From Rhetoric to Actuality:
Researching "Access" and "Inclusion" in one Australian city

Louise Johnson
Deakin University, HOME Research Hub
louise.johnson@deakin.edu.au

David Kelly
RMIT University, Centre for Urban Research
david.kelly2@rmit.edu.au

Fiona Andrews
Deakin University, HOME Research Hub
fiona.andrews@deakin.edu.au

Ursula de Jong
Deakin University, HOME Research Hub
ursula.dejong@deakin.edu.au

Patsie Frawley
Deakin University, HOME Research Hub
patsie.frawley@deakin.edu.au

Richard Tucker
Deakin University, HOME Research Hub
richard.tucker@deakin.edu.au

From Rhetoric to Actuality:
Researching "Access" and "Inclusion" in one Australian city

Louise Johnson[1], David Kelly[2], Fiona Andrews[1], Ursula de Jong[1], Patsie Frawley[1] Richard Tucker[1]
[1]Deakin University, HOME Research Hub
[2]RMIT University, Centre for Urban Research

Abstract:
National legislation requires Australian cities to be accessible and inclusive. Changing national demographics mean that not only are there significant numbers of people now recorded as "needing assistance" in their day-to-day living but the population is ageing rapidly, leading to more and more people unable to fully participate. So what does it mean to have an accessible and inclusive city? One regional centre – Geelong in Victoria – has committed to becoming a national leader in accessibility and inclusivity. The Deakin HOME Research Hub has been tasked with detailing what measures are being taken and what interventions are feasible and desirable to better include those with different levels and forms of disability in employment, the built environment and community infrastructure. This paper will focus initially on how best to theorise those with lived experiences of disability within the city before considering just how Geelong to date has met this challenge through its various plans. It will then outline the processes by which those who are most often marginalised in this city were given a voice in the research project – through advisory groups, systems thinking workshops and focus groups - to move beyond rhetorical commitment to meaningful engagement. We thereby present and assess here our effort to research access and inclusion in Geelong.

Keywords: *Access; Inclusion; Disability; Geelong; Right to the city; Systems thinking*

Introduction

Australia is one of many countries that has a range of legislative prohibitions against discrimination based on disability. There is also widespread official commitment to addressing discrimination and exclusion as a result of disability. Thus, in 2008, Australia ratified the *United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* (2006) and this was subsequently echoed in a range of Disability Acts across the country as well as disability action plans at federal, state and local government levels. Further, driven by disability activists, their supporters and carers, the many problems with delivering services – of underfunding, fragmentation, unequal and ineffective care (Productivity Commission 2013), along with the marginalisation, medicalisation and infantilisation of those with a disability – led to the development of new service models.

Increasingly, services were based on need, with the emphasis of funding shifting from dedicated institutions and agencies to the clients themselves via a person-centred model (Green and Mears 2014). Out of this reform and activism emerged the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS), which promises to revolutionise the care and support of those designated as "high needs"; by locating responsibility and funding at the highest federal level of government, delegating service delivery to competing agencies and the power of choosing what is needed along with adequate resources to those most in need (Weisel et al. 2017). The scheme is to provide the 460,000 Australians under 65 with a "permanent or significant disability tailored support to live an ordinary life" (NDIS 2015). Significantly, the regional city of Geelong in Victoria, was chosen as one of a number of trial sites (in 2014) and also for the head office of what is becoming a ballooning bureaucracy.

Like other local government areas, the City of Greater Geelong (CoGG) is required to have an "Access and Inclusion Plan" (2018-2022). It also joined the Global Compact for Inclusive and Accessible Cities in 2018 and in its various plans mentions the word "accessibility" over 700 times. However, like many other cities and towns across the nation, there is no robust or systematic process of either assessing or altering the city's built form, housing, services, public spaces, workplaces, attitudes or opportunities to ensure that it is indeed an accessible, welcoming and inclusive city. To that end and with the National Disability Insurance Agency located in the heart of the city, the Victorian Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) commissioned the HOME Research Hub at Deakin University[i] to complete a Feasibility Study for making Geelong a world class "Accessible and Inclusive city".

