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Abstract

This thesis focuses on one of the most controversial and ambitious urban regeneration policies of recent years – the plan to create sustainable communities via Housing Market Renewal Pathfinders (HMRP). Announced as a ‘step change’ in urban policy to overcome problems of low demand and abandonment experienced most acutely in nine former industrial towns and cities in the north and midlands of England, the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) (ODPM, 2003a) involves the demolition and relocation of mainly white, working class inner-urban communities. This thesis focuses on a year long moment in the process of regeneration in one such HMRP in North East England, known as ‘Bridging NewcastleGateshead’ (BNG) and draws from rich, detailed ethnographic case studies of three former industrial communities.

Originally, the thesis draws together critical engagements with the concepts of space, governance, community, sustainability and materiality to develop a relational understanding of urban regeneration. Starting with an understanding of ‘spaces of regeneration’ as spaces in the process of becoming this perspective moves beyond normative, prescriptive understandings of spaces as static and contained and subject to the process of spatial regulation from above i.e. power over. Rather than a straightforward process of spatial regulation to transform people and places, the process of regeneration involves uncertainties, negotiations, contestations and emotions between the multiple social, material, economic and environmental networks. The thesis has drawn together urban theories and empirical evidence (including historical and contemporary policy analysis as well as a range of qualitative methods) to illustrate the relational transformation of people and places. Governmentality provides the main conceptual framework. This leads to an in-depth exploration of the rationalities and technologies of urban regeneration from three perspectives in the empirical chapters - governing communities, demolishing communities and transforming communities.
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<td>Urban White Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCED</td>
<td>World Commission on Environment and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Walker Riverside Promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YHN</td>
<td>Your Homes Newcastle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Spacing urban regeneration policy

In recent years the notions of space, governance, community, sustainability, materiality and regeneration in urban environments have been discussed in similar but largely separate theoretical debates. This thesis draws together recent critical engagements with these concepts to develop a relational understanding of urban regeneration. The restructuring of urban space has arguably been caused by neoliberal economic policies that manifest in the image of an economically polarized city (Sassen, 2001) where the new urban middle class live contiguously with the poorly paid service class (Ellison and Burrows, 2007). Marcuse (1996:198) adds that gentrification, ghettoisation and the growth in size of the abandoned city exacerbate socio-spatial polarization of the post-Fordist city. It is within this ‘splintered urban’ landscape (Graham and Marvin, 2001) that ‘community’ has re-emerged as the object and target (Rose, 1999) and solution to urban problems (Raco, 2003) in contemporary UK urban regeneration policy discourse. New interpretations of community, heavily influenced by ‘communitarianism’ (Etzioni, 1993:1995) are most prominent in the recent plans to create sustainable communities via Housing Market Renewal Pathfinders (HMRP) (ODPM, 2003a) in nine former industrial cities in the Midlands and Northern England. The nine cities, which include Manchester, Liverpool, Sheffield and Newcastle have experienced several traumatic decades of decline and deprivation as a result of deindustrialization. The effects of deindustrialization have not been city wide and the impact has been most harshly felt in working class areas most associated historically with industrial employment. This thesis explores three such communities in the ‘NewcastleGateshead’ HMRP, known as ‘Bridging NewcastleGateshead’ (BNG). The communities in BNG are characterized by high levels of deprivation, worklessness, ill health and out migration. The main aim of the thesis is to assess the extent to which the plan to create sustainable communities via HMRP represents a genuine and meaningful step-change in urban regeneration policy and the research aim is met by three research questions:
1. How and to what extent have the themes of ‘community’ and ‘sustainability’ been incorporated into local and national urban regeneration policies within in recent decades?

2. How significant is the ‘local context’ and ‘place’ in shaping, enabling and constraining the capacity to achieve policies for sustainable communities in this particular urban region?

3. How are the themes of ‘community’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable community’ being interpreted by the different stakeholders involved in the BNG area?

1.2 Contribution of the thesis

Conceptually the thesis develops a relational understanding of urban regeneration. In contrast to ‘static’ notions of community associated with places traditionally dominated by a single industry such as coal or ship building, the thesis considers the juxtaposition of these notions of ‘fixity’ in relation to the ‘dynamic, shifting, fluid’ nature of urban regeneration as ‘spaces of becoming’ (Doel, 1999). By considering the juxtaposition of fixity and flow, of people and places and the social, material, economic and environmental networks that make spaces of regeneration, the negotiations and contestations of power emerge. Developing a governmentality framework, the rationalities and technologies of urban regeneration are explored through three key themes – governance, demolition and transformation. The three interrelated themes strongly emerged from the policy and academic literature as a way of analyzing the process of urban regeneration. In one respect, the themes represent the chronology of the urban regeneration process but in another respect, each theme stands alone (though they are interrelated) as a ‘lens’ through which to view urban regeneration. The three themes draw from the rich, detailed empirical findings gathered in the three case study areas.

The main argument is that despite attempts to involve local communities, national policy imperatives overwhelmingly influence local regeneration efforts. More controversially, the thesis argues that the implicit intention of the housing market renewal approach to
‘creating sustainable communities’ in NewcastleGateshead is to ‘erase’ those members of inner urban communities whose behaviour is deemed ‘anti social’, and/or ‘criminal’ and attract the middle classes employed in the ‘creative or knowledge industries’ (Florida, 2002). Allen (2008) in his ethnographic study of the Liverpool HMR similarly argues that it is one of the most controversial policy programmes of recent years: at best HMR can be viewed as an attempt to reshape existing communities and create new ones; at worst as a deliberate attempt to destroy and disperse old communities. Via a combination of surveillance and selection ‘techniques’, such as ‘community experts’, ‘surveys’, ‘urban branding’ and so on, the inhabitants of BNG are sorted and sifted according to their ‘responsible’ or ‘irresponsible’ behaviour. Those ‘active, responsible citizens’ are rewarded with relocation – if there is social housing available as ‘sustainable communities’ are mainly ‘owner occupied’. As Raco (2005) argues, ‘homeowners’ appear to be the desired citizens in the newly created communities. The Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) promotes the presence of middle class households who will be active, responsible citizens whilst marginalizing those who do not demonstrate responsibility (Raco, 2005).

Empirically, the thesis draws on detailed evidence from policy documents, grey literature, interviews, focus groups, and observation to inform the three case studies. The thesis offers not only the perspective of key stakeholders involved in urban regeneration but also the ‘lived experiences’ and the ‘emotional geographies’ of the communities undergoing the transformation. Thus the conceptual avenues and development that provide the framework for the thesis are related to the rich, detailed empirical findings. This is not writing that “has become increasingly abstract and divorced from the complex and at times contradictory, realities of policy definition and implementation” (Raco, 2007:4). The starting point of the thesis was a particular policy – the SCP, so in analyzing the policy I have been mindful not to lose sight of the fact that the implementation of that ‘policy’ affects people living their everyday lives. Indeed, in studying one particular policy and its implementation, it has to be remembered that the impact has often been most acutely felt in the same areas for generations, a phenomenon referred to as “the policy laboratory” by Fred Robinson (2005:18). To hear the voices of communities that have experienced the sharp end of policy implementation is important. Furthermore, in his latest book, Allan Cochrane asks two questions in the introductory chapter – what is urban policy? And when is urban policy? (Cochrane, 2007)
To these I would add - where is urban policy? This may seem an obvious question but it is worth asking in order to stress the fact that urban policies have persistently targeted the same urban places for decades. As the Audit Commission (2003) recognized in its early assessment of BNG, “the pathfinder area has been subject to numerous programmes of interventions in the past…but all have failed to halt the area’s decline”. Urban regeneration policy is not targeted at “those in the fast lane, the secure and well connected” (Amin, 2006:1011). As Amin (2006:1011) continues,

“For the vast majority, cities are polluted, unhealthy, tiring, overwhelming, confusing, alienating. They are the places of low-wage work, insecurity, poor living conditions and dejected isolation for the many at the bottom of the social ladder”

This is ‘where’ the housing market renewal urban policy is – the poor spaces of the city. Despite decades of policy intervention, whereby the poor spaces of the city become a ‘policy laboratory’ (Robinson, 2005:18) there still exists a wide gap between the rich and poor areas. Indeed, the ‘Building sustainable communities’ section of the Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS) draws attention to the spatial disparities arising within a period of national economic growth,

“Although the economy grew overall between 1970 and 1998, there are large regional differences in economic activity in the UK and the benefits of economic growth have not been shared by everyone. In 1998 many areas contained pockets of high or severe deprivation. Almost a fifth of children in 1994 lived in households with persistently low incomes; over half of single people over sixty experienced fuel poverty in 1996; the UK has the highest teenage birth rate in Western Europe; and employment rates for ethnic minorities in 1999 were much lower than the GB average” (DETR, 1999a:113).

---

1 The author acknowledges that the Sustainable Communities Plan (ODPM, 2003) is also concerned with housing supply issues in the South East (see Table 3.4 in Chapter 3) but the focus of this thesis are the areas of low demand and abandonment in NewcastleGateshead and the housing market renewal approach to creating sustainable communities.
The SDS continues, and argues that,

“...growth should benefit everyone, in all parts of the country and in different groups – otherwise areas of local deprivation, unemployment, urban decay, high levels of crime and poor health will persist and worsen, leading to the development of unsustainable local communities” (DETR, 1999a:113).

New Labour’s intention here is to build sustainable communities in order to “close the gap between the poorest communities and the rest” and “improve economic performance and enhance regional competitiveness” (DETR, 1999a:114). As Robinson (2005:18) argues, commenting on previous urban policy interventions in the West End of Newcastle, “each intervention has had some impact ...all have fallen far short of a solution to the problems of the area”. Part of the problem is that “policies are often launched...in an ahistorical vacuum in which the same debates are played out time and again” (Raco, 2007:13). As Raco (2007:13) adds “a central element of modernity is the ongoing drive towards improvement and betterment, with the consequence that what already exists must be overridden and superseded”. Although Robinson and Raco, respectively, recognize the generational aspect of policy interventions, they and other commentators have not explicitly examined the process of policy and the impact on residents i.e. living in an area or areas that have been the target of urban policy for decades. Policy makers may attempt to erase the policy history of an area but it is this policy history that contributes to the family and community history of many poor areas and they do not forget. This thesis offers an insight into the process of one particular urban regeneration policy in three former industrial communities in ‘NewcastleGateshead’. The next section provides a brief introduction to the concepts of ‘communitarianism’, ‘urban sustainability’, ‘sustainable development’ and ‘New Urbanism’ and their influence on the sustainable communities’ agenda.

1.3 Influencing the sustainable communities agenda

The communities of concern to this thesis can be and have been labeled in many ways by a range of commentators to describe the people and places – ‘poor’, ‘deprived’, ‘working class’, ‘white’, ‘anti social’, ‘criminal’, ‘hoodies’, ‘chavs’, ‘underclass’, ‘slums’ and so on. In the paragraph above, I have described them as ‘former industrial communities’
because for me the various descriptions stem from the fact that processes of deindustrialization contributed to their subsequent and terminal decline. In turn, this has led to periods of intense policy focus and for many their lives have been dictated by and interrupted by state interventions for generations. More affluent, middle class city spaces have not experienced the same intense policy focus. The SCP is New Labour’s attempt to address the failures of past urban policies. The expressions of concern were fuelled by the persistent and unequal spatial segregation and social polarization manifest in many towns and cities (Oatley, 1998). The social polarization of wealthy and poor people increased in Britain from 1970 to 2000 and the urban clustering of poverty increased (Taylor, 2008). A study by Dorling et al (2007) examines the spatio-temporal distributions of poverty and wealth in Britain and found that in some parts of the city over half the households were breadline poor, while wealthier households concentrated in the suburban outskirts of the city. As MacLeod and Ward (2002:154) argue, “the contemporary city – featuring the escalating extremes of wealth and poverty ….appears to be manifesting as an intensely uneven patchwork of utopian and dystopian spaces that are, to all intents and purposes, physically proximate but institutionally estranged”.

1.3.1 Communitarianism

New Labours appeal to ‘community’ is heavily influenced by ‘communitarianism’ (see Chapter 3 and 6 for more on New Labour’s understanding and interpretation of ‘community’; see also Putnam, 1996; Etzioni, 1993, 1995 and Driver and Martell, 1997 for critical commentary). According to Etzioni (1995:146) “one of the gravest dangers in rebuilding communities is that they will become insular and indifferent to the fate of outsiders”. To overcome parochialism there should be an expansion of the two moral dimensions of community - that community is good in itself and speaks with a moral authority (Etzioni, 1995). The call for community to ‘look outwards’ is reiterated by Selznick (1992:195) who distinguishes between particularism (the bonds of family, friendships, ethnicity and locality) as “bounded altruism” and universalism as “inclusive altruism” based on the premise that humans are morally alike, sharing core values of respect and civility. By recognizing human sameness on a moral level Selznick (1992) argues that individual groups can express their difference within this moral framework with place increasingly seen as open and consisting of hybrid identities.
But as Defilippis et al (2006:676) argue, communitarian theories such as those advanced by Etzioni and Putnam which call for a return to a romanticized, mythical community, created by all for all, mask the “structural divisions, blurs political sides and interest and eliminate dissenting voices”. Community becomes an asset rather than a problem, with Etzioni (1993) and Putnam (1996) arguing for the rebuilding of social capital as a means of recreating civil society. Community in this sense becomes the site of collaboration, consensus and voluntary participation and ignores tensions, problems of power, policies, economics or politics. Community becomes the site of social and cultural practice and experience with residents expected to build upon their assets and develop their skills. This perspective assumes first, that community is separate from the market and state and second, by focusing on social capital and capacity or community building from ‘inside out’ that the resources to address community problems and concerns already exist within the community. So describing, discussing and evaluating community is a contextual challenge and perhaps this is more evident in poor, inner urban communities were political expectations (such as urban regeneration policies) lay excessive pressure at the “trapdoor of community” (Herbert, 2005). In contrast, Butler (2004:281) comments that middle class groups can operationalize economic, cultural and social capital to “move in entirely separate worlds” and create a particular habitus, enclave or “virtual urban village” based on shared conceptions of lifestyle (Robson and Butler, 2001: 79). Relations with other groups, Robson and Butler, 2001:77) describe as “tectonic”, there been an awareness of others but little or no interaction.

1.3.2 Urban sustainability

The historical foundations of urban sustainability have been traced back by some commentators to the writings of scientists, philosophers, historians and economists of the eighteenth, nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Holland, 2003; Lumley and Armstrong, 2004; Pepper, 1996). For instance, during the early twentieth century, writers such as Ebenezer Howard and Lewis Mumford raised questions about the industrial city, human development and the natural world. Later, during the 1960s and 1970s writers such as Rachel Carson, Andre Gunder Frank and Meadows et al (Limits to Growth) drew attention to unsustainable development practices and issues; particularly as the ecological and social implications of global growth and development were beginning to be understood (Wheeler and Beatley, 2004). Yet despite such writings it was not until the publication of the Brundtland Report (World Commission on Environment and
Development, WCED, 1987) that the term ‘sustainable development’ was popularized and the role of environmental issues in urban areas highlighted (see Section 2.5.4 for the UK policy impact). It was at the WCED that the concept of sustainable development was launched as a global objective to guide policies to represent the ‘triple bottom line’ of ‘economy, environment and society’ (Elkington et al, 2007:1). Reconciling economic, environmental and societal goals is not a straightforward matter because of the different scales at which compromise is sought (local, regional, national and international) and the problems of negotiating competing interests and values (Bulkeley and Betsill, 2003). Thus sustainability is not a fixed concept; rather it is a shifting compromise between the economic, environmental and social objectives between the present and future (Gleeson and Low, 2000). In particular the Brundtland Report is responsible for highlighting the central role of cities in pursuing sustainability especially as the majority of the world’s population will live in urban areas (Bulkeley and Betsill, 2003).

