From wharfies to sharks: the class remake of Melbourne Docklands

As gentrification evolves (Shaw 2002) or mutates (Lees et al 2008) into ever more subtle processes of transformation in and of the constructed environment, old debates about whether the word is overloaded have evaporated in the face of its unquestionable social and political utility. The concept is as ably applied to retail, rural and new-build as it is to urban residential upgrading and adaptive re-use, for the simple reason that it is a widely recognised signifier for a complex set of phenomena. Agreement ends at the role of culture in gentrification, however. The necessity of artists, the arts, cultural capital, of markers of distinction, to the class transition that itself is a necessary element of gentrification, remains a point of contention. This paper considers the question of the role of the arts in gentrification through examination of a case of gentrification gone wrong – or is it? The paper concludes that the conspicuous absence of cultural cachet at Melbourne’s Docklands redevelopment reveals the fundamentals of gentrification through a class remake that is shocking simply in its rawness.
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The generalisation of gentrification

The concept of gentrification has evolved over the last five decades to refer to a generalised class restructuring of place, encompassing the entire transformation from low-status neighbourhood to high-status playground. It refers to residential transformations and their retail and commercial equivalents (Rose 1996; Zukin 1995), suburban and rural transitions (Scott 2011, and Scott et al 2011) and waves of super-gentrification (Lees 2003). It includes renovation, adaptive re-use and new construction (Davidson and Lees 2005). It can assume different structural processes over time and place (Hackworth and Smith 2001). A generally accepted definition of gentrification now is the “production of space for progressively more affluent users” (Hackworth, 2002: 815) though this is usually narrowed down by three key features: the comprehensive revalorisation of land (closure of Smith’s [1979; 1996] rent gap), wholesale displacement of inhabitants and/or use values (Marcuse 1985; Davidson 2009) and a conspicuous transition in class character (Smith 1996; Lees et al 2008).

This broad agreement, while allowing for quite some variation in specific manifestations, does include boundaries. Not every reuse or redevelopment of land, even though a revalorisation of some sort is almost always involved, is gentrification (Collins 2013). Comprehensive closure of a rent gap on a neighbourhood scale requires systemic economic change, meaning that gentrification involves more than a series of disparate events of recapitalisation. A substantial rise in property prices throughout a defined precinct relative to those around it is necessary to gentrification, and even then, the process must be associated with the other two criteria to be identified as such.

The nature of displacement from gentrification is complicated. Displacement might involve the direct dislocation of tenants from their dwellings in a defined area. Low-income households experiencing gentrification may however remain in place (Vigdor 2002; Freeman 2005; 2016) perhaps because they benefit from the amenity improvements, perhaps because they have nowhere else to go, or cannot afford the up-front costs of moving (Slater 2006; Davidson 2009). Even where low-income incumbents are not spatially displaced, neighbourhood transformations that constrain their mobility and sense of place may still considered gentrification (Shaw and Hagemans 2015). Neil Smith’s (2002) argument, that government assistance to private investors to enter high-risk quarters where there are no prior occupants can constitute gentrification, also has weight. Redevelopment of public housing estates by constructing private housing on their open space, for example, or rezoning industrial areas for residential and commercial development, significantly increases the exchange value of these areas and alters their socio-economic composition such that only higher-income people will be allowed entry in the future (Kipfer and Petrunia 2009; Shaw 2013b). Marcuse’s (1985) term ‘exclusionary displacement’ refers to the exclusion of low-income people from a place they might have lived in (or worked or shopped) had the place not become gentrified. So while there are many possible kinds of displacement – direct, indirect or exclusionary, community displacement, neighbourhood resource displacement
(Davidson 2008; Shaw and Hagemans 2015) – the process must nevertheless have a systemic or wholesale element to it, and be associated with revalorisation and a conspicuous class transition, to be considered a consequence of gentrification.