Our research to date has examined international experience; investigated the extent to which notions of "accessibility" are present in the many plans for the city; and documented how service providers,

employers and those with lived experiences of disability see the city, in order to detail some of their realities and derive a set of meaningful and impactful recommendations for realising the aim of an inclusive city. This work – focused on the built environment, community infrastructure, employment and economic participation – has generated many suggestions for change but also allowed concepts such as the "right to the city" to be concretised in this place. After canvassing some of the most useful ways an accessible and inclusive city for those with lived experiences of disability can be conceptualised, this paper considers how existing plans have paid lip service to aspirations without fully delivering on this objective. The paper then outlines the processes by which the research team engaged with stakeholders to generate an array of feasible and impactful recommendations for the city.

Conceptualising and delivering the "right to the city"

Urban geographers – and sociologists – have long seen the major divisions within cities as class-based, but also as ones inflected by race and ethnicity (see Harvey 1973, 2008; Brenner, Marcuse and Mayer 2011). Documenting the processes by which poor or African Americans are segregated in the cities of the United States, theorists such as Peter Marcuse (Iveson 2011), Don Mitchell (2003) and David Harvey (2008) not only detailed the structural and institutional means by which these patterns occurred but demanded change, a "right to the city" for those excluded from safe neighbourhoods, adequate services, political institutions and public spaces.

Pragmatic responses to such conceptualisations have tended to move beyond their socio-structural foundations to invoke ethics and broader principles of inclusion. Thus notions of the "just city", the "ethical city" and the "city of care" have emerged at the same time as the concern for the socially marginal has been extended to those with disabilities (Barrettt, Horne and Fein 2016; Fainstein 2010). From considering the lifeworlds of those with disability in the city, this work has focused on the definition of disability and the political economy of exclusion (see for example Butler and Bowlby 1997; Butler and Parr 1999; Dyck 1995). Robert Imrie (1994) has detailed the processes by which urban environments erect barriers to marginalize and impoverish those with either physical or intellectual limitations across a number of countries. Imrie joins others – such as Reg Golledge (1991), Brendan Gleeson (1997, 1999, 2001) and Jos Boys (2014, 2017) – to highlight the social-cultural and political processes underpinning the social construction and reproduction of disability as a state of marginalization and oppression in the city (Imrie 1996: vii; 2001). Such an approach directs attention to the built environment and how it expresses assumptions about able bodies within it (Imrie 2001). The city therefore "creates" spaces and processes of exploitation, marginalization and violence to thereby generate a sense of powerlessness for those with a disability.

In addition, Imrie argues that what needs to be added to such socio-structural analyses, is the notion of embodiment and how those with a disability are variously defined, demonized, excluded and medicalized in the city. Other theorists of embodiment, further emphasise ways in which the city is literally built for those of a certain bodily configuration – a 1.5 metre tall, active man – and how bodies which do not conform to such ideals are variously excluded and demonized in the city (Butler and Bowlby 1997; Butler and Parr 1999; Teather 1999). Further, Hall and Bates (2014) write of "Hatescapes" in which social discrimination and spatial exclusion facilitate not only "hate crimes" but lower level judgements which in turn produce anxiety, fear, immobility and actions to remain invisible for those with disabilities. While there are areas deemed unsafe in the city, those considered welcoming emerged from an assemblage of embodied actions, agency, the actions of others and the spaces in which movement or rest occurred. Along with feminist theorists such as Wendell (2013), Cameron Duff (2017) in his studies of homelessness introduces the notion of affect, which can be added to this analysis as a key dimension in the experiences of those with disability as they not only attempt to negotiate spaces built for the able-bodied, but also have to deal with the negative responses of others to them. Duff therefore argues for the right to appear, to be visible in public spaces, to be able to articulate social and political concerns, to act in the city. While Duff writes on the homeless, such demands can surely be echoed for those with disability. The role of attitudes in the social construction of "difference" is vital here (see Dear 1997).

There is therefore a need to broaden the political economy approach to include that offered by those who consider embodiment and affect. Further, affirming the right of all to access, be visible and live in the city goes beyond the economic and class dimensions of exclusion, to include all of those who are variously defined and excluded by judgements, embodied value responses and urban structures (Prince 2008).