Since the Brundtland Report many different typologies of sustainability have emerged (Bulkeley and Betsill, 2003). One example locates different versions of sustainability along a spectrum from ‘weak to strong’ (Owens and Cowell, 2002). The weak or shallow perspective is also known as ‘anthropocentric’ because this version emphasizes human needs and views humans as the sole determinants of value judgments. Proponents of this weak version of sustainability believe in technological and neoliberal economic solutions to environmental problems and the ecological world is given an instrumental value (Pearce et al, 1989). Weak interpretations of sustainability imply that environmental issues should be part of the decision making process but in a trade off against economic and social considerations (Bulkeley and Betsill, 2003). The ‘strong’ perspective of sustainability is also known as ‘ecocentric’. The ecocentric perspective believes that humans and non-humans have an intrinsic value and that the latter cannot be instruments of the former (Gleeson and Low, 2000). Thus in decision making, strong interpretations of sustainability acknowledge that trade offs between environmental, social and economic issues are inevitable but suggest that some “environmental systems, goods, beliefs and values are critical and should be exempt from any process of trade off” (Bulkeley and Betsill, 2003:21).
It would seem then, at a superficial level that economic neoliberalism and urban growth politics would “conflict ideologically and materially with the principles and practices of urban sustainability” (While et al, 2004:550). Nevertheless,

“there is evidence that environmentalism……in its various forms does exert a powerful influence on urban growth politics, and this is not simply a matter of the demands placed on local state regulation by national government or pressures from upper and middle-class residents, significant though these are (Feldman and Jonas, 2000). Rather it would appear that urban entrepreneurialism itself might depend on the active remaking of urban environments and ecologies” (While et al, 2004:550).

This, they argue, is “especially true of ex-industrial areas most often associated with the rise of the entrepreneurial city” (While et al, 2004:550). As Short (1999) argues, the post-industrial city depends in part upon promoting the cities image as clean and attractive – ‘a place for business’ yet devoid of factories. Thus it is within the context of urban planning and regeneration of former industrial areas that discourses and practices of sustainability are increasingly applied (Raco, 2007; see Chapter 8 of the thesis for more on how a range of urban branding techniques are used to promote an image of sustainable communities in the three case study areas – the former industrial areas of Newcastle and Gateshead).

Two interpretations of ‘sustainability’ have most explicitly influenced the UK sustainable communities’ agenda and these are the concepts of ‘sustainable development’ popularized by the Brundtland Report (as mentioned above) and ‘new urbanism’ (see Section 1.3.4). Taking inspiration from global reports like Brundtland and US concepts such as new urbanism the idea of sustainable communities emerged in the UK urban regeneration policy context.

1.3.3 Sustainable development

The first trace of evidence that links the concepts of sustainable development and sustainable communities under New Labour can be found in the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) (1999) publication, A better quality of
life: a strategy for sustainable development in the United Kingdom. This draws together the ‘triple bottom line’ of sustainable development (Elkington et al, 2007) – economic, social and environmental capital to achieve a ‘better quality of life’. Recognizing that some discussions of sustainable development, particularly in richer countries, focused on environmental limits, ‘A better quality of life’ argues that economic and social boundaries must be taken into consideration (DETR, 1999). Outlining the key characteristics of unsustainable development such as, an economy in long term recession, ignoring the essential needs of the poorest people and urban regeneration schemes which concentrated on physical investment alone, the report states that, “the Government aims to prevent further overall deterioration, and to secure enhancements which contribute to an overall improvement in quality of life” (DETR, 1999:13).

Interestingly, Chapter 4 of ‘A Better Quality of Life’ (DETR, 1999) is entitled ‘Building sustainable communities’ and details six themes to achieve this - promoting economic vitality and employment; better health for all; travel; access; shaping our surroundings and involvement and stronger institutions. These evolved under different headings into the eight components of a sustainable community in the SCP (ODPM, 2003; see Chapter 3 for a discussion of the evolution of urban regeneration policy under New Labour and Table 3.5 for the eight components of a sustainable community). The relationship between sustainable development and sustainable communities continued in the next ‘UK Sustainable Development Strategy’² published in 2005 by DEFRA. There is a shift in emphasis in the 2005 Sustainable Development Strategy (SDS) whereby the environment is placed more prominently and more equally alongside social and economic considerations,

“We are increasingly aware of the need to make care for the environment an integral part of policy making from the start, rather than dealing with the consequences of neglect down the line. We need to regard the local environment as a major public service (like the NHS or education) which benefits us every day. Looked at this way, it is clear why policies to promote better quality environments also have the capacity to have long-term social and economic benefits. Often those people who are most economically and socially

disadvantaged also live in degraded environments with fewer jobs, unsafe and ugly streets. Our goals are a strong economy, and decent homes in places with clean, safe and green public spaces, where people are able to lead healthy lives, and enjoy the environment around them. So our new strategy contains not only a commitment to create sustainable communities but a commitment to give a new focus to tackling environmental inequalities as well” (DEFRA, 2005:3-4).

It is particularly interesting how, in the 2005 SDS, the environment is viewed as a public good and ‘public service’ very much like the NHS or education. The language no longer refers to ‘stewardship of the environment’ as an almost abstract idea but instead promotes the environment as an active and necessary aspect of social and economic sustainability and sustainable communities. In other words, by creating the right substrate, that is clean, safe and green, business will invest and people will want to live there and this will create a sustainable community (also see Section 1.3.4 on New Urbanism and sustainable communities where ‘environment creating community’ is discussed). Unlike the 1999 SDS, the 2005 SDS does not mention poverty and exclusion yet like the 1999 SDS, a chapter is devoted to sustainable communities i.e. Chapter 6 is entitled ‘From local to global: creating sustainable communities and a fairer world’ (DEFRA, 2005) and mentions the SCP as the local level initiative,

“The Government will promote joined-up solutions to locally identified problems, working in partnership to tackle economic, social and environmental issues. At the local level, we are announcing a package of measures to realise the vision of sustainable communities across England, in both urban and rural areas, which will catalyse the delivery of sustainable development.” (DEFRA, 2005:9).

Here we see that the vision is to create a sustainable community that then provides the means by which to achieve sustainable development. Yet the notion of sustainable development is not the only influence on the sustainable communities’ agenda (see Section 1.3.4, Chapters 2 and 3).
1.3.4 New urbanism

In 2005, two years after the announcement of the SCP (ODPM, 2003) John Prescott (then the Deputy Prime Minister) hosted a three day conference at the G-MEX in Manchester called the ‘Delivering Sustainable Communities Summit’. The summit drew together national and international speakers for example, Danuta Hubner a Nominee European Commissioner for Regional Policy who was one of the keynote speakers at the plenary session entitled ‘Global influences and national perspectives on sustainable communities’ and John Norquist – the president and CEO of the Congress for New Urbanism in the US who was a panel discussant at a workshop entitled ‘Design, excellence and building places that people want to live in – what does a successful sustainable community look like?’. At the summit, John Prescott stressed his belief that the sustainable communities’ agenda can unite the American New Urbanist approach with Europe’s urban traditions. In his keynote address, Prescott told delegates, “It’s a belief that we can do things better – we can once again create strong and sustainable communities; places that will stand the test of time…..We can and must learn from each other” (Lupton, 2005:1, see also Section 8.3.2 and Chapter 9 for more on policy learning).

Thus we see the way in which the UK SCP has drawn together global and national perspectives on sustainable communities and explicitly referred to the US concept of New Urbanism (see Table 1.1 for comparison). New urbanism, or ‘traditional urban design’ is an urban design response to the perceived ‘lack of authenticity’ and ‘placelessness’ in many US cities that produced a “geography of nowhere” (Kunstler, 1993) - of fragmented city cores with soulless suburbs and mindless edge cities (Harvey, 1997). For some, the answer was new urbanism (see Katz, 1994) – the “unswerving belief in the ability of the built environment to create a sense of community” (Talen, 1999: 1363). In the UK, the language of new urbanism underpins the vision to create sustainable communities (Cochrane, 2007:54). Indeed, as we saw in the section above on sustainable development, the 2005 SDS has shifted towards this idea of creating a safe, green and clean community to attract investment be it economic or social. Here too we see that this notion of environment is similar to the new urbanism idea of the ‘environment creating community’.
Table 1.1: A comparison of US and UK urban regeneration policies: the key themes and concepts of New Urbanism and Sustainable Communities  
(Adapted from the Charter for New Urbanism, 2008 and CLG, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Urbanism</th>
<th>Sustainable Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Citizens responsible for maintenance &amp; evolution of community; activities of daily living (work, shopping, home etc) should occur within walking distance; promote daily interaction in community (by urban design) to strengthen personal &amp; civic bonds essential to authentic community</td>
<td>Expect active, responsible, tolerant citizens &amp; in turn community will be safe, friendly and inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Civic, institutional &amp; commercial activity to be embedded within community; distinctive civic buildings &amp; public gathering spaces to reinforce community identity &amp; the culture of democracy</td>
<td>Partnerships; participation, representation &amp; accountable; engagement; capacity building; inclusive; civic responsibility and pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (ecological)</td>
<td>Green parks, community gardens distributed in communities &amp; conservation areas &amp; open land to connect communities; recognize relationship with agrarian hinterland &amp; natural landscape</td>
<td>Waste recycling; promote walking &amp; cycling; biological diversity; create clean, safe, green spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (physical)</td>
<td>Compact, pedestrian friendly &amp; mixed use, broad range of housing types &amp; price levels to attract diverse community; Urban design to reinforce safety but not at expense of accessibility &amp; openness; design and architecture to grow locally (based on topography, history, climate etc); preservation and renewal of historic districts, buildings and place as they affirm continuity &amp; evolution of urban society</td>
<td>Urban design approach, sense of place, mixed tenure, mixed use, flexible &amp; adaptable buildings, buildings &amp; public space used to promote health &amp; reduce crime (‘defensible space’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>Corridors (roads, railway, rivers etc) are regional connectors, design interconnected streets to encourage walking &amp; reduce car usage; public transport as a viable alternative; relationship with agrarian hinterland and natural landscapes</td>
<td>Well connected by public transport &amp; cycling/walking facilities; access to telecommunications and internet; access to strategic networks (regional, national &amp; international)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Metropolitan region as the fundamental economic unit of contemporary world therefore government, policy, planning etc must reflect this ‘global-local’ relationship</td>
<td>Thriving &amp; diverse local economy, job &amp; training opportunities, sufficient land and buildings available to support economic prosperity, job &amp; business creation, strong business community links into wider economy, viable and attractive town centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local services</td>
<td>Easily accessible within the community</td>
<td>Well served with accessible public, private, community &amp; voluntary services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice</td>
<td>(Not mentioned explicitly)</td>
<td>Fair for everyone, recognize individual rights and responsibilities, respect rights &amp; aspirations, have due regard for future generations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both New Urbanism in the US and the Sustainable Communities Plan in the UK are operationalized at the local scale of community. The desire to connect (or re-connect) the environment at the local scale with the more usual aspects of urban spaces and urban policy, such as social, economic, political and cultural considerations, appears to be gaining prominence. The desire to integrate environmental politics into the more ‘banal’ everyday concerns of people is emerging (Latour, 1998). The globalization of environmentalism and the focus on the most marvelous or dramatic ecological threats and environmental change has meant that some environmental movements have become dislocated from the everyday concerns of people (Latour, 1998).

1.4 Thesis structure

This thesis offers an in-depth account of the process of regenerating a former industrial area in the North East of England – NewcastleGateshead. Chapters 2 and 3 provide the national urban regeneration policy context by mapping the evolution of UK urban regeneration policy from the Second World War to the introduction of the SCP. Chapter 2 concentrates on ‘Twentieth Century’ urban regeneration policy from the post Second World War period to the election of New Labour in 1997. Chapter 3 charts the evolution of urban regeneration policy during the early part of the ‘Twenty-first Century’ to the introduction of the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) in 2003. The concepts of ‘community’ and ‘sustainability’ are charted throughout this period as are the ‘perceived urban problems’ and the ‘urban policy solutions’. This helps situate the current SCP initiative and shows how the problems and solutions experienced in urban areas have been developed and influenced by evolving discourse and rhetoric. The last section of Chapter 3 is devoted to the study area – NewcastleGateshead. This section charts the evolution of local urban regeneration policies to the introduction of the NewcastleGateshead Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder, now known as Bridging NewcastleGateshead (BNG). Overall, these chapters critically discuss the ‘politics of policy’ whereby ‘certain’ inner urban areas (and their inhabitants) have been the object and target of successive political and policy intervention. In consequence, there is a generational aspect to regeneration that is not always appreciated or mentioned, whereby successive generations of the same families have had their housing choices dictated by the state.
Chapter 4 is the principal conceptual chapter. The chapter follows the same chronology of Chapters 2 and 3 and begins with a discussion and critique of key urban theories for understanding urban governance such as Elite Theory, Pluralism and the Community Power debate, Urban Growth Machine and Urban Regime Theory. The main argument is that these theories provide a useful framework for understanding ‘power over’ in urban governance but because they do not sufficiently engage with community, sustainability, materiality or space, an alternative theoretical framework is required. The chapter then moves on to the work of David Harvey and considers his work as a bridge between earlier theories of urban governance and the development of a relational understanding of spaces of regeneration. Governmentality provides the main framework for interpreting the rationalities and technologies of urban regeneration. Central to the thesis is an understanding of space as “territories of becoming that produce new potentials (Thrift, 2004: 88). In this sense then, spaces of regeneration are not static, bounded spaces, rather they are shifting mobile spaces through which people and ideas travel, where social and political networks are broken, created and/or reconfigured. The spaces of regeneration are thought of in terms of ‘fixity’ and ‘flow’ in that ‘certain’ places (in the context of this thesis, working class inner urban areas) are sites or nodes ‘to which’ and ‘through which’ social, political, economic and environmental networks connect and/or disconnect.

Chapter 5 is the methodology chapter and explores the challenge of researching communities in regeneration areas. The chapter begins by considering the influence of a CASE funded studentship upon the choice of a research area, approach and questions. The ethnographic research approach and research methods are evaluated and discussed before moving onto the choice of case studies. The three case study areas of Benwell and Scotswood, Walker Riverside and Felling are briefly introduced. The chapter then considers the challenges posed when negotiating access into communities undergoing regeneration. This involves a discussion of ‘consulting communities’ as part of the regeneration process and the problems this poses for the researcher in negotiating access when faced with residents experiencing ‘consultation fatigue’ and deliberate exclusion by some regeneration practitioners. Finally, the chapter reflects on the power relations.
Chapters 6 to 8 are the main substantive chapters that critically explore the spaces and networks of fixity and flow that are negotiated, formed and transformed during the process of regeneration. During the research, three themes emerged through which urban regeneration can be explored and they are governance (chapter 6 ‘governing communities’); demolition (chapter 7 ‘demolishing communities’); and transformation (chapter 8 ‘transforming communities’) and they are discussed in more detail below.

