [BURP] has no exit. It implies that you’re going to leave. Isn’t that what exit means — leave? So we don’t want to leave.’ (BURP staff member, TAS)

Nevertheless, the development of what appears to function as an exit strategy for TAS occurred serendipitously rather than through good planning, and relied on the motivation of a particular individual who is no longer resident.

In other projects the common reason cited for not developing exit strategies was the long life of the projects. For instance, The Parks project runs for a total of 15 years and is currently only into its sixth year of implementation. Hence, the immediate focus is on redevelopment itself and not the period beyond its completion.

‘Probably because it is still ten years out, I don’t think anyone has given much thought to it [exit strategy].’ (Council officer, SA The Parks)

In SA, another reason cited for why exit strategies have not been developed is that the key agencies will still have a presence in the areas at the end of the projects:

‘There will always be public housing in Salisbury North, there will always be Council in there doing things ... The project might come to close, in terms of formal agreement between the Housing Trust and the Council, but the sustainability of what we’re doing continues ... an exit strategy presupposes that you’ve come in that then you leave, and I would question that from both major project partners’ perspectives.’ (Council officer, SA Salisbury North)

Although the estate regeneration programme in Minto in NSW had no explicit exit strategy in place at the time of the research, several respondents noted the importance of incorporating an exit

strategy from the outset of a regeneration programme. Others stressed the need for resident capacity building and support to form part of the exit strategy especially as tenants face the trauma of seeing their neighbours replaced around them.

Typical responses were:

‘Planning for the transition is also required rather than simply removing services as the number of tenants drop.’ (Department of Housing manager, NSW Minto)

‘There needs to be some ... dedicated people and resources to help through the transition and establish a new community ... but a full time worker costs \$100,000 per year.’

(Department of Housing project manager, NSW Minto).

The Windale project in NSW, though not having a specific exit strategy, had put in place a ‘Transition Plan’. The aim of this plan was to move the project from its initial coordination as a state Premier’s Department place management project to one where residents, in the form of an incorporated community body, take over the management of the scheme. This body will have responsibility to coordinate and develop new resident development initiatives but primarily with Department of Housing support. At the time of the research, this transition plan was only in the early stages of implementation.

Overall, the findings suggest that there is only a limited understanding from across the different stakeholders involved in the regeneration projects of what exit strategies entail, when they should commence or agreement about whether they are even necessary. At present, there is no explicit ‘exit strategy’ in place in the Tasmanian or South Australian case studies or in Minto in NSW. The Transition Plan in the Windale estate in NSW, however, was functioning as an exit strategy and pointed to the value of

having this kind of arrangement in place to carry over the programme of resident capacity building beyond the end of a formal period of intervention.

Resident involvement and exit strategies

Interviewees identified positions such as the Neighbourhood Development Officers (NDO) as essential in terms of building resident capacity and resources and linked the ongoing funding of these positions to issues of maintaining the benefits of regeneration in the longer term. Some fears were expressed that, at the conclusion of the regeneration projects, the neighbourhood cohesion that has been established would disintegrate if these positions were abandoned:

‘There seems to be a need to have someone cracking the whip and saying this is what you should be doing, this is community.’ (Housing officer, SA Salisbury North)

There was general anxiety in the projects about long-term funding commitments and where funding for resident development would come from after regeneration projects are completed. Residents at Salisbury North, for instance, suggested that an important part of an exit strategy and the transition of the Community Reference Group to an independent Progress Association, would be planning for ‘who do we approach to get money from, where are we going to get it’. Similarly, at Bridgewater, attracting revenue was an important priority for the current project director. Currently, BURP receives funds from Brighton Council and Housing Tasmania, but these funds are set on an annual basis, so it was difficult for BURP to engage in long-term strategic planning because of the uncertainty over funding.

'There is core funding that comes from housing and there is some money the council puts in. I think I am comfortable with that but the rest of it is project driven and I guess you are working constantly to try and achieve extra money.' (BURP Director, TAS Bridgewater)

The limitations of exit strategies

The problems at Windale in implementing the Transition Plan for resident ownership of the regeneration process pointed to some of the issues that can arise with exit strategies. Specifically, difficulties arise if the exit strategy is not implemented with enough time and funds to ensure all resident elements are effectively brought into the process. In this case, from the viewpoint of residents, the Transition Plan was devised too late on in the three-year programme to be fully embedded, and resources were limited:

'They should have been working on this well before.' (Community worker, NSW Minto)

Overall, respondents thought that, if problems arose, they would probably relate to the resident development aspects rather than physical housing outcomes. It was emphasised that, if the effort was made at the start in developing programmes in areas such as employment, parenting and vocational training and monitoring outcomes, there would be less likelihood that problems would arise when the project finishes:

'I cannot imagine the last day the last block of land is sold everything falls in. I think we'd be seeing some warning signs.' (Housing officer, SA The Parks)

'It's necessary to keep the community involved from the start, if we keep things basic and for the people then we will succeed.' (Resident, TAS Bridgewater)

In general, stakeholders and residents appear to have similar expectations about

who will continue to deliver all the services needed once regeneration projects are formally completed. There is an expectation among regeneration partners that local councils should be the lead partners responsible for resident development activities once the redevelopment process has completed. The one exception was in Windale, where the NSW Department of Housing remains the majority owner of the estate and whose role in maintaining a resident development strategy remains substantial. Nevertheless, even there, once the Premier's Department's involvement recedes, the local Council will assume a more significant profile, together with other key government and non-government service agencies.

The need for exit strategies?

Our penultimate observation concerns the perception of the need for exit strategies in the context of social inclusion policy. Several respondents, mainly staff from the SHAs involved, questioned the need for such a concept. Essentially, they saw themselves as still being involved in the area, albeit on a reduced scale, once the regeneration process had ended. Hence, from their perspective, there was no real need for an exit strategy. Such a view was most evident in the locations where the majority of new residents were home purchasers. This group was probably more outwardly mobile than the residents they replaced and were perceived of as being more self-sufficient. Hence, there would be no need for the extensive resident supports and services that public housing tenants would both need and expect once the area was dominated by homeowners. In the context of a completely different neighbourhood profile, what the function of an exit strategy would be in these

cases will need to be carefully defined. Would the strategy be for the remaining tenants only or for the whole neighbourhood?

The lessons from the case study projects on developing exit strategies

Overall the experiences of the case study projects suggest the following four lessons about what works well and the pitfalls to avoid in implementing exit strategies. First, the earlier on in the project that such strategies are considered, the better the chances that the transition of an estate into a new community will be managed successfully. Problems that may be encountered in implementing an exit strategy include: uncertainty of budgets, which limits opportunities for forward planning; difficulties in coordinating effective service delivery across different agencies once the regeneration programme has ended; and resolving conflicts between various stakeholders in a community. Second, ideally, local residents, government agencies and other relevant stakeholders should be involved in the planning and development of an exit strategy. Third, the development of exit strategies seems to have been most effective where one skilled person coordinated the planning process and was able to bring these stakeholders together. Fourth, the longer the timescales allowed for the development and embedding of appropriate exit strategies during the lifetime of the renewal project, the greater the likelihood of a successful transition beyond the end of the project.

CONCLUSION: POLICY AND MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

At the start of the paper, the most influential theoretical paradigms that

inform urban regeneration were discussed. The authors also made explicit their own perspective, which draws upon a structuralist framework for understanding urban regeneration but is also broadly supportive of social inclusion policies in terms of practice. The empirical component of the paper outlined how the key actors in regeneration projects (housing and regeneration professionals and tenants) conceptualise exit strategies and the expectations that they have about their potential. It also explored the ways in which exit strategies can facilitate tenant involvement, particularly when the funds for projects come to an end and finally the limitations of exit strategies as a model for planning. This final section of the paper sets out the key policy and management findings that emerge from the empirical study.

First, it is evident that, despite the myriad urban regeneration projects, exit strategies are not well developed in projects included in this study or, indeed, more widely in Australia and other nation states. Moreover, it is evident that it was only when projects were beginning to reach maturity that the need for such strategies became obvious. It should be noted, however, that, despite the international literature stressing the need for such strategies, it is also the case that there are relatively few examples of these strategies being implemented in comparable projects in other Australian jurisdictions.

Second, in each of the regeneration projects examined, resident capacity building is promoted as an important component of policies designed to address social exclusion. It has yet to be seen, however, whether sufficient numbers of residents have the capacity, time or interest in maintaining a direct involvement, once the regeneration project is completed. Indeed, respondents

considered the idea that the task of neighbourhood development might be simply passed to some form of resident grouping without sufficient support and resources as highly problematic.

Third, the issue of adequate funding is at the core of all housing regeneration projects and constituted a major theme running through the discussion on exit strategies. Many interviewees assumed that additional resources would be needed beyond the regeneration programme itself — whether this was in the form of a budget to fund resident led group, a project development worker or ‘place manager’. The issue then arises as to how long such support should continue, and where long-term funding for such positions might be sought. Given the reluctance of government agencies to commit to long-term funding of such posts, this remains a problematic area of regeneration practice. Of course, much depends on the nature of the regeneration programme and the profile of the neighbourhood that is formed at the end of the process. In many cases, it is likely that neighbourhoods dominated by homeowners will have very different needs and service requirements from the ones they replace.