In addition to those developing an explanatory framework for examining marginalization in cities are those who are more focused on just how to address the processes and practices of exclusion. Such

work considers key dimensions of the city, the assumptions underlying them, how they in turn create boundaries and barriers to all but the able bodied, and alternatives. In particular the focus is on the built form of the city – from housing to public spaces and mobility – the means available, barriers and facilitators. Building on the economic marginalization of those with disability, there is also an emphasis on employment and economic participation along with the importance of those with disabilities to achieve a political voice, pride and representation in key decisions. Combined, these elements could generate feelings of welcome within a place, to thereby invite a sense of belonging and inclusion rather than barriers and exclusion (Aitkin et. al. 2019; Bigby 2008; Harrison 2004, 2007; Imrie 2005; Imrie and Kumar 1998; Tually et al 2011).

How then have the politics of exclusion and the alternative principles and actions of inclusion been realised in one Australian city? The regional city of Geelong, Victoria, is the focus of a project to consider how inclusion can and should work. The research has investigated the legislative context within which to consider these issues and the planning response; and will generate a set of feasible and prioritised actions to make Geelong a world class accessible and inclusive city. Critical to this task are the research methods used, and they have included global benchmarking and literature reviews, along with an assessment of how Geelong has planned to include all. Further, as our assessment of the many plans shows, there is a need to more actively include the voice of those with lived experiences of disability in the planning and designing of the city. The research team deployed a number of strategies to engage stakeholders in the question: How do you make Geelong a world class accessible and inclusive city over the next five years? The following reports on two elements of this research – the planning audit and the stakeholder workshops – as the Accessible and Inclusive Geelong (AIG) research team attempted to ensure access and inclusion in our research methods.

Geelong – Researching and improving "Access" and "Inclusion"
Located 75 kilometres from Melbourne, Geelong is the second city of the state with 244,000 people. In 2016 more than 14,000 – or 6% of the population – reported needing help in their daily lives because of disability, and nearly 24,000 (10%) provide unpaid assistance to a person with disability (ABS 2016). Each year this number swells by over 1000 people when the city hosts Australia's largest conference for people with disability. Like many other Australian cities, it has a rapidly ageing population. It was also chosen as one of the trial sites and ultimately as the head office location for the NDIA and has a commitment to social inclusion through its many city and regional plans.

Geelong plans
Planning for social inclusion and accessibility in the City of Greater Geelong (CoGG) region occurs in the context of a nested set of legislative and service delivery obligations. These range from the international (UNCRPD, 2006) to the national (DDA, 1992; Disability Act, 2006; NDS, 2010-2020) and state level (Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities, 2006), and these necessarily shape responses to the challenge of ensuring all citizens and visitors feel included and able to access its services along with its public and private spaces.

Twenty-five CoGG Plans and six CoGG Annual Reports (2012-2018) were analysed in total. An analysis of how these plans and reports are considered in relation to one another, mapping their commensurabilities and differences, was not performed. The framework that was used to assess and summarise each plan and report, comprised of measuring: stakeholder engagement; aims, scope and principles; methods; recommendations and actions. Three key areas of investigation enveloped the built environment, community Infrastructure, and economic participation. This framework was developed from the initial research brief to review the evidence-base for what constitutes an accessible, inclusive city, and to measure the feasibility of application in Geelong.

To add contextual value beyond the geography of Geelong, Victoria and Australia, the research included a review of international exemplars of accessibility and inclusion. Each local plan was interrogated in terms of their definitions of "access" and "inclusion", the various domains they considered such as the built environment, connectivity, employment, transport etc., the actions that were proposed and those that had been realised and assessed. From this analysis key dimensions were identified, including how notions of accessibility and inclusion are defined and practised, what initiatives have been proposed and then realised within each of the plans considered. The team identified a series of models and gaps and these have been used to formulate some recommendations which were then explored in the next stage of the research. The documents reviewed ranged from the general and strategic to the statutory and those developed for particular organisations or parts of the city[ii].