Chapter 6 develops a governmentality framework to understand ‘governing communities’ in spaces of regeneration. Drawing in particular from the writings of Rose (1999) the chapter begins by considering the way in which new discourses of community simultaneously offer diagnosis and cure to societies ills. The restructuring of state-community relations has led to forms of power outside the state – ‘action at a distance’. Alongside this, the citizen is expected to be autonomous, responsible and self-regulation within a set of moral codes and norms. In this sense, the chapter argues that community is a technology of government to shape and normalize conduct. The chapter critically explores the common themes that government use to rationalize community – active citizenship, active communities and social capital. The chapter then goes on to discuss the various techniques identified in BNG to ‘govern community at a distance’ - neighbourhood management, neighbourhood wardens, active children and residents associations.

Chapter 7 explores the contentious issue of demolishing and relocating communities. The chapter develops a relational understanding of demolishing communities in spaces of regeneration by critically examining the social and material moments of disconnection and destruction. Conceptually the chapter draws together a range of literatures on materiality, infrastructure, repair and maintenance, mobility, class, home and emotion to interpret demolition in relation to the process of creating communities. The main argument is that demolition is a technology of government to erase socially the ‘inner-urban’ working class and materially the working class housing from strategic positions in the urban landscape. A governmentality framework surfaces the ‘hidden’ and ‘visible’ power relations of demolition. The visible rationalities of ‘obsolete housing’ are related to hidden rationalities such as the judgement of spaces of regeneration to seek out the ‘sustainable and unsustainable resident’ and the ‘irresponsible landlord’. The chapter then reveals three techniques of demolition - the community expert of relocation and
resettlement teams; promising plot preferences and Compulsory Purchase Orders. The final sections of the chapter reveal the hidden side of demolition – the act of demolishing house and home from the perspective of the demolition expert and the emotional response of residents losing their home and the impact of community ties and networks.

Chapter 8 considers the way in which the case for transforming communities is justified by highlighting the negative social and material geographies associated with spaces of regeneration, for instance, council housing, the working class, stigma and lack of housing choice. The main argument is that narratives that problematize communities in spaces of regeneration are generated to portray a ‘regime of truth’ that then translates into governmentlized assumptions and aspirations of ‘mixed communities’. The chapter also argues that to transform negative perceptions, urban branding is a technology of transformation in spaces of regeneration to ‘engineer images’ and attract investors/developers and the creative middle classes. Drawing from empirical findings the chapter critically explores a range of urban branding techniques – the spectacular event; renaming; the branding expert; and the strategic alliance with a well known brand. Finally, the chapter considers the implications of ‘branding’ and ‘mixing’ for existing residents. Throughout, the chapter considers the interpretation of such urban transformations as ‘state-led’ gentrification.

Chapter 9 is the concluding chapter and begins by revisiting the research questions. Subsequent sections consider the strengths and shortcomings of the theoretical approach and the policy implications. The chapter ends by offering future avenues of research.
CHAPTER 2

Twentieth century urban regeneration policy in Britain

Figure 2.1: Images of Newcastle - T Dan Smith, high rise flats and a view from Scotswood over the River Tyne (Source: Andrea Armstrong³)

2.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter and Chapter 3⁴ is to map the evolution of British urban regeneration policies since 1945 and draw out past and present discourses of community and sustainability. The main argument is that although the language and rhetoric of British urban policy may appear to have changed, in many respects current urban policy approaches are marked by continuities rather than change. Rather than the policy of sustainable communities representing the policy ‘step change’ that the New Labour government claim, it could be argued that there has been an evolution of policies.

---

³ High Rise flats in Newcastle

⁴ Chapters 2 and 3 have been divided for practical purposes i.e. length and to distinguish between the historical policy context and the contemporary urban regeneration policies at the heart of this thesis
Of course, policy makers use new language to give an impression of progress and invention and to distinguish difference from other political parties. But whether new policy language will mean a real and meaningful difference to delivery and results has yet to be determined. In this sense, the chapter follows the logic of Cochrane (2007:13) who views urban policy “as the product of a complex interweaving of meanings, producing a changing pattern but with recognizable continuities”. To this extent, the chapter is not designed to provide a fully comprehensive policy review (see, for example, Lawless, 1991; Gaffikin and Warf, 1993; Atkinson and Moon, 1994; Hambleton and Thomas, 1995; Oatley, 1998; Imrie and Thomas, 1999; Atkinson, 2000; Imrie and Raco, 2003; Johnstone and Whitehead, 2004; Raco, 2007; Cochrane, 2007).

Chapter 2 is divided into four periods that most clearly illustrate the changes, continuities and evolution of national urban regeneration policies in the UK from the post war era to election of New Labour in 1997. The first four sections of Chapter 3 chart the evolution of urban regeneration policy to the arrival of the SCP in 2003. Particular attention is paid throughout the chapters (2 and 3) to the ways in which the themes of ‘community’ and ‘sustainability’ have been incorporated into national and local urban regeneration policies. The second half of Chapter 3 briefly introduces the NewcastleGateshead area and examines local urban regeneration policies for the same time period (post war to SCP). Thus these two chapters directly address research question one. Table 2.1 provides an outline of Chapters 2 and 3.
Table 2.1: The changes in urban policy and conceptions of community and sustainability from the post Second World War period to early 2000s (Sources: Atkinson and Moon, 1994; Healey and Shaw, 1994; Imrie and Thomas, 1999; Imrie and Raco, 2003; Cochrane, 2007; Raco, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1940/50</th>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban problem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of housing</td>
<td>Urban problems spatially concentrated – pockets of poverty</td>
<td>Wider structural problems Multi-faceted nature of urban decline</td>
<td>De-industrialization Counterurbanization North-South divide</td>
<td>Intensification of poverty in ‘sink estates’ Extension of polarization between rich and poor</td>
<td>Low demand and abandonment Housing obsolescence Social exclusion Neighbourhood decline and poor quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor condition of existing housing stock</td>
<td>Pathological behaviour of deviant groups Loss of community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban expansion and high density inner city housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban solution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolish old/unstable housing (slum clearance)</td>
<td>Continue slum clearance Correct pathological behaviour</td>
<td>Co-ordinated action at various levels – economic, social, environmental (built environment) Partnership working</td>
<td>Neoliberal economic policies to create conditions that attract and encourage urban entrepreneurship and privatism Partnership working</td>
<td>Competitive bidding Tackle exclusion and economic competitiveness</td>
<td>Physical measures such as demolition, refurbishment and building new houses to stimulate housing market renewal Neighbourhood management and wardens to promote and enhance social capital and ‘liveability’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build local authority housing Build new homes on green field sites Dispersal of urban populations</td>
<td>Community and Area improvement, clearance and decentralization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical measures such as demolition, refurbishment and building new houses to stimulate housing market renewal Neighbourhood management and wardens to promote and enhance social capital and ‘liveability’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership working</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place marketing and urban branding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban policy approach</strong></td>
<td>1940/50</td>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical reconstruction</strong></td>
<td>Physical and social rehabilitation</td>
<td>Economic and infrastructure-led</td>
<td>Market and property-led</td>
<td>Focus on ways to stimulate economic growth</td>
<td>People and place based approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area approach</strong></td>
<td>Area approach</td>
<td>Trickle down effect</td>
<td>Inter-area competition and place marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welfarist – resources directed to poorer areas (community orientated)</strong></td>
<td>Welfarist – resources directed to poorer areas (community orientated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Conception of ‘community’</strong></th>
<th>1940/50</th>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community not a specific focus of policy – during this time the pre-war belief in the ‘sanitary approach’ i.e., poverty stemmed from poor housing led to physical urban policy approaches</strong></td>
<td>Malfunctioning community, individuals and families (social pathology perspective)</td>
<td>Shift away from focus on community and social projects towards industrial, environmental and recreational programmes</td>
<td>Community not a focus of policy – belief that in a free market economy the benefits would ‘trickle down’</td>
<td>Active citizens</td>
<td>Community given a more prominent position in urban regeneration discourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community as site of problem and solution</strong></td>
<td>Community as site of problem and solution</td>
<td>Self help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

People and place based approaches
‘Cross-cutting themes’ e.g., sustainable development across all Government departments
A vast range of approaches to deal with the social, physical, environmental and economic aspects of towns and cities

New Labour understanding of community draws from ‘communitarianism’
Community consultation and participation
Rights and responsibilities – active citizens and active communities
Belief in a ‘hand up not a hand out’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Conception of ‘environment’</strong></th>
<th><strong>1940/50</strong></th>
<th><strong>1960s</strong></th>
<th><strong>1970s</strong></th>
<th><strong>1980s</strong></th>
<th><strong>1990s</strong></th>
<th><strong>2000s</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built environment and countryside</strong></td>
<td>Managing growth and modernization</td>
<td>Active environmental care – no longer seen as a backcloth to be preserved but as a natural system to be managed to save its value</td>
<td>Marketized utilitarianism and heritage</td>
<td>New environmental agenda ‘This Common Inheritance’ (1990)</td>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilitarian aesthetic</strong></td>
<td>Natural environment viewed as resource and amenity</td>
<td>‘Hint’ of sustainability</td>
<td>Balancing development and conservation</td>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment as a ‘backcloth’</strong></td>
<td>Preservation and stewardship</td>
<td>Still seen as a resource</td>
<td>Environment as tradable assets combined with narrow conception of conservation as heritage landscapes and wildlife sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples of policy and legislation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1947</strong></th>
<th><strong>1946</strong></th>
<th><strong>1974</strong></th>
<th><strong>1986</strong></th>
<th><strong>1990s</strong></th>
<th><strong>2000s</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Act</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Community Programmes (CCP) 1974</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing Act 1974</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emergence of environmental statements and charters at local levels</strong></td>
<td><strong>City Challenge Planning Policy Guidance (PPG12)</strong></td>
<td><strong>PPG 3 Housing (2000) – 60% new housing on brownfield sites</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1990s</strong></td>
<td><strong>2000s</strong></td>
<td><strong>2002</strong></td>
<td><strong>2003</strong></td>
<td><strong>2004</strong></td>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Post-war Reconstruction

Britain faced a number of economic, social and political problems after the Second World War. The cost of victory had been high and in 1945, the economy of Britain was in tatters (Morgan, 1985). Many cities had been devastated by war and it was estimated that 200,000 houses had been destroyed and over 500,000 were uninhabitable (Donnison, 1967). At this time, urban problems were seen in physical terms and in consequence, there was a physical approach to tackle the three main problems of housing shortage, housing quality and urban growth (Atkinson and Moon, 1994). The next section explores the solution to housing quality and shortage – demolition and new building.

2.2.1 Demolishing ‘slums’ and building council houses

Demolition as an urban policy approach had “only received coherent attention as late as the Housing Act of 1930” (Atkinson and Moon, 1994:23) and in that pre-war period, demolition was used as a method of slum clearance. The 1930 Housing Act (or ‘Greenwood Act’) gave local authorities the power to demolish houses unfit for inhabitation “to ensure a speedier end to the evil” (Housing Act, 1930:1). The lack of housing regulation and control in the nineteenth century, with mainly permissive laws and byelaws had led to the “establishment of housing conditions that are intolerable” (Housing Act, 1930:1). Therefore, central government in a “concerted effort alongside local authorities” embarked on a “vigorous campaign of slum clearance” (Housing Act, 1930:1). The Housing Act 1930 (p 5) also provided subsidies to build new houses for the displaced working class stating,

“Conditions are now exceptionally favourable for the work. With low building costs and cheap money, houses built with the subsidy payable under the Housing Act 1930, can be let at rents well within the capacity of the poorest of the working classes. That subsidy is equivalent to £15 per annum for each non-parlor house with three bedrooms, since such a house is regarded as providing accommodation for five persons”.

The demolition of inner city slums meant that many communities were displaced to newly built council estates on the fringes of towns and cities (this planned dispersal is discussed in section 2.2.2). However, the war intervened and house building ceased. In
1945, the new Labour government inherited the problems of housing quality and shortage that had been exacerbated by the war. The Labour government considered the simplest solution and drew from the relatively recent concept of demolition and rebuilding. The solution to poor housing quality was “demolish the old unsanitary or unstable dwellings and redevelop the sites with new housing under the ownership and management of local authorities” (Atkinson and Moon, 1994:23). Furthermore, to solve the housing shortage problem, new council homes were built on green-field sites (Atkinson and Moon, 1994). The most pressing problem after the war was bomb damage to housing, so for the first two years (1946/7) these houses were demolished or repaired if possible and 156,622 prefabricated houses (History of Council Housing website, 2009) were constructed as a temporary measure (though many lasted for forty or more years). House building increased with over 80 per cent constructed by the public sector (Atkinson and Moon, 1994:24). Although traditional house building methods continued, a new form of construction emerged - PRC (Pre-cast Reinforced Concrete) that was quick to assemble and required less labour than traditional building methods. Consequently, in the decade after 1945, 1.5 million homes had been completed and the percentage of people renting from local authorities had risen from 10 per cent in 1938 to 26 per cent in 1961 (History of Council Housing website, 2009).

2.2.2 Dispersal, control and creating new communities

During the nineteenth century, towns and cities had developed in a haphazard way resulting in a poor mix of housing and industry (Atkinson and Moon, 1994). After the Second World War, as discussed in the previous section, demolition began again in urban areas and new council estates were built. However, to ensure the expansion into suburbs did not threaten villages and countryside adjacent to towns and cities, central government intervened with measures to control the planned dispersal of urban population i.e. land-use planning and new towns. To prevent urban sprawl the Town and Country Planning Act 1947 gave planning authorities land use and development control. Green Belts were established (see section 2.2.4) around major cities thereby ‘containing’ urban sprawl and the New Town Act 1946 ensured diversion of growth into new areas. The New Town Act 1946 drew from the Garden City Movement of the late nineteenth century and thinkers such as Ebenezer Howard who saw new towns as a solution to problems of population and industrial concentration in inner cities (Howard, 1898/1946). Such thinking advocated the construction of new, mixed urban spaces and the
establishment of self-contained and harmonious communities (Ward, 2004; Raco, 2007). By 1949, 14 new towns were built, for example, Stevenage, Crawley, Hemel Hempstead, Hatfield, Welwyn, Bracknell, Basildon and Harlow were built as part of the decentralization of London (Atkinson and Moon, 1994:28). Certain principles underpinned the building of new towns, for example, low housing density (about five houses per hectare), balanced social mix i.e. not dominated by one single ‘type’ of citizen and adequate local employment opportunities (Atkinson and Moon, 1994; Raco, 2007) in other words, the creation of self contained balanced communities for working and living (Simmonds, 2001). Most early new towns in Britain used the idea of ‘neighbourhood units’ to foster a sense of community whereby each town was planned around units of 5-10,000 people, each with their own shopping, medical and educational facilities within walking distance. Raco (2007: 81) argues that “the concept of balance was deployed as a mechanism through which what might now be termed ‘sustainable communities’ could be created and could reproduce themselves……sustainability through self-containment”. However, the neighbourhood unit concept, as seen in early British new towns, has been widely criticized for social engineering and architectural determinism (Lawhon, 2009). In addition, commentators have noted that planned dispersal and the new town concept gave little concern for the impact on inner city communities that lost mainly young, working class residents or the ‘receiver’ communities where houses were often developed before retail, leisure or even employment opportunities (Young and Wilmott, 1962; Cordon, 1977). However, following the defeat of Labour in the 1951 General Election, the Conservatives came to power with a pledge to build 300,000 new houses a year (Simmonds, 2001). The main question for Harold MacMillan, the Minister for Housing and Local Government, was how to marry Conservative economic principles with the cost of new towns. Official estimates stated new towns would cost £250 million by 1954 but the figure of £325 million was more accurate (Simmonds, 2001). To rectify the financial shortfall and ensure the new town programme fitted Conservative ideology, MacMillan altered the licensing arrangements to “allow private enterprise a greater role in the construction of new houses” (Simmonds, 2001:5). Yet, new towns only contributed 3.2 per cent (72,894 houses) out of 2.2 million completed between 1951 and 1960. During the Conservative administration of the 1950s, many architects and planners favoured a ‘modernist’ approach and the idea of ‘streets in the sky’ emerged drawing from Le Corbusier’s vision of ‘cities in the sky’ and this is discussed next.
2.2.3 Post-war conceptions of environment

In the 1940s, the ‘environment’ comprised of the built environment and the countryside (Healey and Shaw, 1994). The key influences on environment at this time were the planners Patrick Abercrombie and Thomas Sharp who argued on moral and aesthetic grounds “for a clear separation of town and country to preserve the country life and retain nature as a refuge from modern life” (Healey and Shaw, 1994:427). In Abercrombie’s Greater London Plan the natural environment was treated as a backcloth and “planning was presented as having a stewardship role with respect to the natural environment, producing a valued inheritance for the future” (Healey and Shaw, 1994:427-8). As Marsden et al (1993) argue the concept of the landowner as steward and preserver of the countryside is long established and can be viewed as a precursor to the sustainability principle.

