

Peter Mez ([00:00](#)):

Good afternoon and welcome to Housing three point north. My name is Peter Mez, and it's a real pleasure to chair this conversation with Michael and Charles Landry. Our topic here is Housing three point north, but I anticipate we're going to expand that to cities three point north, because while Michael is a housing person, Charles is a city person. And of course there's a close connection between those two things. And that's implicit in the questions that we've been asked to discuss here today. Could there ever be such a thing as citizens in that housing? And what would that mean for cities? Would we citizens become the developers, the builders, the landlords, as well as the tenants. And could we develop truly inclusive models of collaborative governments, governance in group housing? Will this be the way of the future? So let me introduce, Michael is going to talk first and then Charles, I'm going to introduce Michael first.

Peter Mez ([00:54](#)):

And then when I come to Charles, I'll introduce him more fully. Otherwise you've got to forget who he is by the time Michael's finished speaking. So Michael is managing director of housing choices, Australia. It's an organization he established in 2008, left in 2012 and returned to in 2014. And he's also the national chair of the community housing industry association, a member of the south Australian planning commission, a trustee of the history trust of south Australia, and much more besides, and he's worked internationally and a CEO of the Glasgow housing association, nor girl CEO of New Zealand housing corporation. So I think fair to sum up his ethos in the following terms, that Michael is committed to utilizing a mix of commercial and government investment to make housing affordable, safe, and accessible for the most marginalized members of the community. Michael, given that background, I hope that's a fair introduction. What might citizen led housing? Three-Point not

Michael Lennon ([01:48](#)):

Okay. Well, to begin, we might just go through some very basic statistics about our current housing circumstances in Australia. This is just a summary of our plethora of graphs and diagrams that could bore you to death, but you should be alarmed by these statistics less than 1% of houses for rent in greater Sydney are no class affordable by international standards. And then the international measure is paying 30% or less of housing costs. So 30, 30% or less of household income in housing costs either in rent or mortgages. The gap between supply and demand is estimated to be between 370 and 527,000 dwellings. This is because over the last 15 years, we haven't produced enough housing supply to keep up with demand. And the economists tend to think that is almost the sole explanation for why we've got this escalation in house prices.

Michael Lennon ([02:48](#)):

The Grattan Institute estimate that if we did build an extra 50,000 dwellings a year, the, the reduction in house prices could be somewhere between five and 20% water would otherwise be. But the real issue is that the impact of this is felt disproportionately across income distribution. So we talk about income and distribution across five Quintiles and up to what is the, the end of the second quintile, about 80% of average incomes. That's where we see the greatest proportion of housing stress. Now in all capital cities or all low-income households are in housing stress. And it's very common for people now to be spending 40, 50, 60% of household income in their housing costs. Historically we've relied upon public and social housing in Australia in order to deal with people who are most marginalized. So 7.1% of households in 1991 were housed in public or social housing that has now gone down to 4%.

Michael Lennon ([03:55](#)):

And we're now amongst the lowest in the OECD. And in fact, Melbourne progressive Melbourne is no. In fact has the lowest proportion of public housing. This is felt disproportionately across the different kinds of tenures. The biggest single change is the emergence of a group of people who will rent for life. So one in three households ranked privately, and that number is up from 27% barely. 25 years ago, homeownership rates are falling across every age cohort under 65 and most seriously amongst young people. So the critical age cohort in terms of accessing home ownership is between 25 and 34. That's typically when households form when people have children. And in that group, we're seeing the sharpest fall in home homeownership, but importantly, at the other end of the spectrum, we're also seeing large proportions of retirees be in the private rental market for all of their lives and public housing numbers.