The transition in class character is most complicated of all. Gentrification theory presumes that the producers of gentrification, as individuals and/or institutions, are witting participants in the extraction of value from the gentrified product, and that the consumers, through the very act of consumption, are increasing in both economic and cultural capital. Implied in this is the acquisition or consolidation of Bourdieu’s (1984) notion of distinction: the increase in wealth gained through the act of acquiring or producing gentrified property translates into an increase or consolidation of class status. But how necessary is cultural capital, as distinct from financial or symbolic capital, to the process of gentrification? The gentry, with their air of cultural refinement, were long ago deemed unnecessary to gentrification in the course of its spatial and temporal expansion. Bohemian and ‘creative’ classes were similarly associated with gentrification but not essential. Even so, the ‘follow the artists’ or ‘follow the hippies’ trope (Ley 1996) is remarkably persistent in explanations of gentrification. Some recent work has challenged this simplified narrative of the arts in a causal role, arguing variously that commercial arts establishments are attracted to gentrified environments rather than creating them (Grodach et al 2018), and that independent and politicised arts activities can in some instances slow the process down (Shaw 2014; 2013a; 2009). How essential to the class transition is cultural capital, then, as opposed to economic capital? And what of symbolic capital, which relies on a broader frame than cultural capital, and in the context of neoliberal urbanisation is very effectively acquired through the accumulation and display of wealth?

This paper contributes to discussions on these questions through an examination of the redeveloped Melbourne Docklands. The structure of the paper is as follows: after an introduction to the area and consideration of the question of whether it should be considered ‘gentrified’ at all, we outline the methods used in taking a closer look. Then each of the key criteria outlined above – revalorisation of land, displacement of previous occupants, and transition in class character – is examined in turn. The paper finds that the precinct must be considered gentrified, but that it has yet to display any of the cultural capital traditionally associated with the gentry or ‘creative’ classes. Finally, we consider the question of the necessity of artists, the arts, as markers of distinction, to gentrification, and conclude that without them, the process is shocking indeed.

**Is Melbourne Docklands gentrified?**

Melbourne Docklands is the name of one of inner-Melbourne’s newer suburbs. It is located on the site of the old docks, immediately to the west of the city centre on the Yarra River (figure 1). From the 1890s this was the largest port in Australia until changing shipping technologies in the 1980s, and the increasing value of this well-located real estate, catalysed their relocation downstream to the mouth of the river. The redevelopment of the 150
hectares of deindustrialised (though not deserted) waterfront land commenced in the 1990s and is scheduled for completion by 2025.

Figure 1. Melbourne Docklands is located on the Yarra River to the west of the original city centre grid. The former docks were relocated to Webb Dock at the mouth of the river.

In the early 1990s the vacated land was in full public ownership and zoned industrial. Sale to the private sector and subsequent rezoning encouraged highest and best use, which was duly delivered in the form of the globally formulaic office/residential/retail mix (figure 2). The offerings were uniformly high-rent, with commercial and residential sales and rents starting at more than twice the metropolitan median. By any measure, this was a substantial recaptitalisation on the rent gap.

The dock workers were gone by the time the land sales were transacted, but it’s not too much of a stretch to think of them as having been displaced in the interests of this revalorisation. In any event, Marcuse’s notion of ‘exclusionary displacement’, given the land value increases, clearly holds. Various informal cultural uses replaced the docks functions for a while, but these too were summarily displaced to make way for the redevelopment. So the second criterion for judging Docklands as gentrified is satisfied.

It was certainly the intent of the politicians, the development corporation, the developers and the marketers to present Docklands as the very image of a class remake. Promotional literature referred to the “creation of a waterfront spectacular. An urban oasis. A modern marvel” (VicUrban 2005).
Australia’s most ambitious urban renewal project ... has involved the transformation of an industrial wasteland into one of the most stunning city waterfront precincts in the world today. (VicUrban 2005)

Figure 2. Newquay, Docklands’ largest residential precinct (photo by author)

But below the shimmering blue waters of the artists’ renditions, something darker was going on. An estimated quarter of the apartments at Docklands were unoccupied. Others were crammed with international students paying exorbitant rents. Drug busts and the occasional dead body were lending the area a distinctly noir feel. Efforts by the state development authority and the City of Melbourne to ‘activate’ the precinct with a temporary arts initiative from 2012 to 2106 suggested that the state-sponsored gentrification of Docklands hadn’t delivered quite the desired results.