The Town and Country Planning Act 1947 cemented the countryside preservation ideas by introducing the ‘green belt’ concept. The green belt encircled and contained urban areas and was for agriculture and recreational use. However, as Atkinson and Moon (1994:26) argue, the green belt concept had social and political costs and benefits. The middle classes benefited most as their environment was protected from further development whereas the working classes had fewer options as urban development remained in existing urban spaces.

2.3 Dealing with ‘poverty’: understandings and solutions

Until 1968 the main urban problems were seen in physical terms i.e. the obsolescence of the Victorian housing stock and supporting infrastructure. Therefore, policy solutions were directed at slum clearance, dispersal of urban populations, development planning systems and new towns. By the mid-1960s, there was a general recognition that the physical approach although well intentioned, was fragmented and ignored the social aspects of urban problems; for example, poverty and disadvantage still existed in Britain despite the establishment of the welfare state (Atkinson and Moon, 1994). Therefore, governments were forced by the late 1960s to acknowledge that the physical approach could not solve the “inner city problem”. As Atkinson and Moon (1994:31) argue, the challenges to the physical approach “essentially concern the ‘rediscovery of urban
poverty’ and the strategies for its amelioration”. The emergent new approach entailed area-based policies focused on one or more aspects of social pathology (Atkinson and Moon, 1994:41). The shift in policy emphasis can be attributed mainly to civil servants with an interest in urban issues (Higgins et al, 1983; Loney, 1983) and the often understated contribution of community based campaigns such as those led by the Child Poverty Action Group and Shelter (Hambleton and Thomas, 1995:4). The social pathology perspective and the area approach are discussed next.

2.3.1 The social pathology perspective

To explain why urban poverty was still prevalent the social pathology perspective was used. This theory steered attention away from “systemic failures and structural inequalities and onto the more limited issue of how to deal with the individuals/groups still living in poverty” (Atkinson and Moon, 1994:33). This shifted attention (and blame) away from state policies, and cited the cause of any residual poverty on the “pathological” behaviour of the people or communities who remained in poverty (Atkinson and Moon, 1994). As Lawless (1981:6) noted “a common assumption underlying many initial policy responses was that personal and familial inadequacies lay at the heart of the problem”. Welfare-state policies worked at the level of the individual but studies at the time noticed that individuals experiencing poverty tended to concentrate in certain areas of the city.

2.3.2 The area approach: the ‘search for coordination’

From this developed the “area approach” which combined with the social pathology perspective and “entailed the targeting of policies and resources on to areas with the express aim of combating the problems therein” (Atkinson and Moon, 1994:33). For the first time areas were characterized in terms of multiple deprivation, linking social and economic disadvantage. The area approach marked a shift away from inflexible, centralized, vertical control to a more horizontal approach that targeted communities, understood the multiple aspects of poverty and involved a participatory approach (Cochrane, 2007). In response to the fragmented physical approach that characterized the 1940s and 1950s, from the late 1960s onwards there has been “a search for coordination” whereby urban policy rhetoric in the UK often combines “the identification of areas for targeted attention with a promise of coordination” (Cochrane, 2007:32). As
Cochrane goes on to (2007: 31) argue, in a retrospective discussion of the various UK area approaches,

“A focus on urban problems appears to offer the possibility of working across the traditional divisions associated with the professions and organizational structures of the welfare state – in health, social services, social security, employment services, education, housing, planning and even economic development”.

However, early attempts at area-based initiatives have been widely criticized for being ‘inward looking’; for example, focusing on employment creation in the neighbourhood, with an emphasis on community self-help (Eisenschitz and Gough, 1993). To this extent, area based initiatives at this time were not outward looking, ignoring the skill demands of the wider economy while also failing to address structural barriers to employment such as poor transport (Webster, 1994; Hall, 1997).

The next section discusses an example of an area approach – the Community Development Project to demonstrate the shift in thinking (i.e. from inward to outward).

2.3.3 An area-based initiatives: the example the Community Development Project

The Community Development Projects (CDP) are often cited as early examples of area-based urban initiatives to emerge from Britain (Atkinson and Moon, 1994). As we have seen, earlier urban policies lacked coherence. In contrast, the urban initiatives of the late 1960s attempted to coordinate horizontally across traditional divisions and target areas. The CDPs were “small area projects located within deprived local authorities and designed to focus limited resources on ‘deviant’ individuals and communities” (Lawless, 1979:6). Twelve CDPs were set up and each had an action team located in the community and a research team placed at a nearby university or polytechnic (see Atkinson and Moon, 1994 for more on CDPs).

When the CDP was announced by Harold Wilson, the Labour Prime Minister in May, 1968 unemployment was still well below one million. Therefore, at that time it was possible to view the inner cities as islands of poverty in a general sea of prosperity (Butcher et al, 1990:98). The early area-based urban initiatives had a common aim: to
provide opportunity for individuals and communities by encouraging self-help, mutual aid and a better targeting of local authority services (Atkinson and Moon, 1994:59). Area-based policy was the chosen method for delivery but areas were chosen with little theoretical or empirical justification (Atkinson and Moon, 1994:60).

The CDP increasingly sought to incorporate the social and economic analysis of urban decline and this approach hastened the demise of the physical approach to urban problems. At the time of their inception, the social pathology perspective was central to CDPs as seen in the National CDP Report,

“problems of urban deprivation had their origins in the characteristics of local populations – in individual pathologies – and these could best be resolved by better field coordination of the personal social services combined with the mobilization of self-help and mutual aid in the community ‘even amongst those experiencing most difficulty in standing on their own feet’ (CDP, 1974:1).

Many CDP teams soon rejected the social pathology perspective that blamed individuals for their own plight. Atkinson and Moon (1994) suggest this came about because many CDP workers were educated in community and student radicalism of the 1960s. In consequence, alternative explanations were sought and many CDP teams adopted Marxist theory, which saw urban poverty as an inevitable by product of uneven capitalist development (CDP, 1977a; Forrest et al., 1979; Atkinson and Moon, 1994). According to the CDP, it was:

“clear that the problems of these areas were firmly tied to much more basic structural problems in society and that the solution does not consist in the poor pulling themselves up by their bootstraps, but in sufficient political will being directed toward fundamental and far reaching social change” (CDP, 1977b:5).

The new explanation of urban poverty and decline looked to broader political and economic factors i.e. structural reasons rather than social pathologies and unemployment was identified as a key feature in the CDP areas (Atkinson and Moon, 1994). Now that the reasons for an area’s decline were recognized to be external as well as internal, the “area approach was rendered largely redundant as both an explanatory
variable and as a viable strategy for economic recovery” (Atkinson and Moon, 1994:50). This change in orientation was specified by the Department of the Environment (DoE) guideline that stated, “there must be a presumption in favour of projects which have as their objective the stimulation of economic activity appropriate to the area (DoE, 1981:5). According to Imrie and Thomas (1999:6-7) the

“recognition that changes in the economic base of inner areas were crucial in explaining their characteristics was crystallized in the 1977 White Paper, which recommended the creation of Inner City Partnerships (ICPs), joint central-local state initiatives, in conjunction with private sector interests, to develop projects aimed at the economic revival of the inner cities”.

The next section discusses the first urban White Paper ‘Policy for the Inner Cities’ mentioned above.

2.3.4 The first urban White Paper: ‘Policy for the Inner Cities’

Several factors preceded the publication of the first urban White Paper published in Britain (Atkinson and Moon (1994). Research produced in the mid 1970s by the CDPs challenged previous assumptions that urban poverty was a result of the pathological behaviour of individuals and communities. Their research raised questions regarding urban policies that targeted areas to challenge the behaviour of those in poverty. Furthermore, the CDP research challenged the assumption that discrete pockets of urban poverty could be identified on maps i.e. the area approach was questioned. Other factors within government also led to ‘less effective urban policies’ because the “division of responsibilities between the Home Office and the Department of the Environment generated competition and hindered co-operation” (Atkinson and Moon, 1994:65). Also, by 1975 the British economy had entered a crisis and appeared to be in a state of terminal decline (Jessop, 1980). It was within the context of persistent urban problems, the failure of past policy approaches to tackle urban poverty and economic decline that the Urban White Paper was initiated by Peter Shore, the Secretary of State at the Department of the Environment and it was finally published in 1977.

On reflection the ‘Policy for Inner Cities’ was highly commended by commentators as the “first serious attempt by a government in the post-war era……to understand the nature
and causes of Britain’s urban problems” (Atkinson and Moon, 1994:66). Others went even further and describe the first Urban White Paper as “a sea change in official thinking” (Butcher et al, 1990:98). For the first time, structural reasons for deprivation were given and the White Paper made an explicit connection between the poor economic situation, inner city communities and housing conditions,

“too little attention has been paid to the economic well being and to the community life of inner areas, and the physical fabric in some parts is badly neglected or decayed” (Department of the Environment, DoE, 1977:1).

The White Paper also recognized some ten years before the principles of sustainable development reached the world stage (see section 2.5.4 on the emergence of sustainable development) that, “regeneration not only took time to achieve but involved a long term commitment” (DoE, 1977:1). During the 1960s, the environment was mainly viewed as a resource and amenity. This was beginning to change by the 1970s, as we see in the White Paper; there is a ‘hint of sustainability’. The environment was no longer seen as a backcloth but as a natural system to be managed in order to save its value, in other words, ‘active environmental care’ (see Healey and Shaw, 1994).

The Urban White Paper also promised community involvement in the regeneration process by fostering closer links between “members, officers and the people……[as] self help is important and so is community effort” (DoE, 1977:8). Later in this chapter and in subsequent chapters we see how the themes of community involvement and self help evolve and are incorporated into the Sustainable Communities Plan. Other aspects of the Urban White Paper suggest that local authorities should be “entrepreneurial in the attraction of industry and commerce” (DoE, 1977:8) and promises a combined central and local commitment to improving the physical and social conditions of inner cities. However, such promises were short-lived. The election of a Conservative government under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher in 1979 signalled a new direction.
2.4 The Thatcher years: Neoliberal urban policy

Neoliberal ideology underpinned Thatcherism (Hambleton and Thomas, 1995) and signalled a new direction in urban policy. Neoliberal thinking can be traced back to classical political economists; in particular, Adam Smith and the core themes are freedom, choice, the free market, minimal state intervention and the primacy of the individual (Joseph and Sumption, 1979). Such neoliberal ideologies influenced the way in which Thatcherite urban policies evolved. By the early 1980s, local government was no longer a major player in urban policy and instead there was a shift towards the liberalization and deregulation of urban policy (Lawless, 1991). Privatization was considered a more effective means for tackling the inner cities, so Thatcherite urban policy centred on deregulation and entrepreneurship (Hill, 2000). In particular, it was felt that local government and planning systems were overly bureaucratic and impeded economic growth (Maginn, 2004). The Thatcherite approach to urban problems was to encourage private entrepreneurial investment and partnerships by creating attractive conditions such as deregulation of the planning process and minimizing local authority interventions and control. Central state funding was mainly for “property-led projects that prioritized economic development and business interests over those of local residents and community groups” (Imrie and Raco, 2003:11). Community based projects were not explicitly a government strategy, as the Thatcher government believed that a free market economy would ‘trickle down’ benefits.

Housing policies followed similar trends, in that there was a sustained attack on local authority housing, with a clear switch of resources away from the public sector to owner-occupation (Atkinson and Moon, 1994). The introduction of a ‘right to buy’ scheme for local authority housing tenants coupled with a dramatic reduction in house building is the legacy facing the New Labour government today. As Forest and Murie (1983, 1986) argue, during the 1980s, local authority housing became the tenure of the very poor and this phenomenon was considerably accelerated by Conservative policies.

Throughout the 1980s, a range of measures were introduced that minimized the role of local authorities and favoured the private sector (Imrie and Thomas, 1999) and Urban Development Corporations (UDCs) were one such measure. As Imrie and Thomas (1999:8) note,
“The focus on business elites, quangos, and localized forums for policy delivery, also led to a proliferation of non-elected bodies dealing with the socio-economic problems of the British cities. In sum, urban policy gradually became dominated by central directions, with implementation heavily influenced by the private sector and market trends”.

UDCs were promoted as exemplars of the more general approach increasingly being adopted towards urban policy, particularly utilization of business leaders to take over the agenda of public policy (Imrie and Thomas, 1999:7). The next section will describe and assess the role of UDCs.

2.4.1 Redeveloping inner urban localities: the example of Urban Development Corporations

In 1980 the UDCs were established under the Local Government, Planning and Land Act (LGPLA). This legislation enabled the Secretary of State for the Environment to designate areas that could be physically regenerated by the creation of a UDC. The emphasis was on property-led regeneration and as Lawless (1991) noted they bypassed the traditional deliverers of urban policy – local government. Interestingly, a UDC could be declared if the Secretary of State thought it was in the ‘national interest’ to do so (LGPLA, section 134). This effectively provided justification for removing certain areas out of the hands of local authorities and into the hands of an unelected body. The main remit of the UDCs as outlined by the 1980 Act was:

“to secure the regeneration of its area by bringing land and buildings into effective use, encouraging the development of existing and new industry and commerce, creating an attractive environment and ensuring that housing and social facilities are available to encourage people to live and work in the area (LGPLA, section 136)

UDCs had a variety of powers including compulsory purchase to acquire land and planning controls which enabled them to circumvent local authorities. As Cochrane (1999:248) argues, UDCs like earlier urban policy approaches “were area based projects located in a limited number of places. The ‘problem’ was defined in terms of area, rather
than people”. UDCs were also able to utilize business leaders in order to take over the agenda of public policy. Successive Conservative governments viewed the often Labour controlled local governments as been part of the problem of urban decay. Conservatives argued that (Labour controlled) local authorities were bureaucratic with rigid planning controls that thwarted enterprise. Rather the UDCs were to

“remove the political uncertainty and restraints of local democracy which…….represents a significant hindrance to the development process and a deterrent to private investment” (House of Lords Select Committee, 1981:7)

To some commentators this reflects the dominant themes of British urban policy in the 1980s that UDCs were illustrative of, namely, the minimization of local authorities’ involvement in urban regeneration and the creation of a private enterprise culture (Imrie and Thomas, 1999). Drawing on the thinking of Harvey (1987), we can interpret the relationships fostered between the UDCs, business and local government as part of a wider endeavour to promote place marketing and ‘urban entrepreneurialism’ amid significant changes in the global economy. Further, as Cochrane (1993: 96) noted about this period “it is also important to stress the extent to which competition is localized – i.e. between places, not only between countries”.