Definitions of Access and Inclusion

While many plans noted a dedication to either or both access and inclusion, there was far less clarity around the meaning of these terms. There was indeed a proliferation of rhetoric around these notions. Definitions ranged from ambiguous articulations of universal design as an approach that realises a "master plan vision to revitalise Geelong for all its citizens" (Making Geelong Accessible, 2017), to socially inclusive city design "that cater[s] for multiple uses, all ages and abilities and which encourage active life styles and social interaction" (CoGG Social Infrastructure Plan, 2015). High level rhetoric is so often captured by imprecise language such as "inclusive, healthy and socially connected community, including public areas and local services that are accessible to all levels of ability, housing options, support for vulnerable community members and equity in the provision of social infrastructure" (CoGG A Clever and Creative Future 2017). Defining what *socially connected* means, or how *social infrastructure* will support vulnerable community members, remains underdeveloped at a local level. At state level, rhetoric seems to pervade descriptors of accessibility, with planning agencies describing physical accessibility as including "universal design principles" with walking as well as public transport access (DELWP, 2017).

Whilst access and inclusion remain ambiguous, in part due to their non-definition in the principle planning framework, equality and rights also continues to lack precision. The stated vision of the *Geelong Access and Inclusion Plan* is to "uphold the rights of equal and dignified access for everyone while setting out how we will work towards full equality for people with a disability to participate and be included in our broader community" (CoGG Access and Inclusion Plan 2018-22). The (universal) design of the built environment (primarily public space), access to public spaces and services, and decision-making process for those of all abilities were consistent concepts across these definitions. However, across all 25 plans, there was no consensus on the meaning of access and inclusion and a more extensive audit of the Geelong planning scheme noted over 700 references to "access" but none included an actual definition, with most uses relating to *the presence* of a service or facility that was in some way assumed to be accessible to all.

Key initiatives and actions

Of the initiatives identified in these documents the following might be considered as key relatively recent planned actions to address accessibility and inclusion within the CoGG region. The three domains highlighted here are ones that readily emerge from the literature on disability in the city but were also specified in the DHHS brief as needing to be considered. They are:

- The Built Environment;

- Community Infrastructure; and,

- Employment and Economic participation.

These key planning initiatives and actions are detailed in an endnote table[iii].

Some organisational units within the CoGG – such as the regional libraries – had specific recommendations and actions to facilitate the serving, employment and retention of people with a disability. This and other plans are nested within the 2017 *Clever and Creative Futures* framework which in turn is to be implemented via the various Social Infrastructure, Asset and Open Space plans; four-year Council and Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plans, Municipal Strategic and Statutory Planning Schemes and Finance/Resource Plans. Some but not all of these plans reference and relate to each other. Too often, however, they do not.

Across all initiatives identified, the majority were proposed with limited to no information available about their implementation or evaluation. However, actions for accessibility and inclusion described in the Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan (2013-2017), Geelong Regional Libraries Draft Access and Inclusion Plan (2018-2022), and CoGG Annual Plans (2016-2017 and 2017-2018) had been actioned.

A number of gaps and examples of good practice were identified in the analysis of the documents identified. Excellent practice was seen in the regional library plans, in the tourism employment initiatives and in the hospital precinct redevelopment. There was also a good Disability Action Plan which had concrete actions and reported against proposals. Gaps were geographical (as not all localities across the region were included), demographic (in that the plans often considered an undifferentiated population rather than how they impacted on particular age, income, ethnic or ability groupings), sectoral

(with limited physical mobility not necessarily considered in transport planning) and/or conceptual (in that many plans did not consider issues of access and inclusion explicitly). Furthermore, social attitudes, access to information, and access to transport were identified as the main barriers to inclusion and participation in the local community (CoGG, 2014).

Findings from this analysis demonstrated that there are a plethora of initiatives. However, there is much rhetoric with few concrete, measurable recommendations, timelines, evaluative criteria and/or budgets reported. We also concluded from the analysis of the plans that these initiatives could be better integrated with each other, to avoid repetition and prevent serious gaps in coverage.