Michael Lennon ([05:00](#)):

In terms of actual physical numbers are no less than 400,000. That's the same number of roughly 20 years ago, but our population has increased by a third. During that time, the implications of this are tremendously serious. So for wealth in Australia, for the vast majority of the population, there are two things that matter. One is homeownership, and one is superannuation. Now what we're seeing is for young people, 25 to 34 to 35 to 44, increasingly stranded in the private rental market, but also because of the casualization of work, we see them with extraordinary, low superannuation balances. So what we're talking about is a wave and not a small wave, our big wave across the Australia of people being excluded from home ownership and being in the private rental market. Now, the question is, what do we do about that? And how are we simply destined to the whims of government and that taxation can concessions and the way in which we treat capital gains, what we would say is no, there is an alternative that between the market and government, that is what is internationally terms of civil society, where self-organized groups in this case, the regulated not-for-profit sector is able to blend and, and Shandy income and assets from different sources to produce stock.

Michael Lennon ([06:27](#)):

So the only non-market housing, which has grown in Australia in the last 10 years is community housing up from 38,000 dwellings to 80. And we have a plan Peter to build another 200,000 over the next 10 years. Okay. Okay.

Peter Mez ([06:46](#)):

We'll come back to that plan for community housing. Let me now introduce our second speaker, Charles Landry and international authority on the use of imagination and creativity and urban change is currently a fellow at the Robert Bosch academy in Berlin is the author of many books, including the creative city, the toolkit for urban innovators. And since the 1980s, his concept of the creative city has been developed into a global movement, I guess, to help cities, to think plan and act with imagination, to solve problems and develop opportunities. And clearly in Australia, one of the problems we have is with housing. So Charles,

Charles Landry ([07:22](#)):

As you know I know less about housing and I focus more on the overall setting and stuff like that. But I think context is everything. A lot of what Michael just said is completely true in many countries in Europe. So I don't need to repeat that the same trends that you're talking about, but I do think there is a context in Liverpool, just as a random example, because it begins with the letter L you giving houses

away or Darlington in Britain, you give houses away because they're just not worth anything, even buy a house for \$5,000 or something like that in London, you know, where my son lives, 2 million, you know, whatever, just for an apartment. And so that same problem is happening unless you're well off, have a middle-class parent in a place like London, who's dying and you inherit something. You can then buy an apartment and simplifying.

Charles Landry (08:14):

Obviously, if you're very rich, you can then help your kids buy an apartment. So that is the general trend, which then is creating from a city perspective, taking London as an example, a vast spread further out, further out, further out, further out. But in the case of London, there is a green belt, which in, in theory is protected. So therefore people jump that and then therefore commuting times get longer and longer and longer. And you see people having strange lives. That's why also another effect of that is more people are trying to work from home telecommuting and all of that, which is creating all these other effects. There's a lot to say about that. If one wishes, so the Vortec cities, a typical one is Amsterdam, Lisbon Berlin, or something like that. So Lisbon, just as an example, you know, cities are fashion items now there's but sunny speak a bit of English comparison, London, Berlin prices, Lanvin, all capital moves in four or five years later, that same process has happened.

Charles Landry (09:19):

That's the last big city where that's happened at the speed of light. The next one, where it will happen in my prediction is Athens got a bit of heritage, dah, dah, all of that, the sun shining you can operate digitally. And it's about to happen there, even though we all talk about the Greek crisis. So that's moving around Europe, really at an incredible speed. At the same time, there are more cities in Europe that are shrinking. So all of these dynamics we're talking about, then you can, then you can actually renting is a good idea because it's, it's, it's relatively speaking cheaper. So we have to make certainly in the European context, that sharp distinction between those that are growing and those that are declining. And in those that are declining, you actually want some form of gentrification, which of course you don't want in the vortex cities, because then it is raising prices far too high.