The UDCs were started in four phases or generations and by 1993, there were thirteen UDCs (Tables 2.2 and 2.3). Although all UDCs were mainly in inner city areas the size and character of the Urban Development Areas (UDAs) varied. Teesside was the largest UDA with 4,858 hectares and Central Manchester the smallest with 187 hectares. A variety of works have been published, based on individual UDCs that provide an in-depth assessment and critique of their role in, and contribution to, urban policy and regeneration (for example, see Robinson et al, 1993 on Tyne and Wear and Teesside Development Corporations). Such work has highlighted a number of criticisms. Whilst it is generally accepted that UDCs redrew central-local government relations, such a policy dominated by central state direction led to a proliferation of non-elected, unaccountable bodies dealing with the socio-economic problems of British cities (Imrie and Thomas, 1999).
Table 2.2: Key Dates in the lives of the Urban Development Corporations  
(Source: DETR, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start-up date</th>
<th>Urban Development Corporation</th>
<th>Wind-up date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Country, Cardiff Bay, Teesside, Trafford Park, Tyne and Wear</td>
<td>March 31st 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Generation – 1992/93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: The varying designations of the UDCs  
(Source: Imrie and Thomas, 1999:14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporation</th>
<th>Size of urban development area (ha)</th>
<th>Population in the development area (numbers)</th>
<th>Employment in the urban development area (numbers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Heartlands</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Country</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>35,405</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff Bay</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Manchester</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>15,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>40,400</td>
<td>27,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesside</td>
<td>4,858</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafford Park</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne and Wear</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>40,115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, as Robson (1988:96) noted, the financing of urban policy in the 1980s was “piecemeal, ad hoc and subject to the law of one hand taking away what the other had given”. Moreover, UDC expenditure was overwhelmingly directed towards promoting land development through land acquisition and reclamation. The Department of the Environment (DoE) (1990) estimated the total expenditure of UDCs (excluding London Docklands) in 1990-91 to be 56 per cent on land purchase and assembly.
As Harding (1991) highlighted, such an approach appeared to ignore local needs. With such a heavy reliance on land, the collapse in the property market meant that by 1991, UDCs were unable to dispose of land bought in the boom of the mid to late 1980s. In consequence, UDCs became more dependent on government grants and public sector schemes to maintain the regeneration momentum (Centre for Local Economic Strategies, CLES, 1992). To many commentators, it had become clear that the property-led approach to regeneration had many failings. The Audit Commission (1989) noted that during the 1980s the reclamation of derelict land failed to keep pace with the growth of new derelict spaces. Turok (1992) added that some vital aspects of city revitalization were ignored such as education and training, investment in basic infrastructure (like transport and communication) and the underlying competitiveness of industry (especially the technical bases of production and the innovative capacity of firms). UDCs were based on an unsubstantiated premise that investment in buildings and infrastructure would generate new jobs and wealth. They were also an attempt to facilitate local economic growth but as Imrie and Thomas (1999) argue, evidence suggests that the property –led approach cannot guarantee any rise in the level of economic activity. In addition, Robson et al (1994:54) commented that there had been little ‘trickle-down’ from UDCs to local residents.

UDCs marked the advent of a new approach to an old problem: the inner areas of cities were seen as the problem and UDCs approached the problem by measures to transform the material landscape. The approach was primarily ‘property-led’. As Cochrane (1999:249) argues,

“Although land assembly and the reclamation of derelict land have been integral to inner city policy for a very long time, the corporations defined the urban – or inner city- problem almost entirely in terms of land and property, dereliction and a lack of development, rather than poverty, unemployment or even, strictly economic decline”.

The focus on places not people and the lack of community participation led to UDCs being heavily criticized and it was only later in their life that community consultation and participation began to emerge (Maginn, 2004). However, Brownill (1993) argues this was too little too late. Although UDCs were widely criticized for their part in reshaping local
governance (see for example, Cochrane, 1993), the UDC initiative arguably left a legacy that is relevant today, as we shall see in later chapters. Briefly, the lasting legacy of UDCs include public-private partnerships, the “architectural symbolism of property development as a measure of success” (Cochrane, 1999:254) and the belief in urban entrepreneurialism and place marketing.

2.5 Thatchersim with a grey face?

The Thatcher urban initiatives were distinctive in their desire to draw the private sector into the policy making process at the expense of local government. By the late 1980s, it was becoming evident that Thatcherite urban policies were extending polarization. Property-led regeneration encouraged gentrification in some areas but the withdrawal from community-based initiatives combined with welfare reduction meant the intensification of poverty in ‘sink estates’. As Imrie (2004:133) notes, “discourses of community revolved around (the moral) notions of self-help” but with an “endemic shortage of affordable housing, job insecurity, and the proliferation of low-waged employment” (Imrie and Raco, 2003:11), there was little chance that either poorer individuals or communities could help themselves in this particular urban policy climate.

In November 1990, Margaret Thatcher was ousted as Prime Minister and John Major took over the leadership. Michael Heseltine was brought back as Secretary of State for the Environment and announced the City Challenge initiative in May 1991, and appeared to press for a more conciliatory approach to local government (Hambleton and Thomas, 1995). This marked a further transformation of urban policy as noted by Oatley (1998:4):

“these initiatives have widened the policy focus beyond the narrow concerns of property-led regeneration and the traditional concerns of physical obsolescence and social disadvantage to address issues of exclusion and economic competitiveness”.

Oatley (1998:4) identifies three key dimensions to urban policy during the Major years, (1991 – 97):

“First, globalization was exerting competitive pressures between cities and between businesses that had to struggle to establish their place. This led to
policies that would improve the competitiveness of business and localities. Second, the Major government encouraged cities to address the issues by introducing a competitive bidding process. Third, such changes have led to a “quiet revolution in urban regeneration policy and practice leading to changes in urban governance and the process of policy formulation and implementation”.

Two further dimensions can be added - community participation, albeit within the context of competitive bidding (Imrie and Raco, 2003) and the emergence of sustainable development. However, as Cameron and Davoudi (1998:250) note, too often community groups were “given a mere presence rather than a voice”. The next sub-sections examine four of the key dimensions - competitiveness and the city, the introduction of the competitive bidding process, the tentative re-emergence of community and the emergence of sustainable development. The third dimension mentioned by Oatley (1998) - urban governance is discussed in chapter 6.

2.5.1 Competitiveness and the city

In the past, initiatives had attempted to address the urban problem by increasing social and physical investment and hoping that economic activity would follow. But such approaches treated the inner city in isolation from the surrounding economy. In contrast, the ‘new’ model of inner city economic development identified and exploited the competitive advantage of inner cities (Porter, 1995). To help localities adapt to the changing external economic and political situations a number of factors have been identified. For example, Kresl (1995:51) attempted to identify the economic and strategic factors of urban competitiveness: economic factors being factors of production, infrastructure, location, economic structure and urban amenities while strategic factors were governmental effectiveness, urban strategy, public-private sector cooperation and institutional flexibility. Fainstein (1990) also identified a range of factors operating at different levels that determine the relative competitiveness of different cities and the success of local economic development. Central to Fainstein’s conceptualization is the way national political responses to international, national and regional forces of growth and decline shape the kind of policies it is possible for localities to pursue. Increasingly, research has demonstrated that the capacity for local pro-activity is increasingly exercised through inter-organizational relationships. The motivations and activities of different local institutions and the relations between them has been the focus of research
(Oatley and Lambert, 1997). Such studies have alternatively conceptualized the inter-organizational relationships as: leadership (Judd and Parkinson, 1990; Stewart, 1998); growth coalitions (Harding, 1991); policy regimes (DiGaetano and Klemanski, 1993); local modes of regulation (Mayer, 1994); institutional thickness (Amin and Thrift, 1994); collective action (Cheshire and Gordon, 1996). These studies suggest that ‘successful’ localities display certain characteristics in terms of local institutional arrangements.

Central to the success of localities is cooperation between a wide range of governmental and non-governmental agencies formalized in various partnerships. Such partnerships have a number of aims that were identified by Oatley and Lambert, (1997:3); to establish consensus and a shared vision of development, the mobilization of skills, expertise and resources to enhance competitiveness, to engage in networking and lobbying in relevant markets and political arenas, to exercise clear and effective leadership while maintaining flexibility and to deliver plans.

Soon after Michael Heseltine’s speech to Manchester’s Chamber of Commerce in March, 1991 where he announced that competition was the ‘vital catalyst for the new approach’ in urban policy, the City Challenge was introduced (May 1991). Subsequent initiatives based in competitive bidding followed.

2.5.2 Competitive bidding

Cities now attempt to gain ‘competitive advantage’ (an economic term, previously applied to business) by enhancing and promoting their advantages in relation to other cities. The relational concept of competitive advantage can be applied at all scales not just city but regions and nations. To gain competitive advantage inter-area competition and place marketing have become an important part of economic development strategies as has diversification and adopting new roles (Porter, 1990). Specific initiatives that emphasized competition and place marketing were City Challenge, the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB), Local and Sector Challenge, City Pride and the National Lottery. Table 2.4 provides a chronology of urban initiatives that were introduced based on the competitive bidding process since 1991 but for more detailed explanations of each initiative see Oatley, 1998, p 12-13.
Table 2.4: A selection of urban initiatives introduced since 1991 that were based on competitive bidding (Source: adapted from Oatley, 1998:12-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>TEC Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Estate Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>City Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Capital Partnership (Urban Partnership Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>City Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Rural Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Single Regeneration Budget (The Challenge Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The Lottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Regional Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Estates Renewal Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Capital Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Local Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Sector Challenge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competitive bidding, involving competition between localities for a limited pool of resources, became the pervasive culture of public sector resource allocation in urban policy under the Major government during the period 1991-97 (Oatley, 1998). The ‘challenge’ approach of resource allocation was extended and Oatley (1998) argues that the Challenge Fund model had a number of defining features that distinguished it from previous approaches. First, need was replaced with economic opportunity in that winners and losers were determined by the quality of the bid rather than the level of deprivation. Supporters argued that this encouraged greater value for money and motivated people to create innovative development proposals. Whereas, critics note that competition reduces inter-local cooperation and places the government and regional offices in powerful positions that undermine the government aims of local empowerment and ownership. Second, the Challenge Fund model consolidated the contract culture whereby a bid was made for funds; if successful the local agency took on the role of ‘procurement manager’ by procuring outputs from delivery agents (e.g. training providers, developers etc) by contracting (Oatley, 1998:9). Third, it was the partnerships rather than central government that identified local priorities for regeneration.

As Oatley (1998:13) noted, the challenge approach was “deemed so successful, the principle of competing for funding became an integral part of other initiatives”. However, the new initiatives were associated with a number of concerns and criticisms. For instance, Burton and O’Toole (1993) suggested the City Challenge embodied a shift from the three ‘E’s’ of the 1980s (efficiency, economy and effectiveness) to an emphasis
on the three ‘C’s’ (cooperation, concentration of resources and competition). Differing from the trickle-down property-led regeneration of the 1980s, the challenge approach encouraged access to the benefits of growth rather than focusing on ways to stimulate growth. Also, challenge initiatives focused on opportunities rather than problems in urban areas and sought to achieve a balance between investing in people and places (Oatley, 1998).

In the 1980s, the confrontational approach and dilution of local government powers helped achieve Thatcher’s political aims. This enabled increased involvement of the private sector in local governance and the transition to an entrepreneurial culture of competition and bidding. As Duncan and Goodwin (1988:273) note, both the Thatcher and Major governments were intent on sweeping away socialism. This did not just mean the Labour party but collectivist and community socialization in all its forms. The application of competitive bidding regimes to regeneration was an important part of the Conservative’s aim of constructing a hegemony that stresses the virtues of market processes over collectivist principles (Oatley, 1998:37). In 1997, the pre-election promise of Tony Blair’s New Labour party was to abolish competitive bidding but once elected the New Labour government continued with round four of the Challenge Fund. The ‘Third Way’ had arrived in Britain and as Johnstone and Whitehead (2004) argue an important part of New Labour’s Third Way project was urban renaissance. This is discussed in the Chapter 3, Section 3.2.

2.5.3 The ‘tentative’ re-emergence of community

During the Major years, there were some subtle changes and developments in urban regeneration policy approaches as discussed in the previous two sections. This section explores the ‘tentative’ re-emergence of community as part of urban regeneration policy. During this period (1991-1997), commentators mentioned community in conjunction with and secondary to the partnership approach to regeneration (see for example, Mayo, 1997; Atkinson, 1999). In addition, Colenutt (1999) questioned the role of people-based regeneration and Maginn (2004) and Cochrane (2007) wrote retrospectively and briefly about recognizing the importance of community involvement during this period. However, on examining the literature, the commitment to community during this period is not that clear and this influences the understanding of community participation in urban regeneration. For example, Maginn (2004:22) argues,
“the increased emphasis the Conservatives placed on the need for local communities to be more involved in decision making was borne out of an increased realization that community consultation/participation was instrumental if regeneration programmes were to be a success”.

The evidence for “this new-found commitment to community participation” can be found Maginn (2004:22) argues “in a flurry of policy advice documents during the 1990s”. Here it is worth listing the policy documents cited by Maginn (2004) in full:

- DoE (1995) Involving Communities in Urban and Rural Regeneration
- DoE (1996) Partners in Regeneration

Cochrane (2007:61) cites a further example,

- DoE (1994) Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund

The SRB was initially launched in 1994 and Cochrane (2007:61) argues “there was already extensive reference to the involvement of community in guidance developed for the SRB” adding that,

“Guidance stressed that the community should be involved in ‘setting up and running these programmes’ and those who were intended to benefit from them were expected to ‘have a continuing say in the management, further development and implementation of the scheme’ (DoE, 1994 cited in Cochrane, 2007, p61).

The SRB works on the basis of a competitive bidding process developed around a three-way partnership model (local authorities, voluntary sector representatives and business/public sector agencies) that bid to receive funding in competition with other localities (Colenutt, 1999; Morrison, 2003). However, as Colenutt (1999:235) argues,
“Local in this sense generally means a local authority area or a large regeneration zone; it does not mean residential neighbourhood or local community”.

Indeed, many commentators found that under the Conservative government, the policy failed to devolve power in a way that met local needs and priorities and this prompted a litany of sustained complaints (Ward, 1997; Morrison, 2003). Similarly, in Round Three of SRB, Hall (2000) found that the community and voluntary sectors were least represented and the dominant players in the leading sixty per cent of bids were local authorities.

2.5.4 The emergence of ‘sustainable development’

Interestingly, it was during Conservative Party governance of an increasingly neo-liberal political economic climate that sustainable development was placed on the urban policy agenda. The concept of sustainable development originated in the Bruntland Report of 1987 (World Commission on Environment and Development, WCED, 1987) and the most widely cited definition from the report is “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. The following year, in a key speech to the Royal Society, Margaret Thatcher announced the government’s commitment to environmental issues and stated,

“The government espouses the concept of sustainable economic development. Stable prosperity can be achieved throughout the land provided the environment is nurtured and safeguarded” (Thatcher, 1988).