However, the main gap was the need to actively engage with disability groups or individuals in the approach, assessments and recommendations within each of the plans. Despite the existence of a Disability Advisory Committee, they did not and could not examine each and every plan, building proposal or precinct structure plan. For those researching and active within Disability Studies, the meaningful, supported and active inclusion of those with lived experiences of disability in the planning process is fundamental to the achievement of real change. This is a basic principle of inclusion in the planning process and should be implemented by all initiatives. A single small group – such as the CoGG Disability Advisory Committee – is insufficient to vet 100% of extant plans. More proactive and broader consultation is required at various stages in the planning process.

Drivers for inclusion are both legislative and moral – it is required by law to have disability access plans and not to discriminate. These instrumental and genuine commitments to access and inclusion should be echoed in consultative processes, plan recommendations, implementation and follow up evaluations. Too many plans replicate others without assessing what did or did not work. There is therefore a further need to evaluate plans and to set specific targets, objectives and outcomes before another is initiated, to examine outcomes sustainably and minimise duplication. Finally, planning legislation tends to be about land use, the built form and facilities. There is a need to also address attitudes, service provision, consultation and communication within the planning process and to include a commitment to consider disability within the planning framework and in the building regulatory system. All of these considerations now form part of our recommendations, but such ideas also need to be tested and explored further with those who have lived experiences of disability.

Researching disability in Geelong
The project was of deep interest to a local State Member of Parliament – Christine Couzens – who initiated a Taskforce comprised primarily of people with disability. This Taskforce interrogated the research team on methods, the ways in which information was presented and the ways we engaged with those with non-visible disabilities.

There was a great deal of engagement in co-designing with those who had a lived experience of disability. A systems thinking tool developed by Deakin University – STICK-E – was utilised as a vehicle by which groups of between 10 and 20 could be engaged in assessing just how Geelong could become a world class accessible and inclusive city in the three domains specified by the funders: the built environment, community infrastructure, and employment and economic participation.

Systems Thinking in Community Knowledge Exchange (STICK-E) is a web-based software package that supports the facilitation of workshops to help stakeholders form a shared understanding of a problem. In workshops with around 15-20 participants, a problem is presented and causes are brainstormed in smaller sub-groups and then in the larger group. In the course of such discussions STICK-E specifically supports the construction of causal loop diagrams, as drivers are linked to others and the complexity of the problem is visually displayed. These diagrams depict the key variables that influence a complex problem of interest and the connections and feedback loops between variables that cause the problem to persist. The facilitation method STICK-E supports – of group model building – has shown evidence of improving the way people think about problems, allowing agreement among a diverse group about a problem of interest to emerge, and encouraging a shared commitment to action.

Three STICK-E workshops were held, though overall representation of those with disability within these all-day sessions was only 20%. Recruitment occurred by way of disability support organisations, existing service providers and key government personnel. Over 200 individuals and organisations were approached, resulting in three groups ranging in size from 11-23 (See Table 1).

Table 1 - Participants in the STICK-E workshops

STICK-E Workshop	Participants n=49	Attrition n=17	Self-identified persons with disability n=9
Built Environment 11 April 2019	15	1 withdrawal 1 no show	4
Community Infrastructure 7 May 2019	11	3 withdrawal 5 no show	3
Employment and Economic Participation 9 May 2019	23	5 withdrawal 2 no show	2

Source: Authors

Those present included people with disability, their carers and service providers. Their brainstorming of answers to the set question, drawing causal links between the factors involved and then deriving a set of agreed and prioritised actions, produced 119 action ideas. Thirty-seven of these actions were identified by participants as 'priority' actions and ranked according to feasibility and impact. The research team then categorised these into 12 systems thinking levels of intervention ranging from tinkering to paradigm shifting. Actions that tinker at the edge of system include fixing uneven pavements, installing a hoist in a disabled toilet and putting in more disabled parking spaces. Those that get at the heart of a system and have the potential to bring about paradigmatic change include raising the level and flexibility of the Disability Support Pension, building an Accessible Visitors Centre in the CBD and amending the Victorian Planning Scheme. There was also a large number in-between – including better information for employers on the ease and benefits of hiring those with a disability, introducing disability audits and co-design for all public buildings. There was also a call for "Ability pride", for a major shift in the ways in which disability is thought about in the city, by all. This last suggestion is one of the deepest to emerge from the process and goes to the heart of the political economy but also the embodiment, abjection and right to the city literature canvassed earlier.

