

More than bricks and mortar:

Attempts at integrated community services in two South Australian urban renewal projects

Mario Trinidad
Place Manager
Playford North Urban Renewal Project
Housing SA
Department for Families and Communities

Outline

- Urban renewal: general remarks
- Salisbury North Urban Improvement Project
- Families Empowered to Act to Together (FEAT)
- Playford North Urban Regeneration Project
- Playford Alive Community Master Plan
- Conclusion: some learnings

Urban Renewal

“Contemporary Australian urban regeneration policies, aimed at disadvantaged public housing neighbourhoods, are generally concerned with the issue of balancing **social mix** to create more socio-economically diverse communities. These urban renewal programs have undertaken a **broad mix of renewal activity**, ranging from outright physical redevelopment and stock replacement for sale, to community development type initiatives to improve social and employment outcomes for residents...”

Ruming, Kristian (2006) MOSAIC Urban Renewal Evaluation Project Kensington, NSW: University of New South Wales, p. 9

Urban Regeneration

Redevelopment is seen by many State Housing Authorities as a solution to multiple problems confronting estate developments, “low-income mono-tenure neighbourhoods”: --

- lack of access to social networks
- poverty
- high crime rates
- low education retention rates
- poor health
- inadequate access to housing
- poor public transport
- postcode prejudice

Decreased access to a range of health, education and community services due to service overload within particular areas or outright absence .


Social Capital, Individual and Community Resilience

Arthurson, K (2004). Creating Inclusive Communities Through Balance in Social Mix: A Critical Relationship or Tenuous Link. Urban Policy and Research, 20, 3, 245-261.
Carley, Michael (2002), Community Regeneration and Neighbourhood renewal: a Review of the Evidence. Edinburgh: Communities Scotland, p. 4.

Salisbury North Urban Improvement Project

- A 10-year joint initiative of the South Australian Housing Trust and the City of Salisbury (1998 - 2008) in response to social and economic disadvantage and social decline.

Overarching vision:
to improve environmental and housing quality, social wellbeing and the economic viability of Salisbury North as an attractive and desirable living environment well integrated with surrounding communities



Families Empowered to Act Together

- Initial three-year (2002 - 2005) funding of the Department of Human Services to the City of Salisbury: *Integration of Services to Families with Young Children*
- Model was born out of “structured conversations” between state agencies (12) and City of Salisbury: strengths-based, voluntary, confidential, non-stigmatising, and time-limited **intensive intervention with families experiencing multiple difficulties**
- Funded by contributions of partners and auspiced by Salisbury Community Health Centre.
- SACHRU 2008 Evaluation



Playford North Urban PLAYFORD *Alive* Renewal Project

Our Aspiration:

Playford Alive is creating a new diverse, integrated and sustainable community in northern Adelaide. Through world's best practice in urban and community development, this will be a place where innovation and opportunities thrive – Playford Alive.

The community has envisaged their future and they aspire for their community to be modern, attractive, connected, green and sustainable, healthy, safe and active.



Integration of services

Communication	Co-operation	Co-ordination	Coalition	Integration
Low level collaboration		High level collaboration		
Limited or no formal agreement Agencies remain autonomous Work towards different targets & goals Agency maintains control of resources & funding Staff managed by individual service Focus on individual case Decision-making responsibility of agency Collaboration likely to be voluntary or within guidance Variable practice dependent on individual Affiliation to own agency/discipline Accountable to agency		Formal agreements Agencies sacrifice autonomy Work to shared goals & targets Joint responsibility for resources & funding Staff managed by partnership Focus on whole service Joint decision-making Clear mandate for collaboration at government or state level Specific focus of activity outlined in strategic plans Affiliation to partnership plans Accountable to partnership		
Agency-focused		Collaboration-focused		

Howarth, Jan & Tony Morrison (2007), Collaboration, integration and change in children's services: critical issues and key ingredients, *Child Abuse and Neglect* 31, 55-69

Conclusion: some learnings

- Social infrastructure may not be an afterthought
- Integration is 'locality-based'
- Integration is 'messy': poetry in motion
- In integration the process – relationship-building – determines the success, strength, and sustainability of the outcome