Methods

The research from which this paper is drawn used a mixed methodology of statistical data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), the City of Melbourne (CoM) and the Real Estate Institute of Victoria (REIV); analysis of policy documents and media reports; and interviews with people closely associated with the repopulation of Melbourne Docklands – real estate agents, property journalists, and state and city bureaucrats. Most of those interviewed requested, and were given, assurances of complete confidentiality.
Docklands in detail

At the start of the 21st century Melbourne Docklands was Australia’s largest urban renewal project. It covers an area of 190 hectares (including 40 ha of water) and according to the development authority, will have absorbed $17.5 billion of private investment with 20,000 residents and 80,000 workers on its completion in 2025 (Places Victoria 2017). The centrepiece is a football stadium. There is more office space (784,200m²) than residential space (624,200m²) with few recreational facilities other than the expensive bars and restaurants that line the street level (City of Melbourne 2016). The top three industries are finance and insurance, business services, and public administration and safety (City of Melbourne 2016).

The 2016 Census had 58,220 workers at Docklands and 10,966 residents in 6,010 dwellings (a ratio of 1.8 people per dwelling). The city council has recently built a community hub to provide social facilities for the long-term residential population. The most recent demographic profile of Docklands residents is by the council (City of Melbourne 2013) and shows the median personal weekly income to be $1,060, compared with $711 in the broader municipality.

Figure 3 shows apartment sale prices at Docklands. Apart from a few exceptions, they maintain a minimum of $400,000. In 2002-3, when sales began, the median price was $800,000.

Figure 3. Apartment sale prices at Docklands, 1992-2014 (source: REIV database)

This can be compared to sale prices in other areas of Melbourne. Figure 4 shows apartment sale prices in and around Fitzroy Street, St Kilda (bottom right in figure 1) which can be considered one of the more gentrified parts of the inner city. The standard minimum there is $100,000 - $200,000, though this is increasing. Around 2003, the median apartment price was a bit below $400,000 – half that of Docklands.

---

3 2016 Census demographic data for small areas was not available at the time of writing
Figure 4. Apartment sale prices in and around Fitzroy Street, St Kilda, 1992-2014 (source: REIV database)

Figure 5 shows the areas in and around Gertrude and Johnston Streets in Fitzroy (just east of the Carlton Gardens in the top right of figure 1), a steadily gentrifying area. Fitzroy also maintains a minimum of $100,000 - $200,000. Around 2003, the median apartment price was $400,000.

Figure 5. Apartment sale prices in and around Gertrude and Johnston Streets, Fitzroy, 1992-2014 (source: REIV database)
Docklands’ revalorisation

In 2003, Docklands apartment sale prices started at twice the price of apartments in two gentrified or gentrifying areas of inner-Melbourne. Unlike in St Kilda and Fitzroy, though, where median prices have maintained a steady upward trajectory, median prices at Docklands, right from the beginning, went into slow decline. As early as 2004, the Real Estate Institute of Victoria observed that the first re-sales of Docklands apartments were not reaching their original prices. Property advisors began recommending against investment properties at Docklands: “Witness the May resale of a Docklands apartment for $715,000 against a purchase price of about $900,000 in late 2000 – a loss of about 20 percent excluding costs” (Wakelin 2004:3).