The relatively low presence of those with lived experiences of disability in these STICK-E Workshops, led to the convening of three much shorter focus groups, with existing advisory cohorts – the Taskforce, the City of Greater Geelong Disability Advisory Group, Genyus Network and the Scope customer reference group. These focus groups evaluated the outputs from the systems thinking workshops via the translation of these findings into a series of narratives that are intended to allow participants to compare their own lived experiences to those solutions envisaged by the wider community. Through this process they offered inputs, alternatives and validation of the resulting recommendations. The focus groups also proved a key step for ensuring the actions identified in the STICK-E workshops are more user-centred, -created and -managed; thus, increasing the visibility and engagement of people with disability and informing change that improves community attitudes to people with disabilities.

Reflections and conclusions
If the gold standard of engagement is having those with lived experiences of disability driving the research – how it was done, where and with what outcomes (Milner and Frawley 2018; Stone and Priestley 1996) – we did not achieve this in the study. However, workshops did allow a set of ranked, feasible and impactful measures to be derived from a range of stakeholders. A project symposium is now planned to ensure that these prioritised actions will now be actioned and owned by participants. The systems thinking method informed most of the recommendations that will ultimately have stakeholder-wide consensus. To further ensure this outcome the systems approach was blended with other research methods – and we have used focus groups – that give greater voice to those with lived experience of disability.

It is hoped that once the findings of research project have reached implementation phase, then CoGG and DHHS will initiate other work to engage those with lived experiences of disability. Special

consideration should be given to those not currently in any of the consultative groups, who live outside the core of the city or who have harder to see and access forms of disability. While this paper has not ranged over the entire project, it has described the process of auditing and assessing the various plans that exist in this region, highlighted their various concrete suggestions and outcomes, and noted their limitations. The major one is the limited engagement with those who have a lived experience of disability and this paper described the process by which the research team attempted to engage with this complex group. The results are mixed, but they have thrown up a range of pragmatic suggestions and those that are more structural and impactful. Of greatest impact are those recommendations that came from sustained and sensitive consultation with those who have lived experience of disability, and who, in their call for Ability Pride demanded their unrestricted, embodied and free right to the city. The researchers are now engaged in the processes of realising the recommendations, through further engagement with key stakeholders and monitoring research.

References

Aitken, Z., Baker, E., Badland, H., Mason, K., Bentley, R., Beer, A. and Kavanagh, A.M., 2019. Precariously placed: housing affordability, quality and satisfaction of Australians with disabilities. *Disability & Society, 34*(1), pp. 121-142.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2016) Australian household census, Community Profile of the City of Greater Geelong.

Barrett, B.F., Horne, R. and Fien, J., 2016. The ethical city: A rationale for an urgent new urban agenda. *Sustainability*, *8*(11), pp. 1197.

Bigby, C., 2008. Beset by obstacles: A review of Australian policy development to support ageing in place for people with intellectual disability. *Journal of intellectual and developmental disability*, *33*(1), pp. 76-86.

Boys, J. 2017. Introduction, in J. Boys (Ed) *Disability, Space, Architecture: A Reader.* (London and New York, Routledge)

Boys, J., 2014. *Doing disability differently: An alternative handbook on architecture, dis/ability and designing for everyday life.* (Oxon and New York, Routledge)

Brenner, N., Marcuse, P. and Mayer (2011) *Cities for people not profit* (London and New York, Routledge.9

Butler, R.E. and Bowlby, S. (1997) Bodies and spaces: An exploration of disabled people's experiences of public spaces. *Environment and Planning D, 15*, pp. 411-433.

Butler, R.E. and Parr, H. (1999) (Eds.) *Mind and body spaces: Geographies of impairment, illness and disability.* (London, Routledge).

City of Greater Geelong (2014) *Disability Action Plan* 2014-17, Geelong.