Charles Landry (10:15):

And of course, that cohort you're talking about, which is even bigger. The under forties, frankly, have no chance at an average job of buying something, which is why there's all this pressure to go from the old model, which was the council house model, private model to these old alternative models. But they're not actually alternative. These are just old ideas that have, that seemed fresh because mutual housing and all of that was a big thing. I said it would only speak for four minutes, but can I just mention one point because you say housing 3.0. It's just quite interesting because in one of my books, doesn't matter. I talk about the city 1.0 2.0 3.0. And if you then go on 4, 5, 6, so it'd be someone we'll talk about 7.0. But anyway, the net, the simple thing is the city 1.0. If you just think back, leaving aside that every city is different than that 0.0 is the hardware driven city, hardware driven infrastructure, no sense of aesthetics, building more warehousing.

Charles Landry (11:24):

That's what it feels like. Think of Hong Kong, et cetera, et cetera, cultural institution blobs in the landscape when we're all not able to go there, et cetera, 2.0 we're beginning to be a bit more participative in terms of how we plan and think the words begin to change from things like transport to mobility from spatial planning to placemaking. So you're getting a completely different concept of how

things work. And also there's 2.0 is also the thing where we think we could build an icon and there's the Bilbao effect. Yeah, let's have a good time in Adelaide type stuff. The 3.0 city is really the attempt that what we're now talking about, which is that idea that people can be, make a shape as co-creators of their own environment. And that feeds that deep yearning, that you can see everywhere for people to rethink levels of involvement and the whole notion of the participative imperative. And so all of what we're talking about, that the qualities of 3.0 as far as I'm concerned is in, within that drive. And it's not only the poor we're talking about. I'm assuming it's a whole raft of people, enough of me.

Peter Mez ([12:40](#)):

Okay. Fabulous introduction from both of you. And I'm going to pick up on some of those issues and, and come back to some of them. I was struck when you were talking about Lisbon and also about the landmark effect, that Bilbao effect by the comparison with Hobart at the moment where, you know, interstate capital rather than foreign capital is flooding in because the returns on rental on the rent, the housing is cheap relative to the main land. And the rental returns are good. There's not 0.3% vacancy rate in Hobart at the moment. That is, that means there's no nothing to rent, absolutely nothing to rent anywhere. And you can get about much better return on Airbnb because everyone coming to Mona, then you can renting out to a low-income Tasmanian family, where of course wages are the lowest in Australia. So that's, I think an example of be careful what you wish for, or at least manage the complexities of what, of what you do, which for

Michael Lennon ([13:30](#)):

My organization operates about 1500 dwellings in Tasmania, both in Hobart, in the Northwest and Devonport Burnie. And what has occurred, there is a perfect illustration of two things. One is the mobility of capital and how quickly money can go from one place to another. So in this case the Sydney market has peaked. So the investors go for where they can make a quick return, but the second issue is why are they making that return? And it's it's because in the 1980s, we made a fundamental shift and as is often the case fundamental shifts often appear in only in retrospect, we didn't quite understand at the time, but when we said that we could do two things, you could you could negatively gear. You can offset the difference between the rental return and the cost of money, you know, investment mortgage, payment, mortgage, interest rates. And secondly you get a 50% discount on capital gains made for the first time in Australia, we moved in a substantive way from housing being essentially about shelter and a place to bring up a family, to housing, being primarily an investment. So those decisions in the 1980s caused the sudden escalation, which has been going on ever since.

Peter Mez ([14:47](#)):

So in there, Michael though, one of the factors now is that interest rates are so low. So this dynamics being built in, but even if we get rid of negative gearing and we change the capital gains tax discount, it'll, it'll help it'll end or make government \$5 billion, which they could spend on community housing. We'll come back to that. But, but in fact, the, with interest rates so low, the imperative remains even when you get rid of those things, right?