Not everyone heeded this advice. In 2013, only 24 percent of the dwellings were owner-occupied. Rental dwellings accounted for 43 percent, with the remaining 33 percent unoccupied (City of Melbourne 2013). Some of these empty apartments were newly constructed and as yet unsold, and because data is not collected on occupancy other than the five yearly ABS Census it is difficult to determine precisely how many sold investment properties are mainly unoccupied and not for lease on the rental market. However, methods such as examining water retailers’ usage data allow rates of water consumption to be used as a proxy to determine vacant dwellings. The most recent research on this basis puts the number of unoccupied dwellings at Docklands at 27 percent (Cashmore 2014). The ABS 2011 census put the unoccupied rate at Docklands at 17 percent; the 2006 census had it at 23.4 percent (City of Melbourne 2013; 2008). To put these figures another way: three-quarters of the apartments at Docklands are investment properties (City of Melbourne 2013) and probably one-third of these are empty or at best short-term rentals.

Notwithstanding the decline in sale prices, the rental returns on investment properties are high and constant. Figure 6 shows rental data from 2001.

---

4 The REIV database relies on real estate agents entering sale price and rental data. We can only presume that the agent who handled the original sale that Wakelin refers to neglected to record it. The database is however the most comprehensive source of property data in Victoria.
With a few exceptions, rents at Docklands maintain a minimum of around $400 per week. The median rent is just below $600 per week.

This data can be compared with rents in the region of Fitzroy for the same period (figure 7).

Again, the pattern is clear: rents in Fitzroy, Collingwood and Abbotsford start at around half that of Docklands, at $200 per week. And again, unlike at Docklands, rents are increasing. In the early 2000s the median rent in Fitzroy was half that of Docklands, at $300 per week, but the difference is closing.

Clearly the redevelopment of Docklands is a significant revalorisation of the land and delivered substantial profits to the original developers who capitalised on the rent gap. Indeed, the sums paid to the state government by the first developers were in some cases well below even the unimproved value of the land at the time, representing really significant profits for them (Johanson 2012). They were the big winners, pulling off something that no Docklands’ investor since has been able to repeat.
Displacement from Docklands

Those who were most disadvantaged by the redevelopment were of course the wharfies and other dock workers who lost their jobs in the restructure of the shipping industry. This cannot be attributed entirely to the revalorisation of Docklands but neither is it unrelated. Other uses in the interim period, between the functioning docks and the redevelopment, included industrial design and furniture manufacture, circus and theatre performances in the old warehouses, and rave parties. These uses, most of which were informal, and the socially-created use values of the deindustrialised land at that time – alternative uses that tapped into and helped fuel Melbourne’s growing cultural productivity – were also entirely displaced before new development began. They were not allowed in the revalorised space, and cannot in any way be said to have contributed to the final product.

More significant in Marcuse’s (1985) frame are those who are excluded from the new development. All industrial work there is gone – only 3 percent of the workers at Docklands are labourers, and they are on the construction sites (City of Melbourne 2013). Professional/managerial positions count for more than half the new jobs, and another 23 percent are clerical and admin workers.

Of the residents, according to the 2013 City of Melbourne demographic profile, Docklands has the third highest proportion of people earning a personal income of more than $1250 per week (33 percent), behind only East Melbourne (38 percent) and South Yarra (35 percent) – the two richest suburbs in the municipality. A relatively low 17 percent of Docklands residents earned less than $300 per week (with South Yarra, 14 percent, and East Melbourne, 12 percent, the only suburbs to register lower proportions). Docklands had the third highest proportion (16 percent) of residents in the highest income bracket reported by the ABS of $2000 or more per week, again behind only South Yarra (17 percent) and East Melbourne (19 percent).

Apartment sale prices and rents are exclusive, and their effect is evident in the demographics. All the above is sufficient to conclude that the redevelopment of Docklands displaced and displaces people in direct, indirect and exclusionary ways.

Docklands’ class remake

One of the more surprising findings in the population data is that in 2010, 6,550 residents were living in 3,820 apartments (City of Melbourne 2010). A year later, according to the ABS 2011 Census, there were 5,789 residents in 4,006 apartments. That is, even as the number of apartments increased, the number of residents declined.