Dear, M. et.al. (1997) "Seeing people differently: The socio-spatial construction of disability", *Environment and Planning D, 15*, pp. 455-480.

Duff, C. (2017) The affective right to the city. *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers, 42*, pp. 516-529.

Dyck, I. (1995) Hidden geographies: The changing lifeworlds of women with disabilities. *Social Science and Medicine, 40*, pp. 307-320.

Fainstein, S. (2010) *The just city.* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press).

Gleeson, B. (1997) The regulation of environmental access in New Zealand. *International Planning Studies, 2*, pp. 367-390.

Gleeson, B. (1999) *Geographies of disability.* (London, Routledge)

Gleeson, B. (2001) Disability and the open city. *Urban Studies, 38*(2), pp. 251-265.

Golledge, R. (1991) Tactual strip maps as navigational aids. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, *85*(7), pp. 296-301.

Green, J. and Mears, J. (2014) The implementation of the NDIS: Who wins, who loses?. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies Journal. 6*(2), pp. 25-39.

Hall, E. and Bates, E. (2014) Hatescapes? The relational geography of disability, hate crime, inclusion and belonging in the city. *Geoforum, 101*, pp. 100-110.

Harrison, M. (2004) Defining housing quality and environment: Disability, standards and social factors. *Housing Studies*, *19*(5), pp. 691-708.

Harvey, D. (1973) *Social justice and the city.* (London, Edward Arnold)

Harvey, D. (2008) The right to the city. *New Left Review, 53*, pp. 23-40.

Imrie, R. (1994) *Disability and the city: International perspectives.* (London, Paul Chapman)

Imrie, R. (2000) Barriered and bounded places and the spatialities of disability. *Urban Studies, 38*(2), pp. 231-237.

Imrie, R. (2005) *Accessible housing: Quality, disability and design.* (London, Routledge)

Imrie, R. and Kumar, M. (1998) Focusing on disability and access in the built environment. *Disability and Society, 13*, pp. 357-374.

Iveson, K. (2011) Social or spatial justice? Marcuse, Soja and the right to the city. *City, 15*, pp. 250-259.

Milner, P. and Frawley, P. (2019) From 'on' to 'with' to 'by': People with a learning disability creating a space for the third wave of inclusive research. *Qualitative Research*, *19*(4), pp. 382-398.

Mitchell, D. (2003) *The right to the city: Social justice and the fight for public space.* (New York, Guilford Press)

National Insurance Disability Scheme (NDIS) 2015, National Disability Insurance Agency, *Annual Report 2014-15*, https://www.ndis.gov.au/html/sites/default/files/documents/Annual-Report/201415-Annual-Report1.pdf

Prince, M.J. (2008) Inclusive city life: Persons with disabilities and the politics of difference. D*isability Studies Quarterly, 28*(1).

Productivity Commission (2011) *Disability, care and support* Canberra: Productivity Commission.

Stone, E. and Priestley, M. (1996) Parasites, pawns and partners: disability research and the role of non-disabled researchers. *British Journal of Sociology*, *47*(4). pp. 699-716.

Teather, E. (1999) *Embodied geographies: Spaces, bodies and rites of passage* (London, Routledge)

Tually, S., Beer, A. and Mc Loughlin, P. (2011) Housing assistance, social inclusion and people living with disability, *AHURI Final Report 178.*

Walmsley, J., Strnadová, I., & Johnson, K. (2018). The added value of inclusive research. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, *31*(5), pp. 751-759.

Wendell, S. (2013) *The rejected body: Feminist philosophical reflections on disability.* (New York, Routledge)

Wiesel, I., Whitzman, C., Bigby, C. & Gleeson, B. (2017) How will the NDIS change Australian cities? *MSSI Issues Paper* No. 9, Melbourne Sustainable Society Institute, The University of Melbourne.

iHOME is a Deakin University interdisciplinary research hub, comprising 30 academics with a simple aim: A home for all. HOME addresses, with local communities, failure to deliver well-designed, affordable, sustainable and connected housing for all. We argues that HOME is more than a house but rather comprises:

- Home for life: designed to be adaptable and universally accessible, meeting our various needs, enabling us to engage in personally meaningful activities, safe and securely ours, and so home for all stages of life.
- Home we can afford: designed to minimize energy use, constructed to minimize negative environmental and health impacts, matching our means, available to all, and so home that is sustainable collectively and individually.
- Home where we know neighbours: designed for social connectivity, encompassing diversity, and so a home where we can strengthen relationships across difference.
- Home that is connected: linked to occupations, services, education, nature, transport, play, food and the wider community.