Michael Lennon ([15:09](#)):

Well, if interest rates can only go one way, so interest rates will go up at some stage historically and we'll then have the fallout from that part of which will I suspect be a reduction in real terms of housing prices and hopefully a reduction in rental costs. And, and it's true that we will see that, that, that would happen to some extent, no matter what, but importantly, underneath all of this, the biggest problem,

we actually have four people in the bottom, two Quintiles of income distribution is simply the absence of supply. So if, for example, we reduced we took away in a phased way, like not upsetting everyone who had made an investment in the last 25 years in property. But we said from now on, there will be no capital gains concession. And we, and we reduced the impact of negative gearing. The impact on the federal budget would be at least \$5 billion a year. Within four years. Now we spend \$1.3 billion on the national affordable housing agreement. We would have four times the amount of outlay to arrest the decline in non-market stock and begin the assembly of a substantial pool of community housing across the country.

Peter Mez ([16:27](#)):

So, so tell somebody, come to you, then you talked about a number of factors that happen with cities that they expand outwards, and then you have the problems of commuting to jobs and, and in a knowledge economy, service-based economies, jobs tend to cluster in central city areas or central hubs. So you get this dislocation between where people live and where the jobs are. Now, there's two ways to, well, there's many ways to approach that, but one would be to say, okay, well we need to massively invest in public transport so people can get more easily from where they live to, where they work. Another would be to say, actually, we need to move the jobs to where people live. And a third would be to say, no, we need to consolidate the inner urban area, the established suburbs. So in Adelaide, I'm talking Burnside, I'm talking, I'm Lee, I'm talking, Norward, I'm talking. And we need to basically transform the housing, separate houses on the individual blocks into medium rise, medium density living. So, which is the best way forward. If any of things, do

Charles Landry ([17:31](#)):

You think all of those things are happening simultaneously? Of course. So in the case of Britain, of course, people are then trying to make the Birmingham's and the, the Manchesters and all of that. You know, they're shifting out jobs in, in, in that way. However, just from a wealth point of view, whatever we say about all these London is getting richer and richer and richer and richer in comparison. So that that shift is happening. Plus the public transport thing. I reducing mental geography in terms of fast trains and all of that, the whole discussion is very much what is the journey? Like? What is the train itself? Like? Can you make trains where you work? Obviously you can work on a train, but you know, a different level of what a train is. So a lot of, if you look at German trains and stuff, like some of them, it's just quite pleasant, you know, you can do things in them, so that's happening.

Charles Landry ([18:24](#)):

But the other thing that is also happening is those areas that we're seeing a bit like soldiers, of course, because people can't afford things. And perhaps these are younger people. They're also trying to do their stuff, trying to get jobs, trying to do startups. They are more and more becoming places. So what you're getting is if you look at then a map of places, it's less just the simple idea of one hub, which is called the central hub. There, there, there, there tend to be more hubs. One point, can I just come back to the Airbnb thing? Paris has the largest amount of Airbnbs in, in, in Europe, you know, 67,000. But these are all being taken out of the housing market in Berlin. It's 22,000 apartments are being taken out, which is causing a real stress. So there's a movement between which started in Barcelona, Amsterdam, and Berlin to find different ways of controlling Airbnb.

Charles Landry ([19:23](#)):

So it's again wanting to go with the disruptive technology, the technology, the platform, and against it at the same time, because precisely five rentals of Airbnb is better than 30 days, rental two to a Berliner taking Berlin as an example. So you've got all these empty places. So there's what this is all about is creative law making. And in both Amsterdam and Berlin, there'd be legal challenges against in controlling Airbnb and the billing case. It's been one and also in the Amsterdam case, but that's, again, the Vortec city thing, which is probably your capital cities, but remember there are a hell of a lot of places where it's really, I really wouldn't say the word, but it's, there's

Peter Mez ([20:10](#)):

A, there's a very interesting website called inside ed Airbnb, which scrapes data off the Airbnb website and shows you, and you can look at Sydney and Melbourne on that, and it will show you that there's lots of Airbnb in desirable, parts of Sydney, you know, anywhere near the beaches, et cetera, which are already high rental but very little in Western Sydney. So it's very, its effects are not, it's very, you know, it's very