Families (2 related people or more) made up 45 percent of households, and single person households comprised 30 percent (City of Melbourne 2013). The most recent Census count has 10,966 people in 6,010 dwellings, a ratio of 1.8 people per dwelling (ABS 2016). That’s a lot of empty or unaccounted-for dwellings. There may be issues with the data collection, but
other sources of information are indicating that there are layers of reality that formal data collection methods are not detecting.

In November 2014 a fire in one of the residential buildings spread alarmingly quickly from the 6th to the 21st floor. (The problem was attributed to substandard external cladding – a cheap product that does not comply with Australian building standards. It has since been established that it is the same type as on the Grenfell tower in North Kensington, London). In the course of the evacuation, media footage began to focus on huddled groups of young people of Asian and South-Asian appearance. The Metropolitan Fire Brigade (MFB) later reported that firefighters had found “high occupancy rates” in some of the apartments and personal goods and furniture stored on the balconies. The fire had started on one of these balconies. The MFB spokesman said: “In this particular situation the factors that caused this fire to be such an extent were numerous – the discarded cigarette, the poor house-keeping, and the external cladding which didn’t prevent the fire from going any further” (ABC News 2014a).

The announcement of an investigation by the City of Melbourne and the Department of Immigration carried the revelation that safety inspectors had found up to eight mattresses crammed into some of the two-bedroom apartments. The Sunday Age reported: “A Docklands apartment tower gutted by fire last month was being used by some residents as slum housing for suspected illegal workers and foreign students” (Sunday Age 2014). A further report titled “Melbourne’s illegal high-rise rooming houses profit from foreign students” found multiple cases of young students squeezed into small apartments. The latter investigation, which simply followed up listings on well-known websites, said many advertisements “ask for Asian housemates only, due to ‘living culture’” (Sunday Age 2015a). The report detailed the case of six girls living in a one-bedroom apartment in another building at Docklands – four in the bedroom and two in the living room – each of whom was paying $140 per week. The report observed that this meant the owner was taking $840 per week for an apartment with a market rent of about $400. In another case, three people were paying $99 per week each to share a lounge room. More recently, even after wide media coverage of the issue, it was reported that landlords are continuing to advertise for renters to pay $150 a week “to squeeze into two-bedroom city apartments with seven others”, enabling them to pocket $1,200 a week from the set-up – “triple Melbourne’s median unit rent” (Sunday Age, 2017:11).

It can be presumed that the owners and landlords of these apartments are not declaring these arrangements, and safety inspectors reported finding notices on the inside of front doors warning tenants not to talk to people who come unsolicited to the door (Sunday Age 2014). Beyond the official investigation (which has issued no further comment) and the occasional media report, accounts of the informal population at Docklands are anecdotal – received through interviews but strictly off-the-record. This raises interesting questions for researchers about the nature of our knowledge – how do we write about essentially undocumented and sometimes undocumentable activities? The informants are people who have reason to know – local residents and workers, real estate agents and a private detective – and they universally
choose not to be identified or quoted. They are consistent in their message that the practices described above are absurdly common and that the only people who are apparently not aware are those in the relevant authorities. In any event, population estimates and formal counts are unlikely to include this essentially informal population, so they may be underestimates.

On the other hand, there are suggestions that legal and counted residents who bought into Docklands in good faith may have good reason to want to depart. In addition to the unquantified cost-cutting construction practices and housing rackets at Docklands, news reports of organised crime and unseemly wealth repeatedly break the surface. An ABC News report of a former biker with the Bandidos who allegedly threatened to kill a man and his baby daughter if he did not hand over $300,000, mentioned that his arrest took place at his residence in “a property on Harbour Esplanade in Docklands just before midnight on Saturday” (ABC News 2014b).