Our aim is a home for all that is safe, adaptable for all stages of life, matching our needs and so sustainable collectively and individually, where we can strengthen neighbourly relationship across difference, connected to services, facilities and the wider community. Spanning health, the social sciences, business and the built environment, we offer a uniquely agile and adaptable research approach – collaboratively-designed solutions addressing the specific needs of their communities. HOME makes use of the systems thinking and action research expertise at Deakin to facilitate engagement between stakeholder communities to find collaborative solutions to complex real-world problems.

iI
- Central Geelong Community Infrastructure Draft Report for Consultation 2017
- Central Geelong Public Realm Framework 2017
- Geelong Hospital Precinct Plan
- City of Greater Geelong Annual Reports: 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18
- City of Greater Geelong 2014 *Disability Action Plan*
- City of Greater Geelong 2018*. Access and Inclusion Plan 2018-2022.*
- City of Greater Geelong Council Plan 2018-2022
- City of Greater Geelong 2017. *Greater Geelong – A Clever and Creative Future.*
- City of Greater Geelong 2017. *Social Infrastructure Plan 2014-2031.*
  - o *Review Part A: Findings Report*
  - o *Executive Summary*
  - o Final Report

- City of Greater Geelong Karreenga Aboriginal Action Plan 2014-17;
- City of Greater Geelong Multicultural Plan 2011-17;
- Committee for Geelong Proposed Second City Policy Framework
- Department of Environment, Land Water and Planning 2017. *Central Geelong Community Infrastructure Report for Consultation* Thad Ashford Planning and Rethinking Central Geelong Partnership
- Geelong Regional Libraries Draft Access and Inclusion Plan 2018-2022
- G21 Regional Growth Plan
- G21 Implementation Plan
- Greater Geelong Planning Scheme
- International Indigenous Design Charter
- Making Geelong Accessible 2017
- Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013-2017
- Optimising Disability Access and Inclusion at the Geelong Football Club
- Revitalising Central Geelong Action Plan
- Tourism Greater Geelong and The Bellarine Visitor Economy Strategy 2017-2021

iii

Domain	Initiatives and Actions
Built Environment Form, Planning and Building Regulations (including housing)	- Geelong Mobility Access Directory, whose website had 19,000 hits between 2014-17 - Geelong Waterfront Accessibility Map - Increased accessible walkways at Johnstone Park - Kerb channel accessibility in Ocean Grove Town Centre - Hospital Precinct Master Plan 70 street block footpaths replaced (2017-2018) and new pathways in "priority locations" - Standardised use of Tactile Ground Surface Indicators - Beach accessibility via matting and reclinable wheelchairs
Community Infrastructure, including leisure and tourism facilities, and transport;	- Changing Places and Adult change facilities at: Leisurelink (2 in 2009), Vines Rd Community Centre (2010), Norlane Family and Child Centre (2015), Geelong Library and Heritage Centre (2015), Leopold Community Hub (2018) - Disability awareness training for CoGG and community sector workers - Geelong Railway Station – Lift to platforms 2 and 3; Accessible toilets and compliant amenities; Improved all ability access around North Geelong station and bus interchange; Enforce disabled parking restrictions - Communication Access Accreditation for customer services and Geelong Regional Libraries (2013-17) - Weekly reports on street closures to Vision Australia, Web streaming of Council meetings, info-graphics, 16,000 involved in Creative Geelong consultations - Equitable access guidelines, including Auslan interpreters, care and safe viewing areas - International Day of People with Disabilities celebrations (since 2015)
Employment and Economic participation	- Step by Step Volunteer Mentor Project (2015) - Tourism sector recruitment and business training initiatives - Regional Library recruitment and retention strategies