Michael Lennon ([20:33](#)):

Can I come back to the previous point that you made and Peter, but what is called aglomeration Alaric models here? So we can talk about the geography of this a little bit. So the agglomeration and affect the the clustering and the spatial clustering of, of related industries is a phenomenon Charles that we see in Western societies everywhere. And it's happening in places like Adelaide. And of course housing markets respond to that as well. The densification that we are seeing in my view is not driven by consumer preference. Preferences is largely driven by changes in, in the nature of households that we have. So the proportion of households with children has fallen dramatically and household, the household size has fallen. As women have been able to control their own fertility and all the rest of it. What we're now seeing, therefore historically is a, a significant change where if I can get the figures right, 12 years ago in Adelaide, 70% of new dwelling construction was happening on the fringe. 30% is, was infill as of last year. That figure is 80 20, the other way, 20 on the fringe, 80 and renewal, the same as happening in different proportions and other states, although Melbourne, for example, north and west, growing at the fastest rates since the gold rush,

Peter Mez ([21:49](#)):

But the inner city to going boom, upwards to direct AP suburbs. Not that we're acting on the Hawthorne well, we'll come back to that.

Michael Lennon ([21:59](#)):

The political economy of change, and who's prepared to allow this change to occur, but in places, places like Adelaide the future is not predetermined. We can shape these things substantially. And so things like transport investment can dramatically influence obviously the choices that people make because they have to get to work or leisure or whatever. However, that means you have to have land use planning and transport investment brought together. So out here on the front, we had an election recently where one of the issues was whether we should have a simple extension of the tram in one direction or not underneath. That was a deeper question that there is no plan for the tram in Adelaide, which I have tried to find, but there is no plan for where the tram goes next. Then I have my own views about where it should be, but sure as hell, if we did make that transport investment, we would know the land use affects desirable. Land use affects, would follow,

Peter Mez ([22:58](#)):

Okay. Which, which is, you know, raises questions about how much this is something that should be planned through government processes and how much it did something driven by this mysterious market. But let me, let me come back to the idea of citizenship and housing and cities and the idea of citizen engagement. And I'll put this question to both of you, what we mostly see, I would say, and I maybe I've got a Melbourne bias here, but mostly see in terms of citizen engagement with these issues of urban planning and housing development is, is opposition. So the engagement is primarily not in my backyard. It's a kind of, I don't want you know, medium density housing near me. I don't sit there, want social housing near me. You know, so, so citizen engagement, we love it. It's great as democratic, but what if it's actually going the wrong way if I can? Well, in my view, if it's pushing for the wrong things,

Charles Landry ([23:56](#)):

The wrong thing is in this instance are the wrong things would be opposing affordable housing

Peter Mez ([24:02](#)):

In locations, close to work and jobs and transport. For example, that would be the most obvious example. W

Charles Landry ([24:10](#)):

Well, I mean, there's obviously a vast move of because you're just picking up 1.1 version of citizens engagement, because there are many others which are actually really quite creative. You know, the ones that ultimately might be called tactical urbanism, you know, from gorilla gardening to whatever. So those forms of engagement will actually be not often they had no permission in a sense, and, and have made vast contributions if you add them all together. And I can think of lots of examples. I just came across an example in west Amsterdam, recently, a very poor area where there's a new thing, new law in the Netherlands, which is called the right to challenge. So you can challenge lots of things that the government does in the Netherlands, for example, running garbage. So this area has said, we want to run the garbage that will give us jobs. We will therefore make community. We will therefore earn the money from separating the waste. This was the first right to challenge one, that one. So there, you've got, I know I'm not directly answering your question, but I'm just trying to say there are various forms of citizens engagement, which are being really that very productive and more and more of those are happening. Of course not in my backyard is a phenomenon.