Fourth, in spite of the utility of exit strategy planning, there is no ‘ideal’ prototype that can be applied to all situations. Each regeneration project will have different objectives, different funding arrangements, different time scales and mixes of physical and neighbourhood regeneration interventions. As such, each project or programme will need to develop its own approach to how the transition into the post-regeneration period is managed and the resident benefits of the process maintained. Nevertheless, most respondents felt that such strategies are required in some form.

Finally, staff were clear that

regeneration outputs are more likely to be sustained when housing organisations commence exit strategies at an early stage of the project. Policies specifically established to mitigate the effects of social exclusion are likely to be most effective when long-term issues are addressed. Exit strategies, while not a panacea for overcoming structural inequalities, nonetheless provide a *modus operandi* that can, with sufficient resources, enhance the capacity of area-based regeneration approaches.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful for the funds provided by the Australian Housing and Research Institute that made it possible to undertake this research project and to the tenants, community workers and housing professionals who kindly gave up their time to share their expertise.

Notes and References

1. See, for instance, Arthurson, K. (2003), ‘Neighbourhood Regeneration: Facilitating Community Involvement’, *Urban Policy and Research*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 357–372; and Jacobs, K., Marston, G. and Darcy, M. (2003), ‘Changing The Mix: a Case Study of Housing Stock Transfers in Victoria, New South Wales and Tasmania’, paper presented to the National Housing Conference, Adelaide, November.
2. Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision (2000), ‘Report on Government Services 2000’, Ausinfo, Canberra.
3. Family and Community Services (FACS) (2003) ‘Housing Assistance Act 1996 Annual Report 2001–02’, Australian Government Publishing Services, Canberra.
4. Badcock, B. (1995), ‘Towards more equitable cities’ in Troy, P. (ed.) ‘Australian cities — issues, strategies and policies for urban Australia in the 1990s’, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne.
5. Atkinson, R. (1999), ‘Urban Crisis: New Policies for the Next Century’ in Allmendinger, P. and Chapman, M. (eds) ‘Planning in the millennium’, John Wiley, London.
6. Anderson, I. and Sim, D. (2000), ‘Social Exclusion and Housing: an Introduction’, in Anderson, I. and Sim, D. (eds) ‘Social exclusion: context and challenges’, Chartered Institute of Housing, Coventry, pp. 1–21.
7. Arthurson, K. (2001), ‘Achieving Social Justice in Estate Regeneration: The Impact of Physical

- Image Construction', *Housing Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 6, pp. 807–826.
8. Kleinman, M. (1998), 'Include Me Out? The New Politics of Place and Poverty', Paper No. 11 Centre for Policy Analysis, London School of Economics
 9. Moolaert, F., Swyngedouw, E. and Rodriguez, A. (2001), 'Large-scale Urban Development Projects and Local Governance: from Democratic Urban Planning to Besieged Local Governance', *Geographische Zeitschrift*, Vol. 8, Nos 2–3, pp. 71–84.
 10. Andersen, H. (2002), 'Can Deprived Housing Estates Be Revitalised? Efforts Against Segregation and Decay in Denmark and Europe', *Urban Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 4, pp. 767–790.
 11. Arthurson, K. and Jacobs, K. (2003), 'Social exclusion and housing', AHURI Final Report.
 12. European Commission (2007), 'The Community Strategic Guidelines on Cohesion 2007–2013', available at http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/2007/osc/index_en.htm, last accessed on 4th July 2007.
 13. Van Kempen, R., Dekker, K., Hall, S. and Tosics, I. (2005), 'Restructuring large housing estates in Europe', The Policy Press, Bristol.
 14. Madanipour, A. (2004), 'Marginal public spaces in European cities', *Journal of Urban Design*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 267–286,
 15. Maloutas, T. (2003), 'Promoting social sustainability', *City*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 167–181.
 16. Atkinson and Kintrea (2001), 'Disentangling Area Effects: Evidence from Deprived and Non-deprived Neighbourhoods', *Urban Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 12, pp. 2277–2298.
 17. Burchardt, T., Le Grand, J. and Piachaud, D. (2002), 'Degrees of Exclusion: Developing a Dynamic, Multidimensional Measure', in Burchard, T., Le Grand, J. and Piachaud, D. (eds) 'Understanding social exclusion', Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 30–43.
 18. Byrne, D. (1999), 'Social exclusion', Open University Press, Buckingham, p. 79
 19. Randolph, B. and Judd, B. (2000), 'Community renewal and large housing estates', *Urban Policy and Research*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 91–104.
 20. Saunders, P. and Tsumori, K. (2002) 'Poor Concepts, 'Social Exclusion', Poverty and the Politics of Guilt', *Policy*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 32–37.
 21. Travers, M. (2001) 'Qualitative research through case studies', Sage, London.