The Herald Sun reported the unrelated finding of a woman’s body in an apartment in a lavish Docklands complex “which boasts a pool and large shared courtyard” (Herald Sun 2014). A man who had lived at the complex “since the beginning”, 12 or 13 years ago, told the Herald Sun it had become a popular place for weekend and holiday accommodation, and that he had assumed when the police arrived that it was to investigate a drug deal “which was not uncommon” (Herald Sun 2014). In April 2015 The Age reported that “an unemployed ice addict living in a penthouse apartment” was the subject of a surveillance operation on the 40-storey Docklands apartment complex, and that he pulled a gun on police when they nabbed him for stealing luxury cars (The Age 2015). Interviews and anecdotes say the cases that reach the media are just the tip of the iceberg.

A recent investigation by Age journalists concluded the following:

Originally conceived as a lifestyle destination for inner-city professionals and empty nesters, the gleaming towers of Docklands have instead become a popular haunt for gangland figures, illegal sex workers and slum landlords.

The Sunday Age understands apartments and short-stay hotels in the suburb are increasingly being used as “safe houses” and party spots for those on the wrong side of the law, including a number of the city's most influential up-and-coming drug dealers.

Criminals worried about safety but still keen to flaunt their rising wealth and power are attracted to luxury apartments in Docklands buildings where secure underground carparks and extensive CCTV systems are standard features. (Sunday Age 2015b)

The report, headlined “Ganglands, not Docklands: new high-rises harbour the ganglands crowd”, said a drug dealer suspected of committing at least two murders and a string of drug-related stand-overs had “moved into a Docklands high-rise amid fears his activities were making him a target for revenge”, and observed that “there is a perception that the security features of the high-rises – secure underground carparks, multiple locked doors and
lobby CCTV cameras – make it harder to be ambushed by criminals or caught unawares by police” (*Sunday Age* 2015b). The journalists claimed “a number of notorious residents” had made their home in Docklands and quoted unnamed sources as saying:

... booming profits from the ice and meth trade are funding moves into the area for a new generation of criminals ... "As soon as these new guys start to see a bit of money they buy a flash car, Louis Vuitton man bag and get a place in Docklands or Port Melbourne,” a source said. "They're young, violent, just don't give a shit and post all about it on Facebook." (*Sunday Age* 2015b)

Reports such as these and the broadly circulating rumours, anecdotes and innuendos are creating quite a *noir* feel for Docklands. Irrespective of their truth and depth, Docklands has developed a reputation as an unpleasant place. What does this mean for our class remake?

There is a certain symbolic capital that comes with the flaunting of wealth, no matter how it is gained. Indeed according to some accounts a Docklands penthouse is *de rigeur* among the young criminal set – and the symbolic capital conferred via the financial capital is precisely why they want to live there. The rapacious owners, landlords and overseers of the housing racket appear less keen to make their business obvious, and if their profits translate into symbolic capital – which as Bourdieu (1984) emphasises is far more locally, culturally and historically contingent than the other forms – then it occurs below the radar of this research. Their exploited young student tenants are deeply vulnerable in this frame, their main purpose being to enrich the landlords.

The remaining residents, including the estimated 25 percent owner-occupiers (City of Melbourne 2013) are as a group significantly wealthier than those in all other postcode areas in the municipality except the two richest suburbs of East Melbourne and South Yarra. Their presence at Docklands constitutes the high-income occupation that is a necessary characteristic of a class remake.

**Gentrification specified**

Peter Temple’s (2010) hard-boiled detective novel, ‘Truth’, set against a backdrop of power, politics and corruption, opens with a murdered woman in a penthouse apartment at Melbourne Docklands. This is no coincidence, but perhaps a case of life imitating art imitating life. Docklands’ underbelly is exposed.

Is Melbourne Docklands gentrified? The land has been revalorised: the rent gap was not just closed but overshot. Former occupants, workers and uses were displaced. Low-income people are excluded from living there except under unacceptable conditions; the great majority of jobs created, and bars and restaurants there, are not for them. There has been a conspicuous transition in class character – from working class and/or marginal to a class of property owners united by their relative wealth. The most significant beneficiaries are the developers of Docklands and investors who on-sold early. A significant investor class in
individual apartments remains, including exploitative landlords who hide their profiteering, and more innocuous businesses that trade in short-stay rentals. A longer-term residential sector includes middle-class empty nesters, inner-city professionals, and a *nouveau riche* of conspicuous consumers.