Michael Lennon ([25:35](#)):

This bigger question, Peter, of how can people work together to create something new and different? Is this child saying right with opportunity in every sense? When I was in Glasgow, one of the biggest things we had to deal with was this so-called pension day lenders. So basically, and we have them here. We have them in the shopping centers, you'll see them round the post offices on the day that the Centrecare checks come out, they were charging interest rates of between 320 and 360% for loans to poor people on the day that pension checks came out. And that's case, what we did undercover was to set up our own lending agency profiled by the bank of Scotland, where shamelessly, we were charging 48%, but it was a seventh of what was being charged. Otherwise. Now I use that as an example of responding to those things in different, in different ways. Mark Davidoff before was talking about electricity prices and a bit natural resource management in my organization. We've just done a study to say, if we bought, purchased all of our electricity behalf of our residents, we could save between 18 and 27% on electricity. If we paid for them and manage the debt issue behind that, we could save between

36 and 40%. So for low-income households, this is enormous amounts of money. So the next issue Peter is why can't we do that with that

Peter Mez ([27:05](#)):

Was because, well, and, and, and one of the, one of the arguments against it would be a libertarian free-market argument. You'll take away free choice, but that's, we won't go there.

Charles Landry ([27:13](#)):

Basically what we're saying, look, the market or zone will not solve the problems that we're talking about. That's an assumption, which is quite clear. So it's a question of what sort of regulation and incentives and what sort of forms we can create. But I think it will be responding to this new, not new, but this reinforced drive for wanting more control and more say ranging from things that are completely alternative. I mean, El Mira, sorry, another Dutch city. There's a whole range of places where they look at the housing and say, this is all a self-build, it looks crazy, but it's actually wonderful. There's a basic frame within which you operate, but you can do what you like now. That's not for the poor necessarily, but it is another one of these versions of people wanting more say, and more control.

Peter Mez ([27:58](#)):

And Michael, maybe you'd like to go to that too. Cause there's, there's a movement known as bowl group, which is a German term means it means building groups and in Melbourne and manifests in the Nightingale projects. And maybe we can have that PDF image or that slide if we could. There's a flicker. And this is where people come together. And instead of at the moment, what happens largely is you have a developer who says, well, I'll build these sorts of apartments and they need to get finance. So they need to spend a long time marketing it. And that adds massively to the cost because I've got to borrow and hold the land. And they build up a particular model of apartment that they think will hit the middle of the market. And this is people, individuals coming together and say, no, we want something different. We want shared spaces. We want high energy efficiency and we'll pull our money and employ our own architect and do it ourselves.

Michael Lennon ([28:47](#)):

So I'll just take two or three minutes. Nightingale is a, is a business in Melbourne run by five small architectural practices and is the most exciting new form of, I think of it as communitarianism in an urban sense that I've seen in Australia in recent years. And my organization has no that affordable housing partner. And we are hoping that Nightingale might come and do some projects with them. Matt Davis and the architect and Adelaide. But they've got four fundamental drivers. One is obviously about building houses. The second is about saving money. The third and most importantly, for many of them is about doing things in the most environmentally responsible way. And the fourth is about building community. Now, what they would say was when you are a standard developer starts to build something there's three factors. They might be interested in. You have the finance, the sustainability of the building and its quality.

Michael Lennon ([29:41](#)):

In, in livability terms, they would say those things, they equalize, this is the most significant slide. And it will take a little bit of time, but on the horizontal access of the series of contributing factors towards a development outcome. So you buy land, you get consultants, you market it, you set up display seats, and all of these things are savings that they take out, including the end profit. So this, this portion here



of the cost from here to here is the saving that they can make by doing these things themselves. And this represents 35% discount to market. And this is the kind of building. This is not these are not drawings. This is a building in north, got just north of Melbourne. And groups organize themselves to put the capital up, to build these, to own them individually, but they make trade off.

