Providing affordable housing and tackling disadvantage
The experience of living in a disadvantaged place

Professor Hal Pawson
AHURI Research Centre—University of NSW
Presentation overview

1. Survey fieldwork locations and methodology
2. Poverty and economic exclusion
3. Views about the local area
4. Housing market dynamics
5. Key findings summary
1. Survey fieldwork
   locations and methodology
Survey aims

- To complement qualitative fieldwork undertaken in 6 disadvantaged areas of Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane—published September 2014 in:

- To investigate, in 4 disadvantaged areas of Sydney:
  - The nature and extent of poverty and exclusion
  - Residents’ place attachment—views about their locality
  - The functioning of local housing markets
Survey fieldwork locations

- Survey locations selected to represent the four ‘typology categories’ identified from secondary data analysis
- For logistical reasons, fieldwork focused solely on Sydney
- Eligible suburbs limited to those in SEIFA lowest decile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology category</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High on young people and single parent households</td>
<td>Emerton</td>
<td>Mount Druitt, Western Sydney fringe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High on overseas movers, high on two parent families</td>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Western Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High on residential mobility (domestic movers), high on older people and lone person households</td>
<td>The Entrance</td>
<td>Central Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High on overseas movers, on reduced unemployment and on reduced incidence of persons in low status jobs</td>
<td>Warwick Farm</td>
<td>Western Sydney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Benchmarked against Sydney norms

Socio-economic status indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Income 2011 ($)</th>
<th>% unemployed 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerton</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Entrance</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Farm</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Sydney</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Median monthly household income

Housing tenure distribution

Source: ABS census profiles, 2011 Census of Population and Housing
Survey methodology

- 801 doorstep interviews by professional fieldwork firm (approx 200 per area)
- Sample split equally between
  - recent movers
  - longer-established residents
- Data re-weighted to allow for overrepresentation of
  - (a.)
- Interviews typically 20–30 mins duration
% in each tenure rated as having ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’ external condition/surroundings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External condition of ...</th>
<th>Owned</th>
<th>Being purchased</th>
<th>Private rental</th>
<th>Public housing</th>
<th>All tenures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape/garden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Poverty and economic exclusion
Income poverty and economic exclusion measures

Monthly income distribution

% of all respondents

<$2k  $2-5k  $5-15k  >$15k

‘Poverty indicators’

Trouble paying utility bills on time
Sought financial help from family/friends
Trouble paying car reg/insurance
Unable to heat home
Sought help from welfare org
Pawned or sold item
Went without meals

% of all respondents

Responses to question
‘Over the past year have any of the following happened to you because of a shortage of money?’
Income poverty and economic exclusion measures by tenure

- **Owners**: 4% low income, 3% economically excluded, 2% deep poverty
- **Buying with mortgage**: 3% low income, 2% economically excluded, 2% deep poverty
- **Private renters**: 33% low income, 19% economically excluded, 13% deep poverty
- **Public renters**: 53% low income, 30% economically excluded, 13% deep poverty
- **All tenures**: 37% low income, 29% economically excluded, 13% deep poverty
Households in ‘deep poverty’
Tenure split

- Among ‘deep poverty’ cohort private renters are three times the number of public renters because:
  - Incidence of PRS ‘deep poverty’ fairly high
  - Number of private renters in disadvantaged suburbs much greater
3. Views about the local area
Responses to negative statements about the locality

- Drugs are a local problem: 50% Agree, 40% Neutral, 10% Disagree
- Grafitti and vandalism are local problems: 44% Agree, 40% Neutral, 16% Disagree
- Nuisance behaviour from excess drinking is a local problem: 40% Agree, 40% Neutral, 20% Disagree
- I would get out of this neighbourhood if I could: 33% Agree, 47% Neutral, 20% Disagree
Responses to positive statements about the locality

- I feel I belong in this neighbourhood: 73% Agree, 20% Neutral, 7% Disagree
- My local area is a safe place to live: 65% Agree, 27% Neutral, 8% Disagree
- There is a strong sense of community: 60% Agree, 30% Neutral, 10% Disagree
- The physical appearance is appealing: 59% Agree, 32% Neutral, 9% Disagree
Residents’ views on local area trajectory

(a) Views on change in past 2 years

(b) Views on expected change in next 2 years

Got worse
Stayed the same
Improved
Will get worse
Will stay the same
Will improve
4. Housing market dynamics
Residential mobility
Overview

- Across all tenures over half had moved to their current home in past 5 years
- Similar profiles for home ownership and public rental — 6–7% annual turnover
- Private rental annual turnover — 25%
Rental tenure in-moves largely circular—more so than ‘normal’
→ 80% of private renter moves within PRS
→ 53% of public renter moves within SRS
FHBs are vast majority of owner occupier movers—more so than ‘normal’
Localities playing ‘home ownership gateway’ function?
Housing market dynamics
Inter-area moves

- Predominantly local moves but...
  - More so in private rental market
  - Much less so in owner occupier market
- Localities playing ‘home ownership gateway’ function?

Recent movers: previous location by current tenure

- % of recent movers into tenure
- Beyond Sydney (including overseas)
- Elsewhere within Sydney
- Elsewhere within sub-region
- Within neighbourhood or local area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Type</th>
<th>Beyond Sydney</th>
<th>Elsewhere within Sydney</th>
<th>Elsewhere within sub-region</th>
<th>Within neighbourhood or local area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private renter</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public rental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All tenures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Summary of key findings
Key findings

- Private renters typically more numerous than public and live in the poorest condition properties
- Over a third of households live on ‘low incomes’ but one in seven (almost all renters) is subject to ‘deep poverty’
- Over two thirds of those in deep poverty are private renters
- Social issues are perceived as problematic by substantial numbers but place attachment is also high and there is optimism on change over time
- Disadvantaged areas appear to play an important ‘home ownership gateway’ function