If the intent of Docklands’ development authority was to create a place of ‘distinction’ in Bourdieu’s (1984) terms, it was spectacularly unsuccessful. In recognition of this, the state development authority and the City of Melbourne engaged the temporary creative uses initiative, *Renew Australia*, in a project to ‘activate’ the precinct by inviting artists into empty retail spaces. The project provided cheap space for 21 small businesses, creative groups and community projects over a period of three years, “to set-up and trial their ideas in Docklands” (Places Victoria 2016). It finished on 30 June 2016 and the start-ups have gone; most of the retail spaces remain empty. The project had minimal effect on the culture and image of Docklands.

The fact of this initiative is interesting. If the introduction of arts and culture into Docklands had somehow had the intended effect; if the creative uses project had been able to overcome the reputation of the area; if Docklands had become known for more genteel offerings and become attractive to cultural elites, this would have allowed the government and development authority to declare Docklands a case of successful gentrification. The dynamics described in this paper would have persisted, but more likely gone unmarked, unobserved, as the cultural hype overtook them.

This research suggests that the temporary arts initiative was an attempt to cloak the nakedness of Docklands’ gentrification, but that this was already too exposed. The definition of gentrification provided by Hackworth (2002) is widely accepted because people understand that the production of space for progressively more affluent users means overriding, removing, excluding others. This is the word’s utility. The old docks are now wholly gentrified, and without the cultural cover the reality is disturbing. There has been a dramatic influx of financial capital, and a certain symbolic capital has accompanied this, with brazen displays of conspicuous consumption. Without the cultural cachet that often accompanies the class transition, the exclusionary and exploitative processes revealed in Docklands’ redevelopment are shocking. In the final analysis, some people profit obscenely from the revalorisation that constitutes gentrification, and others are excluded or exploited. It is this relation that a critical appreciation of gentrification attempts to capture, and at Melbourne Docklands, without the cultural cloak, the process is stripped bare.
References

ABC News (2014a) Overcrowding, substandard building contributed to $2m Docklands apartment fire, investigation finds, updated 28 Apr 2015, 9:50am ABC News

ABC News (2014b) Toby Mitchell, ex-Bandidos enforcer, threatened to kill man's baby over $300k, court hears, updated 11 Jan 2015, 1:24pm

ABC News (2014c) Man arrested over death of woman in Melbourne's Docklands, updated 17 Jan 2015, 6:48pm


City of Melbourne (2013) Docklands small area demographic profile, Melbourne: City of Melbourne

City of Melbourne (2014) Docklands small area demographic profile, Melbourne: City of Melbourne


Herald Sun (2014) Woman found dead at Docklands, January 17, 2015 4:53PM

Johanson, S. (2012) Docklands: Kennett was almost giving the land away, *The Age*, 3 March


Shaw, K. (2013a) Public housing estate redevelopments in Australian inner cities and the meanings of social mix’, State of Australian Cities Conference, Sydney, 26-29 November


Shaw, K. (2014) Melbourne’s Creative Spaces program: reclaiming the ‘creative city’ (if not quite the rest of it), *City, Culture and Society*, 5, 139–147


Sunday Age (2014) Docklands tower fire reveals slum housing, 28 December 2014

Sunday Age (2015a) Melbourne's illegal high-rise rooming houses profit from foreign students, 21 June 2015

Sunday Age (2015b) Ganglands, not Docklands: new high-rises harbour the ganglands crowd, 18 October 2015

Sunday Age (2017) Rental rip-off: students pay $150 a bed, 23 July 2017


The Age (2015) Jury finds addict guilty of pointing gun at police, 9 April 2015