Michael Lennon ([30:35](#)):

They say, we're not going to have individual laundries. And in return for that, we'll have a, we'll have a shared laundry and we will build a rooftop garden. They don't have air conditioning, but what they do have is fabulous internal ventilation. They don't they don't have ceilings. And the standard way in which we put congresses in these are actually Polly's concrete, which gives them higher ceilings and exposed services, which have their own design characters. They don't use Chrome and Toms. They use raw brass, they have entirely mixed communities, dogs, and cats walk freely across that. Alaric, you would be pleased to know they've got a wine shop on the bottom, and these are the kinds of buildings now being constructed in the suburbs of Melbourne. So I third discount to market and and we are providing 15% rental accommodation for people with disabilities, people with mental health conditions and simply people who are escaping some kind of trauma. So these are the kinds of things available to us, Peter, with a bit of imagination. I mean, can

Charles Landry ([31:40](#)):

I just pick up a point on that? I mean, that's obviously a, a great example, but it fits in the bigger thing, what we're calling the shared economy, because if you actually calculate, what is the time was you actually used the car? How many times you use the hammer? How many hours a drill has 200 hours life? The average use of a drill of an individual is one hour. So of course, I mean, that's with practically every consumption. Good. And this is a version of that to some extent in the building. And so that logic that's, what's good. The reason why this is going to be popular is because we will recognize that madness. Yeah,

Peter Mez ([32:19](#)):

Michael, that bowel group model is very exciting, the Nightingale model, but you've got to have money to invest. So when your concern and my concern because I have a book about housing coming out in mid September is that the real, when we talk about the housing crisis in Australia, we're talking about the bottom 20% and maybe pushing up the bottom 30%. We're talking about people in rental accommodation, private rental accommodation. They don't have the capital to join this. So what's your solution there. Those

Michael Lennon ([32:47](#)):

Organizations need other parties, which historically has been government to essentially provide that accommodation on their, on their behalf. And it is important. Charles would say none of this, as he said before, none of this is new. The ideas are essentially being recycled in Britain. And in Australia, in the post-war era, we chose to deal with our non-market housing in particular kinds of ways to set up state-based institutions. So in the UK, we built council housing in the homes for heroes environment. After the second world war here, we created public housing authorities set up the Commonwealth state housing agreement. And in south Australia, we built the housing trust. One of the internationally, most successful organizations in a 50 year period in the last 15 years, those organizations have declined beyond belief. And as you might've seen recently in south Australia we have sold off 1500 million dollars worth of residential real estate from the housing trust over the last 14 years, 1500 million dollars.

Michael Lennon ([33:56](#)):

So when we say, why can't we do things when we used to do in the past is because we don't have the will to do them. So if we're not prepared to fund these out of state models there is an alternative and it isn't civil society. It is between the market and government where essentially self-motivated organizations made up of groups of people with, with the belief and the professionalism to organize themselves. And remember, this is not new. They've in the mutual societies in England, in the eighties and 17th century, all of these organizations were driven by the same thing. We used to do this through church-based movements, through faith based belief based movements. In other parts of the world, we didn't follow the public or council housing models. We went into forms of community based provision. So in the Scandinavian countries and Norway, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, especially we saw the evolution of what we term as community housing.

Michael Lennon ([34:53](#)):

So these are regulated, not for profits. They, they, they have to run as commercial businesses that raise large amounts of money, largely through private debt. They are developers, but all of their surpluses get reinvested into the provision of more housing. I would say Peter, we have models now and our track record of success in which we can now build that at substantial scale. So I have to do a little bit of marketing that the community housing industry association has put forward its plan to address the housing crisis in Australia. And we have financial models and proposals to build a hundred thousand affordable housing units and a 400,000 social housing units over the next 10 years. So in a place like Adelaide, we would expect that would produce between 16 and 18,000 units. This is entirely achievable,

Charles Landry ([35:46](#)):

Unlikely to be at the core of the city though, because the land prices there would be too high to do some of that. That's just another question, but anyway, so that's a really important question.