The shift from the 1970s perspective, especially in planning discourse, which viewed the environment as a resource for exploitation was marked by “a maturing popular understanding of, and concern about, environmental issues conceived in ecological and biospheric terms” (Healey and Shaw, 1994:430). Within the neoliberal political economy, whereby the environment was increasingly viewed as a ‘tradeable asset’ conflicts between environmental conservation, management and development came to the fore (Healey and Shaw, 1994). In contrast to earlier concepts of conservation characteristic of the post war period, in the 1980s the ‘conservation narrative’ (Whatmore and Boucher, 1993) narrowed to heritage landscapes and wildlife sites.
However, during the 1980s, local authorities were beginning to innovate, with some seeking to ‘green’ their development agenda (e.g. the Greater London Development Plan). The introduction in 1986 of European legislation such as the requirement for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) on major projects was meant to encourage the environmental agenda. However, Woods and Jones (1992) argue that the EIA has had a limited impact because the thresholds were high. Outside the planning system, and inspired by local politicians and/or environmental campaign groups some local authorities produced environmental statements or charters. For example, Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council in collaboration with Friends of the Earth produced a Charter for the Environment and the London Borough of Sutton produced a series of annual Environmental Statements from the mid-1980s (Raemakers and Wilson, 1992; Healey and Shaw, 1994).

By 1990, the environmental agenda was gaining ground due to a greater professional understanding of the ‘environment’ combined with popular pressure, As Healey and Shaw (1994:431) state,

“the adverse development and congestion consequences of the economic boom and slump, coupled with the strength of generalized public support for the new environmental agenda, helped lay the political foundations for a dramatic U-turn in government policy on both the environmental agenda and the role and content of development plans”.

The government’s shift in attitude to the environment was most clearly expressed in the publication the Environment White Paper *This Common Inheritance* in 1990 that made a commitment to sustainable development (Owens, 1994). Following the Environment White Paper, sustainable development was encouraged and legitimized by planning policy guidance notes (PPGs) (see Owens, 1994) and planning authorities were urged to “integrate environmental concerns into all planning policies” (Secretary of State for the Environment, 1992:65). As Bruff and Wood (2000:519) argue, “since the early 1990s, successive governments have identified the land-use planning system as one of society’s key mechanisms for the delivery of sustainable development”. Bulkeley and Betsill (2005:75) add that “the strategic role of planning was resuscitated through the 1991 Planning and Compensation Act” and the revision to Planning Policy Guidance (PPGs) emphasized the important role of land-use planning in sustainable development.
In 1992, the United Nations Earth Summit at Rio de Janeiro placed the concept of sustainable development firmly on the international policy agenda and measures were developed to encourage national and local government commitment. For example, at Rio, Agenda 21 with some 27 principles were developed that were concerned with matters such as participative decision-making and the role and importance of communities, women and young people etc. Chapter 28 of Agenda 21 referred specifically to the role of local authorities in delivering urban sustainability and called on them to establish Local Agenda 21 (LA21) by 1996 (Bulkeley and Betsill, 2003). Nonetheless, as Jonas et al (2004:152) summarize, there were problems with LA21 during the Conservative administration, for example,

“despite central and local government support for the principle of LA21, beyond the imposition of targets the practice has tended to lag behind the rhetoric. This is partly due to difficulties in promoting ‘joined up’ thinking along all three dimensions of local policy, namely, the social, economic and environmental dimensions. But it also reflects the state’s mainly rhetorical commitment to environmental policy during the 1990s. It soon became apparent that in the UK the role of LA21 was constrained by the lack of resources for implementation, its non-statutory status, and mixed policy messages from central government in terms of the relative weight of economic, social and environmental considerations in different aspects of public policy. Above all, the lack of incentives for developing a local environmental strategy sat uneasily with the presence of strong incentives for local entrepreneurialism (emphasizing the ‘economic’) and regeneration (the ‘social’).”

Furthermore, Scott (1999) and Blowers and Young (2000) noted that the delivery outcomes and achievements of LA21 in the UK have been mixed. The reasons for such mixed delivery and achievement have been blamed on the inherently problematic notion of sustainability, the difficulty of obtaining consensus, ingrained cultures within local authorities and apathy among business and public interests (Carter and Darlow, 1997; Selman, 1998). However, with the election of a New Labour government in 1997 under the administration of Tony Blair, Raco (2007:170) argues that the conceptions associated with sustainability have been embraced to such an extent that “they have
gradually come to dominate planning policy guidelines, spatial policy blueprints and agendas”. Raco (2007:170) argues that this ‘embrace’ of sustainability culminated in the publication of the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) (ODPM, 2003a). The next Chapter charts the evolution of policy from the election in 1997 to the publication of the SCP in 2003.
CHAPTER 3

British urban regeneration policy in the new century

3.1 New Labour: new directions?

In May 1997, New Labour came to power with the opinion that previous urban policies had failed, as reports showed that there were stark inequalities between rich and poor neighbourhoods in British cities (e.g. Commission on Social Justice, 1994). Some groups of people were socially segregated and socially excluded from mainstream housing (Robson et al, 2000) and mortality levels, educational attainment and per capita incomes differed between neighbourhoods (Imrie and Raco, 2003). As Schoon (2001:83) suggests, “100 years of policy initiative had almost no impact in the pattern of inequality”. In particular, the ‘property-led’ policies of the 1980s combined with neoliberal economic restructuring had done very little for inner urban communities but exacerbate and entrench problems. For example, in 1979 when Margaret Thatcher came to power, 14 per cent of the population lived in poverty; twenty years later in 1999, this figure had risen to 26 per cent, some 14.5 million people (Gordon et al, 2000). In particular, council estates located in inner urban areas were becoming ‘residualized’ in that this is where the greatest concentrations of poverty were located (Forrest, 1990).

Therefore, there was a broad consensus of belief in New Labour that past policies had not only failed to deliver but were part of the problem (Social Exclusion Unit, SEU, 1998). In consequence, many voices were urging change in regeneration policy, including the Local Government Association (LGA), the National Council for Voluntary Organizations Urban Forum, the Black Training and Enterprise Trust and the Development Trust Association (DTA) (Colenutt, 1999). Between them, they were urging a stronger role for local government and partnerships and a greater role for community development, public participation and more effective targeting of programmes (Colenutt, 1999). Such appeals, Colenutt (1999) argues, were not ignored because the first Minister for Planning and Urban Regeneration, Richard Caborn, issued new guidance for Round 4 of SRB stressing improved targeting of resources. Furthermore, a discussion paper Regeneration Programmes: the Way Forward (Department of the Environment,
Transport and the Regions, DETR, 1997) encouraged community involvement, better targeting, and an end to annual bidding rounds and emphasized ‘holistic’ regeneration that integrated social and economic aspects. In 1999, in a speech to the first national regeneration conference, Caborn (1993: 3) contended that “success depends on giving communities the responsibility for making things better, the skills and confidence to get involved, and the power to really achieve their aims”. As Imrie and Raco (2003:5) argue, “For Tony Blair and his advisers, the attainment of such solutions depends on the re-scaling of government and the devolution of power to new layers of community governance”. Community was back on the policy agenda (see chapter 6 for more on community governance). However, it was six years before the announcement of the SCP – the next four sections chart the evolution of urban policy under New Labour via discussions of urban renaissance, neighbourhood renewal, housing market renewal and sustainable communities. The aim is to assess the claim made by New Labour that the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) is a ‘step change’ in urban regeneration policy. The aim is met by two objectives, first, to examine the extent to which the four policy approaches are similar and/or different to previous urban regeneration policies and second, chart the similarities and differences between the four New Labour urban policy approaches\(^5\).

### 3.2 Towards an urban renaissance

“This urban renaissance will benefit everyone, making towns and cities vibrant and successful, and protecting the countryside from development pressure”

(DETR, 2000)

In 1992, the Labour Party funded a book co-authored by Richard Rogers (architect and Labour Party advisor) entitled ‘A New London’ (Rogers and Fisher, 1992). The book espoused the key role of urban design, community involvement, public spaces and density all of which where to become key components of the ‘urban renaissance’. In 1998, Richard Rogers was appointed by the Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott to lead

---

\(^5\) The four New Labour urban policy approaches have been chosen for two reasons, in addition to the obvious one that the thesis is about ‘sustainable communities’. First, they appeared in chronological order and therefore, demonstrate the evolution of policies. Second, they are the four policies that most directly overlap and influence each other in policy literature at the national and local level. However, the author acknowledges that New Labour policies have been described as a ‘bowl of spaghetti’, a metaphor to denote the complexity and intricacy of policies (for a list and discussion of policies see Imrie and Raco, 2003).
an ‘Urban Task Force’ (UTF). The UTF aimed to explore the causes of urban decline in England and recommend practical solutions to attract people back to the city (Colomb, 2007). Urban sustainability was one of the core themes of the report (Raco, 2007:170), as was an emphasis on ‘liveability’, ‘mixed developments’ and the ‘compact city’ (see Lees, 2003; UTF, 1999, 2005). The report has been very influential and the term ‘urban renaissance’ has permeated into policy discourses and official documents ever since (Colomb, 2007:4). Based on the UTF (1999) report the Urban White Paper (UWP) ‘Our Towns and Cities: The Future – Delivering an Urban Renaissance’ was published in 2000. This was the first White Paper to be published on urban issues since the 1977 ‘Policy for the Inner Cities’ (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.4). The UWP details a ‘new vision for urban living’ and according to Lees (2003:61) this vision is “remarkably similar to visions of gentrification”. However, as Lees (2003:61) remarks, the term gentrification is never used; instead, she argues that ‘neutered terms’ such as ‘urban renaissance’, ‘urban regeneration’ and ‘urban sustainability’ are used.

Four key steps were identified in the UWP to deliver an urban renaissance that fits broadly within a holistic, coordinated approach to urban regeneration i.e. integrating the social, economic, environment and governance aspects (Table 3.1). Furthermore, in contrast to earlier urban policy approaches accused of ‘short-termism’ the UWP claims to be “a long term commitment to action” (DETR, 2000:13) thereby, promising ‘sustainability’ rather than a ‘quick fix’ (Lees, 2003). The UWP does go some way beyond the purely physical approach to regeneration seen in earlier decades and incorporates concerns for community participation, health and welfare, crime prevention and education and employment. A main criticism is that the environment is approached from a ‘physical’ and ‘anthropocentric’ perspective rather than incorporating a physical and ecological perspective. Within the spectrum of sustainability, the anthropocentric perspective is a shallow or weak version as it emphasizes human needs and acknowledges humans as the sole determinants of ‘value’. The alternative, more radical, perspective is ecocentrism that reflects the belief those non-human entities – animals, plants, species and ecosystems have ‘goods of their own’ (Owens, 1994; Pepper, 1996). This debate is especially relevant when considering the objectives in the environment category in Table 3.1 as they have particular relevance for understanding sustainable communities.
### Table 3.1: The ‘Urban Renaissance’ approach to regeneration (adapted from DETR, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Key Step</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Getting the design and quality of urban fabric right</td>
<td>Bringing brownfield and empty homes back into use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve planning and design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Looking after the existing environment e.g. litter, graffiti, open spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Enabling towns and cities to create and share prosperity</td>
<td>Strengthening focus and funding of Regional Development Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting a culture of innovation and enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide employment opportunities and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invest in transport networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Providing quality services that people need</td>
<td>Raise education and employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cut crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve housing quality and choice (Housing Green Paper; Decent Homes For All; Key worker housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promote culture, leisure and sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Equipping people to participate in developing their communities</td>
<td>Support individuals and communities e.g. New Deal for Communities, Community Chest, Community Champions initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduce Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) and Neighbourhood Renewal Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of particular relevance, to the environment/sustainability debate is the potential for urban renaissance based on the concepts of ‘liveability’ and the ‘compact city’.
3.2.1 Liveability

The term liveability was first coined in the US in the 1970s by academics and planners concerned with urban sprawl and community degradation. The American Local Government Commission set out ‘liveability principles’ based on community planning, safety, high quality public space and the efficient use of natural resources (Shaw et al 2004). During the Clinton administration, the Clinton-Gore ‘Liveability Agenda’ was established to help citizens and communities preserve green spaces, ease traffic congestion, restore a sense of community and enhance economic competitiveness. Referring to the ‘broken window’ theory (Wilson and Kelling, 1982), Gore stated,

“When a criminal sees a community with broken windows, garbage strewn on the street and graffiti on the walls, there is a powerful but unspoken message: if you’re looking for a place to commit a crime it’s here because we have a high tolerance for disorder” (Gore, quoted in Groundwork, 2002).

In its broadest sense, liveability embraces a complex and inter-related set of issues, which include poverty and inequality, housing conditions, the quality of public space, cultural and recreational amenities, environmental pollution, policing, personal security and safety and transport. In the UK, the origins of liveability can be traced to the UWP (and informing reports such as the UTF) that set out a range of aims, objectives and initiatives for ‘looking after the urban environment’ (Table 3.2). With the ‘liveability’ example from the US, and mounting evidence in the UK demonstrating that the poorest communities, living close to polluting roads and factories suffered most from environmental problems (JRF, 2001) Prime Minister Tony Blair introduced ‘liveability’ to the lexicon of urban regeneration (Shaw et al, 2004). In a speech, made at the Groundwork Conference, Blair made it clear that a strong sense of community which takes responsibility for the local environment and is intolerant of ‘anti social behaviour’ fosters ‘liveability’,

“We need stronger local communities and an improved quality of life. Streets where parents feel safe to let their children walk to school. Where people want to use the parks; where graffiti, vandalism, litter and dereliction are not tolerated; where the environment in which we live fosters rather than alienates a sense of
community and mutual responsibility” (Prime Minister Blair’s speech to the Groundwork Conference, April 2001 cited in Shaw et al, 2004:2).

Table 3.2: Liveability and the urban renaissance (adapted from UWP:2000:82-93)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Objectives/Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making street safer and more attractive</td>
<td>Improve the street environment with traffic congestion measures, provision for cyclists, public transport, improved road safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town centre initiatives</td>
<td>Initiate Town Centre Management and Town Improvement Schemes (drawing from US Business Improvement Districts, BIDs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cleaner local environment                | Revised codes and penalties for litter and refuse  
  |                                          | Byelaws for dogs on leads, poop scoop  
  |                                          | Encourage excellence via Beacon Council Scheme to deal with litter, fly tipping, dog fouling, street furniture |
| Historic environment                     | Initiatives via English Heritage’s Heritage Economic Regeneration Scheme for under-used retail areas and rundown public areas  
  |                                          | Heritage Lottery Fund for Urban Parks and Townscape initiatives |
| Air quality and climate change           | Local air quality management  
  |                                          | 10 year transport plan  
  |                                          | UK Climate Impacts Programme |
| Parks and play areas                     | Well managed open spaces  
  |                                          | Access to well maintained, safe parks and play areas  
  |                                          | Prevent loss of school playing fields  
  |                                          | Enabling voluntary groups to take environmental action e.g. Groundwork, BTCV, Wildlife Trust |

Following this speech, there was an interdepartmental review of policies that directly affected the local environment. Drawing on the UWP proposals for improving the local environment (Table 3.2) the Urban Green Space Taskforce (UGST) was set up in 2001 and published its final report in May 2002 ‘Green Space, Better Places’ outlining 52 recommendations for improving urban parks and green spaces (UGST, 2002). Later in the same year, the report ‘Living Places: Cleaner, Safer, Greener’ (ODPM, 2002) was published following the interdepartmental review. As Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott stated in the Foreword,

“This report draws on the work of six government departments, joining up, to provide policies that link together in a sustainable way. We are determined to ensure that this cross-cutting work continues so that we do achieve a real improvement to the quality of our public space (ODPMa, 2002:6).
In this report, the link is more clearly made between community, liveability, sustainability and urban regeneration policies,

“Good parks and green spaces make neighbourhoods, towns and cities attractive and appealing. They are an integral part of the wider public space network and as much a part of the urban fabric as its buildings. They bring many benefits that make places more liveable and sustainable and enrich the quality of peoples’ lives and communities. Good parks and green spaces are therefore vital for a wide range of Government priorities, such as regeneration, renewal and housing programmes, supporting healthy living, fostering neighbourhood pride and community cohesion” (ODPMa, 2002:37).

However, compared to the UWP version of ‘looking after the environment’ (Table 3.2) and the US example, the UK liveability agenda became narrower in operational sense to become the ‘cleaner, safer, greener’ agenda (Brooklyndhurst, 2004). The report also strongly asserts the ‘right and responsibilities’ of the citizen and community (Table 3.3) as “part of a wider agenda to reinforce the rights and responsibilities of all those who have a stake in the provision and maintenance of clean, safe and attractive public spaces” (ODPM, 2002a:109) (see chapter 4 and 6 for more).

**Table 3.3: The New Labour ‘rights and responsibilities’ model for citizens and communities** (ODPM, 2002a:110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE CITIZEN (as individual and/or within a collective group e.g. business and community)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rights</strong></td>
<td><strong>Responsibilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have democratically accountable central and local government to oversee the provision of high quality standards and services and to have access to relevant information</td>
<td>To have due regard for their shared public spaces and the local environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To expect their fellow citizens and the relevant public/corporate bodies to observe their respective responsibilities</td>
<td>To ensure that their actions are not detrimental to others’ quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To expect their local authority to play a strategic role by taking preventive and/or remedial action when public/corporate bodies fail to observe their respective responsibilities</td>
<td>Where appropriate, to aid and encourage their fellow citizens and the relevant public/corporate bodies to observe their respective responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have accessible mechanisms to oblige their local authority to observe their strategic role and seek redress when they fail to do so</td>
<td>To inform, scrutinise and hold to account central and local government through consultation and the electoral process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, the ‘liveability’ agenda in the UK emerged in its broadest sense in the UWP published in 2000. Since then, and following cross-departmental reviews concerning the local environment the liveability agenda narrowed in an operational sense to become the ‘cleaner, safer, greener’ agenda. However, several themes are emerging and developing during this time such as the inter-relationship between community, sustainability, liveability and regeneration policies. The conceptual relationship between these themes will be discussed in chapter 4 and then developed in subsequent empirical chapters.

3.2.2 The ‘Compact City’

The UWP promotes the ‘compact city’ in two ways; first, calling for “attractive, mixed tenure, higher density housing, with 20% affordable housing that is well integrated into the rest of the development” (UWP, 2000:62). Second, by bringing some 58,000 hectares of brownfield land into use as well as the 700,000 empty homes, 225,000 of which have been vacant for at least one year (DETR, 2000:68). Furthermore, the UWP in an effort to ‘modernize planning’ and cement the idea of the ‘compact city’ announced new guidance on housing (PPG3) which suggests that 60 per cent of all new housing developments should take place on brownfield sites (DETR, 2000:55). In addition, PPG3 Housing sets out its aims to,

- Provide an adequate supply of housing
- Ensure more efficient use of land
- Promote greater housing choice and affordable housing
- Promote mixed development, so homes are closer to jobs and services
- Promote conversion and re-use of empty buildings
- Promote higher quality development and more imaginative design and layout (DETR, 2000: 55)

The main aim of PPG3 is to ensure that brownfield sites are developed rather that greenfield. To ensure local authority compliance with the policy, three support measures were introduced, first, a Greenfield Housing Direction which means that the only Secretary of State can give planning permission for major greenfield development. Second, a National Land Use Database that provides an inventory of brownfield land and finally, Good Practice Guidance on housing design and urban housing capacities
(DETR, 2000:56). Such revisions and strengthening of land-use planning mechanisms emphasize the key importance and role of planning for the delivery of sustainable development (Bruff and Wood, 2000; Bulkeley and Betsill, 2005). Within the UWP, two versions of ‘mixing’ emerge as a way of achieving an urban renaissance. First, PPG3 explicitly promotes ‘mixed development’ in other words, housing close to employment and services - a physical measure to create community and sustainability. Second, ‘social mixing’ is implicitly promoted as ‘mixed tenure’ and ‘20% affordable housing’ that is ‘well integrated into the rest of the development’.

The idea of a ‘compact city’ with high-density housing of mixed use and tenure that does not encroach on rural areas and is built on previously developed land or refurbished existing buildings may seem ‘sustainable’ and environmentally sound on the surface. However, many commentators warn, “within the governmentality of ‘urban compaction’, nature can become little more than an after thought” (Murdoch, 2006:123). According to Whatmore and Hinchcliffe (2003:4) planners in the compact city rarely see the “fecund world of creatures and plants as active agents in the making of the environment’. Natural spaces are outside the city in rural areas whereas the ‘feral spaces’ in the city are cast as wastelands ripe for development (Murdoch, 2006). In consequence, as brownfield sites are redeveloped, the urban spaces of nature will be squeezed out and urban capacity studies, that explore land development opportunities prioritize governmentalties of urban renewal and renaissance (Whatmore and Hinchcliffe, 2003; Murdoch, 2004).

Also of relevance, the UWP mentions that low demand and unpopular housing areas are a growing problem with some 470,000 homes in the social rented sector and 375,000 in private rented (DETR, 2000:71). Negative equity is also mentioned as a problem for those who are owner-occupiers in low demand/unpopular areas. To rectify the problem, the UWP states that a Housing Green Paper⁶ will set out proposals for tackling low demand such as giving local authorities more flexibility in managing housing stock; encouraging mixed communities and reforming the letting system. Interestingly, the UWP (2000:72) suggests a ‘good practice guide’ to tackle low demand with “more radical solutions such as selective demolition” (see Chapter 7).

---

⁶ The Housing Green Paper ‘Quality and Choice: A Decent Home for All’ was published in April 2000 see http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/housing/pdf/138019.pdf
The ‘urban renaissance’ approach combines social, economic, governance and environmental aspects of regeneration so on the surface it appears a more holistic, coordinated and sustainable approach. However, a more critical reading of the environmental aspects such as mixed-use development, social mixing, and high density building on brownfield sites i.e. the ‘compact city’ idea reveal an anthropocentric perspective that prioritizes governmentality of urban renaissance and marginalizes nature. Furthermore, the UWP recognizes the problem of low demand and hints at possible solutions such as mixed communities (see Chapter 8) and demolition (see Chapter 7). The next subsection discusses another initiative introduced by New Labour that helps understand the emergence of the SCP – neighbourhood renewal.

3.3 Neighbourhood renewal

In 2001, the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) announced ‘A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal – National Strategy Plan’\(^7\). As Tony Blair stated in the foreword, “when we came into office, we inherited a country where hundreds of neighbourhoods were scarred by unemployment, educational failure and crime” (SEU, 2001:5). The main urban problems were identified as,

1. A widening gap between rich and poor
2. Two in five people on means tested benefits
3. Three quarters of young people failing to get five good GCSEs
4. Empty and hard to rent homes
5. A spiral of decline
6. Poor reputation of some areas
7. Out migration (SEU, 2001:6)

The Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (NRS) claimed to be “a new approach to renewing poor neighbourhoods” (SEU, 2001:5) and perhaps anticipating criticism that this was no different to previous ‘area based initiatives’ the document detailed ‘why it was different’ as follows,

\(^{7}\) The Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy (as of 2010) is coming to an end and the dedicated website to NRS on the Communities and Local Government (CLG) website was archived on the 6 January 2009 (see http://collections.europeanarchive.org/tna/20090106142604/http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/default.asp accessed 24/02/10).
1. The scale of the problem being addressed
2. The focus not just on housing and the physical fabric but on the fundamental problems of worklessness, crime and poor public services
3. Harnesses hundreds of billions of pounds spent by government departments, rather than relying on one-off regeneration spending
4. Puts in place new ideas such as Neighbourhood Management and Local Strategic Partnerships for empowering residents and getting public, private and voluntary organizations to work in partnership (SEU, 2001:5).

On the surface, the NRS does appear to heed previous criticisms of urban regeneration policies and in particular, the area-based approach, such as the small scale, localized nature of early area approaches; the focus on the physical fabric rather than people and the limited funds and short-termist attitude. In contrast, the NRS adopts New Labour language and promises a ‘cross departmental initiative’ that ‘joins up locally’ and ‘empowers communities’ by working in ‘partnerships’. Of course, as we have seen in earlier sections, partnerships are not new or different however, the role of ‘community’ in the partnership and the promise of ‘empowerment’ is new, as is the ‘scaling up’ of partnerships. As many commentators argue, the area-based model of regeneration is ‘inward looking’ because it ignores the impact of macro-economic structures in promoting socio-spatial polarization and segregation (Hall, 1997) and it focuses attention on the deficiencies of localities and can encourage pathological explanations of social exclusion (Watt and Jacobs, 2000; Newman, 2001). Furthermore, a number of area-based initiatives since the 1980s have had a community participation and/or social capital focus that can be inward looking and bind residents to their neighbourhood (Hall, 1997; Hasting, 2003). Chapter 6 explores these themes in more detail but as Hastings (2003) suggests, maybe the NRS with its strategic multi-level approach does engage with the inward looking criticisms of previous area based initiatives. Thus, “the designation of city-wide partnerships may indicate the scaling-up of an understanding of the appropriate territorial scales at which to diagnose the causes of neighbourhood problems as well as to devise appropriate solutions” (Hasting, 2003:88).

The NRS has five areas of focus - work and enterprise, crime, education and skills, health and housing and the physical environment. According to the NRS, these five areas of focus aim to improve quality of life and intend to “complement the vision of an
urban renaissance and measures set out in the Urban White Paper” (SEU, 2001:9). So put simply, the neighbourhood renewal approach was intended to ‘complement’ the urban renaissance. If we look back at Table 3.1, neighbourhood renewal focuses on the ‘social’ aspects. In all, 88 Neighbourhood Renewal Areas were announced in England, each an area-based initiative targeting poor communities experiencing poor job prospects, high crime levels, poor health etc. Certain measures such as neighbourhood management were to have an influence in housing market renewal areas as part of the plan to create sustainable communities (see Chapter 5). The next subsection discusses Housing Market Renewal (HMR) because the problem of housing market failure was affecting many of the poorer urban areas and this could severely impede the urban renaissance. For example, it is interesting to note, of the seven urban problems identified in the NRS that three were so persistent that they became the focus of the Housing Market Renewal programme, i.e. empty and hard to rent homes became ‘low demand’, out migration became ‘abandonment’ and poor reputation became ‘stigma’. As Cole and Nevin (2004:7) argue, The Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy initially,

“sought amongst other things to turn around the incidence of low demand by 2010. However, it became increasingly apparent that achieving this objective might be at risk unless a more strategic, sub-regional emphasis was given to public intervention”

3.4 Housing market renewal

Much of the evidence in the late 1990s revolved around the ‘risk’ of low demand (Cole and Nevin, 2004) with certain geographical locations in England displaying significantly higher ‘symptoms’. For example, in 2001, in the North East of England about 30 per cent of the population lived in a neighbourhood at risk of low demand and this was approximately ten times the proportion in London and the South East (Leather et al, 2007). Many other commentators have suggested the ‘causes’ and ‘symptoms’ of low demand. The causes according to Ferrari (2007:126) include, social housing ‘residualization’ (Murie et al, 1998); changing land use and decentralization (Nevin et al, 2000); urban blight and poor public services (Power and Mumford, 1999); poverty and deprivation (Lee and Murie, 1997; Burrows and Rhodes, 1998) and neighbourhood stigmatization and insecurities (Wood and Vamplew, 1999). The ‘symptoms’ of low
demand were easier to identify – empty houses; low or falling house prices; high turnover rates in the social rented sector and refused offers to let (Ferrari, 2007).

3.4.1 The origins of housing market renewal

Housing Market Renewal (HMR) was originally proposed in the autumn of 2001 by the National Housing Federation (NHF), Key Cities Housing Group and the Northern Housing Forum “against a backdrop of severe housing market failure” (Hansard, 3 July 2002). In a response to a question in the House of Commons regarding the progress of a housing market renewal fund, Tony McNulty, then a Junior Minister to the ODPM with responsibilities for neighbourhood renewal, housing and planning, responded,

“We are considering the proposal in the context of the current spending review. However, we are in no doubt that we must address the problem of low demand housing, which underlies the fund proposal. That is why we have invited nine areas, where the problems are most acute, to work with government establishing pathfinder projects to tackle low demand” (Hansard, 3 July 2002).

The recommendations from the NHF, Key Cities Housing Group and the Northern Housing Forum were part of evidence submitted to the Select Committee on Empty Homes (DTLR, 2002) that provided evidence for the ‘housing market renewal’ approach. The ‘Select Committee Sixth Report on Empty Homes’ was published on the 20 March 2002 and called for, “a new approach targeted at the conurbation or sub region” (DTLR, 2002). The sub regional approach was required,

“To address the concerns raised about the existing policies, many of the submissions that we received called for a housing market renewal approach. Through Housing Market Renewal Areas, local authorities, housing associations and other partners should agree a plan for the renewal of the conurbation, to maximize private sector involvement and to develop a more appropriate mix of types, tenures and sizes of houses in the area over a long period of time to encourage people to move back to inner urban areas” (DTLR, 2002: para 105)
On the 10 April 2002, the Secretary of State for Transport, Local Government and Regions announced nine HMR pathfinders areas (Figure 3.1), including the study area of this project – ‘NewcastleGateshead’ (i.e. Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Gateshead). A month later, £25 million was allocated to develop pathfinder strategies such as research, recruitment of a development team and early actions (quick wins) (Cole and Nevin, 2004:13).

Figure 3.1: The nine Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder areas

---

8 Source: [http://www.odpm.gov.uk/pub232/p1141232.gif](http://www.odpm.gov.uk/pub232/p1141232.gif) accessed 22/02/06
The HMR approach promised to “create places where people want to live” (DTLR, 2002). To achieve this, and bring about housing market renewal the initiative must

“include people who already live there and those who might be attracted there. As a lack of choice of tenure, type and size of property is one of the causes of housing market decline, proposals for housing market renewal need to be predicated on making inner urban areas more attractive, including increasing choice, by the creation of new housing in which people want to live. This might be in high density mixed flats or the decent family homes with gardens” (DTLR, 2002: para 106).

In addition, to the mixed tenure and high-density approaches (see chapter 8 for more on ‘mixing communities’) seen before in the Urban White Paper, the HMR approach placed demolition back on the urban policy agenda (see Chapter 7). Demolition, it was argued, was necessary because of “very different local economies” as the Select Committee document warned,

“These areas report a surplus of housing, not all of which is expected to be replaced. During our visit to Bootle we heard how as many as 4,000 properties will need to be cleared over the next 20 years and many may not be replaced” (DTLR, 2002: para 107).

Furthermore, the Select Committee report warned, “a policy of selective demolition and in some places replacement with a greater choice of more desirable properties, requires considerable planning” (DTLR, 2002: para 108).

Overall, the Select Committee report provided the following recommendations to achieve housing market renewal,

“Increased choice in tenure, sizes and types of home is essential to bring about change in inner urban areas. The changes required will however vary from place to place, reflecting the economic viability of areas. We recommend that a clear conurbation-wide strategy and masterplan for the redevelopment of the area should be in place before any significant demolition begins. Strategies must be
developed swiftly and sensitively to try to minimize blight. Where proposals are developed to reduce the number of houses in an area, particular attention needs to be paid to creating sustainable future uses for the sites. Demolition strategies should also take account of the value of retaining some older buildings in creating housing choice” (DTLR, 2002: para 111).

3.4.2 The sub-regional approach to low demand and abandonment

In their report detailing the origins of HMR, Cole and Nevin\(^9\) (2004:9) refer to the original Market Renewal prospectuses that defined market renewal as,

“a philosophy that integrates housing, planning and regeneration strategies to produce a process of renewal that reverses the negative socio-economic trends that cause decline of housing markets within a sub-region. The approach attempts to restore choice and balance in housing markets that have become increasingly ill-suited to the preferences and aspirations of existing residents or potential incoming households”.

HMR was hailed as an integrated and cross-sectoral partnership approach that would address the previous lack of integration between housing and economic development by working within a sub-regional framework (Cole and Nevin, 2004). According to Cole and Nevin (2004:9), the broader sub-regional framework allowed the HMR Strategy to “plan for the provision of a target population and shape urban form according to likely migration patterns, demographic change and fluctuations in income and wealth”. Evidence from earlier urban initiatives such as City Challenge and Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) had shown that, even with successful economic regeneration, if the quality of the urban environment did not significantly improve then residents who became ‘empowered’ moved out of poor quality neighbourhoods (Kleinman and Whitehead, 1999) thereby increasing residential volatility (Pawson and Bramley, 2000). Residential volatility refers to the situation in low demand neighbourhoods where vacancy rates have reached a critical threshold so the pace of neighbourhood abandonment increases (Lee and Nevin, 2003). Cole and Nevin (2004) describe three distinct processes that lead to

---

\(^9\) Brendan Nevin was directly involved in launching HMR. First, he was involved in the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies (CURS) research that identified markets at risk in the North and Midlands. Second, he was involved in the Core cities lobby for market renewal funding and third, he acted as an adviser to the ODPM in the early stages of HMR.
neighbourhood abandonment: stock obsolescence, surplus housing and unpopular neighbourhoods (Figure 3.2).

**Figure 3.2: Processes of housing market change** (Cole and Nevin, 2004: 10)

Stock obsolescence refers to a situation where the characteristics of a property have been outstripped by the changing tastes, aspirations and income levels. Surplus housing stock indicates a condition where underlying changes in the economic base of the area and the consequent shift in population, often through high levels of out-migration, cause a mismatch between supply and demand. Unpopular neighbourhoods is a state of affairs where a range of factors, such as unpopular property design, stigma and high levels of perceived crime and anti-social behaviour, interact to reduce external demand and result in a high proportion of existing residents wanting to leave the area.

To merit the scale of intervention involved in the HMR approach, the ODPM deemed that all three processes had to be present at a sub-regional level in order for an area to be designated as a pathfinder but that at the neighbourhood level where local circumstances could be different, the policy intervention may only need to respond to one or more of the three categories (Cole and Nevin, 2004). The importance of these three categories – surplus, obsolescence and unpopular neighbourhoods cannot be
underestimated because these criteria determine the evidence on which HMR policy intervention is based. For example, the Market Renewal Pathfinder in Newcastle and Gateshead which is now named ‘Bridging NewcastleGateshead’ (BNG) uses the obsolescence criteria defined by Cole and Nevin (2004) to justify demolition.

Once designated a pathfinder, to receive further funding required the fulfillment of four conditions:

- Agree a boundary for HMR with the ODPM
- Agree which local authority would assume responsibility as the accountable body for the HMR funds
- Set milestones in relation to the development of a prospectus
- Set up a Non-statutory Partnership Board with ‘appropriate’ governance arrangements (Cole and Nevin, 2004:14)

According to Cole and Nevin (2004:14) the ODPM has “adopted a non-prescriptive managerial role, which is enabling not controlling”. Although HMR is a spatial, area-based approach, in contrast to earlier area-based initiatives, the boundaries for HMR are not intended to follow administrative boundaries. Instead, the HMR boundaries are meant to be shaped by incidence of market failure.

The HMR funds can be used for a wide range of ‘physical’ interventions such as,

- Targeted renovation and environmental improvement grants
- Acquisition costs (land and property)
- Clearance of surplus and obsolete property
- Associated legal and professional fees
- Gap funding for housing for sale
- Site preparation and reclamation
- Assistance with housing association new build and renovation programmes
- Environmental improvements
- Enhanced neighbourhood management services for neighbourhoods in transition and awaiting clearance (Cole and Nevin, 2004:15).
On the surface, it appears the HMR may be yet another ‘physical area-based approach’ because the funds are targeted at housing refurbishment, demolition, new build and site assembly. Neighbourhood management appears to focus on the social/community aspect of regeneration but only from the perspective of managing the transition i.e. ameliorating the damaging and potentially controversial impacts of site clearance and demolition. However, Cole and Nevin (2004:21) argue,

“Although the programme concerns the renewal of local housing markets, it is readily acknowledged that the source of market failure is not necessarily housing-derived, but potentially covers an array of non-housing factors such as fear of crime, lack of access to transport, failing schools, labour market change and so on. While the HMR programme has a focus on housing market change, it does not have a housing policy ‘home’ from which it can emerge every so often to join up with other strategies, sectors or services. The challenge for all HMR Pathfinders is that, while their earmarked budgets will be concerned with issues of housing stock improvement, demolition, new build, site assembly and neighbourhood management, the mainsprings for the market renewal process may lie elsewhere. ‘Holistic regeneration’ is therefore fundamental from the start”.

It appears that HMR, like the NRS (see Section 3.3) may move beyond the ‘inward looking critique’ of area-based approaches and instead promise a multi-level approach (Hasting, 2003:87). However, as Cole and Nevin (2004:70) warn,

“HMR was never intended to be another self-contained ‘special spending’ programme. The danger is that it will be ‘normalized’ into just another kind of physical regeneration programme, rather than a new approach to influence housing markets through a whole spectrum of initiatives”.

Despite the promise of ‘holistic regeneration’ the HMR approach as announced in 2002 cannot be viewed as holistic because the list of ‘actual’ interventions is no different to previous physical approaches i.e. demolition, mixed development, new building etc. There is no specific mention of ‘sustainable development’, community participation, employment etc beyond acknowledging that housing market failure may not derive from
houses but may derive from ‘non-housing factors’. Therefore, the HMR approach acknowledges ‘non-housing’ factors as a potential problem that contributed to market failure yet focuses on a solution that is exclusively housing/property led albeit at a greater spatial scale than previous initiatives. It is interesting then, that a year later HMR was 're-announced' as part of the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) and this is discussed next.

### 3.5 Sustainable communities

John Prescott, then Deputy Prime Minister, launched the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) “Sustainable Communities: Building for the future” on 5 February 2003. The SCP is the main document and this was published alongside nine English regional documents for the East of England, East Midlands, North West, South East, Yorkshire and Humber, London, North East, South West and West Midlands. It was promoted as a ‘step change’ in the British planning system that would “reverse over the next 15 – 20 years the most damaging, deep-seated trends” and enhance economic development and sustainability (ODPM, 2003a:7). The plan set out specific aims to deal with housing supply issues in South East England and low demand and abandonment in the North and Midlands. As Raco (2007:170) argues, the SCP “has had a profound effect on the discourse of spatial planning across the country”. Although most commentators (this author included) have focused on the urban aspects of the SCP, it is a plan to create successful, thriving and inclusive communities in urban and rural England (ODPM, 2003a:5). The SCP sets out its aims in six chapters and Table 3.4 demonstrates how the aims and objectives of the SCP borrow from earlier policies such as the urban renaissance (UWP), neighbourhood renewal and housing market renewal. Everything in Table 3.4 is drawn from the SCP - then to illustrate the connection with previous policies they have been placed in the appropriate column (e.g. HMR etc).
Table 3.4: Evidence of earlier urban policy initiatives in the Sustainable Communities Plan
A comparison to show how the aims of SCP borrow from earlier New Labour urban policy initiatives (adapted from ODPM, 2003a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCP Aim</th>
<th>SCP only</th>
<th>Urban Renaissance (UR)</th>
<th>Neighbourhood Renewal (NR)</th>
<th>HMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decent homes, decent places</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Liveability’ agenda – public parks and spaces</td>
<td>By 2010, all social housing will have been made decent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the design quality of public buildings and places</td>
<td>Neighbourhood wardens in over 500 deprived communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbourhood Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NR Unit to continue work to narrow gap between rich and poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low demand and abandonment</strong></td>
<td>Planning and compulsory purchase bill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respond to declining demand</td>
<td>Nine pathfinder areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tackle private sector landlords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large scale clearance, new build and refurbishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work in partnership with RDAs, LSPs, and private developers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Coalfield Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community engagement plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A step change in housing supply</strong></td>
<td>Four growth areas</td>
<td>Reuse brownfield land and reduce urban fringe greenfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable/ Key worker housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tackle homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern construction methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Land, countryside and rural communities | Increase supply of affordable homes  
Maintain and increase greenbelt | Brownfield development  
Continue National Land Use Database |  
| Reforming for delivery | Reform planning system  
Devolution of power to regions  
More freedom to local authorities regarding housing and tenants  
Strengthen regional arrangements – new regional plans e.g. RSS |  | Sub-regional approach to housing problem |
Familiar urban policy themes returned in the Sustainable Communities Plan, for example, ‘sustainable development’ and ‘urban renaissance’ themes such as brownfield development and the ‘compact city’. As Yvette Cooper’s statement in the House of Commons reveals,

“The Communities Plan sets out a framework for housing growth within the principles of sustainable development. That means high density, high quality design and easy access to public transport and other public services. It restates our commitment to develop brownfield first, and to protect and enhance the green belt, minimizing adverse environmental impacts” (Hansard, 23 October 2003).

Furthermore, in a joint report by the nine HMR Pathfinder Chairs, three years into the SCP, they asserted the importance of HMR and made clear links between the ‘urban renaissance’, HMR and SCP stating,

“Housing Market Renewal is one of the most important urban initiatives ever launched, aiming not just to regenerate cities and towns but to transform them. It is playing a central role in physical regeneration, but at the same time contributing to economic regeneration, urban renaissance, and the creation of long term sustainable communities in these areas” (HMR Pathfinder Chairs, 2006: 12).

Echoing the concepts ‘liveability’ from the UWP, ‘holistic regeneration’ from HMR and reworking the Brundtland definition of ‘sustainable development’ the SCP promises that,

“Housing and the local environment are vitally important. But communities are more than just housing. They have many requirements. Investing in housing alone, paying no attention to the other needs of communities, risks wasting money – as past experience has shown. A wider vision of strong and sustainable communities is needed to underpin this plan, flowing from the Government’s strong commitment to sustainable development. The way our communities develop, economically, socially and environmentally, must respect the needs of future generations as well as succeeding now. This is the key to lasting, rather
than temporary, solutions; to creating communities that can stand on their own feet and adapt to the changing demands of modern life. Places where people want to live and will continue to want to live” (ODPM, 2003a:7).

The SCP provides a definition of a ‘sustainable community’ with eight components (Table 3.5) that clearly integrates many previous policy themes and concepts such as active citizenship, partnerships, participation, urban design, mixed development, social mixing and sustainable development.

Table 3.5: The eight components of a ‘sustainable community’ (adapted from ODPM, 2003a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sustainable Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Active, responsible citizens, social mixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Partnership, participation, civic responsibility and pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (ecological)</td>
<td>Recycling waste, walking and cycling, biodiversity, clean, safe, green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (physical)</td>
<td>Urban design approach, sense of place, mixed tenure, flexible and adaptable buildings, ‘defensible space’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>Public transport, access to telecommunications, internet and strategic networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Thriving and diverse local economy, links to wider economy, viable and attractive town centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local services</td>
<td>Well served with accessible public, private, community and voluntary services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>Fair for everyone, recognize individual rights and responsibilities, respect rights and aspirations, have due regard for future generations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Raco (2007:172), the government’s concept of a ‘sustainable community’ is “an inherently geographical and spatial construct” because “the agenda is underpinned by assumptions about how social and political actors should be ordered in space […] and […] it draws upon particular visions of what places could be like in order to be balanced and sustainable and highlights the processes of mobility and fixity through which such places can be made and remade”.

The conceptual chapter (4) and the subsequent empirical chapters (6-8) discuss the extent to which the notions of fixity and mobility influence the creation and understanding
of sustainable communities. Furthermore, chapter 4 sets out the conceptual understanding of the various urban policy developments discussed in this chapter, for example, New Labour’s urban policy approach is situated within the context of communitarian views of society (see Etzioni, 1996) and the ‘responsibilization’ of active citizens and communities.

### 3.6 Urban policy development in ‘NewcastleGateshead’

The city of Newcastle upon Tyne and the town of Gateshead are situated in the North East of England (Figure 3.3) with a population in 2001 of 259,000 and 191,151 respectively (ONS, 2001). Newcastle and Gateshead are part of the larger Tyne and Wear conurbation. The River Tyne was an important medieval port but its development really began during the Industrial Revolution. In the middle of the nineteenth century, a coalition of industrial capitalists and large local landowners established the Tyne Improvement Commission (TIC) responsible for converting “little better than a ditch into a great river” (Johnson, 1925:5).

**Figure 3.3: The North East region**
(Source: [http://www.onenortheast.co.uk/map_of_region.cfm](http://www.onenortheast.co.uk/map_of_region.cfm) accessed 07/04/09)
Between 1851 and 1911, the population of Tyneside tripled because of the amount of marine and manufacturing employment (Byrne, 1999). The marine related industries, including coal mining and shipbuilding provided the economic base for Tyneside until the 1970s. In the 1950s and 60s, an ‘engaging and charismatic politician’ emerged – T Dan Smith with a grandiose vision to recreate Newcastle in the image of Athens, Rome and Florence (BBC, 2003) or as a ‘Brasilia of the North’ (Minton, 2009). T Dan Smith was a Newcastle City Councillor, 1950-1965 and a member of the Northern Economic Planning Council 1965-1970. Yet his grand schemes for Newcastle ended in corruption, the resignation of Home Secretary Reginald Maudling and a six year jail term in 1974 for Smith and architect John Poulson (Minton, 2009). One of his most lasting developments is a ‘city in the sky’ - Cruddas Park, a 14 floor tower block built by Wimpey in a Swedish modular design (Figure 3.4).

**Figure 3.4: Cruddas Park**

![Cruddas Park](http://www.bbc.co.uk/insideout/northeast/series2/i/tdan_cruddasnow150.jpg)

During the period of deindustrialization in the 1970s and 80s, manufacturing employment on Tyneside almost halved between 1979 and 1997 (HMR Prospectus, 2004). As discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.4.1, one response was the establishment of Urban Development Corporations (UDCs) and in 1987, the Tyne and Wear Development Corporation (TWDC) was created. The TWDC had four zones of operation (see Byrne, 1999:133-137),

---
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1. *West Newcastle* around the site of the former Vickers Armstrong factories (Figure 3.5)

2. *Newcastle Quayside* (Figures 3.6, 3.7) – an area where most of the population had been displaced by slum clearance in the 1930s and 1960s and which then consisted of warehouses and light industry. This was to be the ‘flagship’ project and became the Millennium Bridge, Baltic Arts Centre (a former flour mill) and the Sage music venue (Figure 3.8). All three projects (along with the ‘Angel of the North’ statue) are now iconic landmarks in Tyneside.

3. *Industrial Tyne*

4. *Industrial Wear*

---

**Figure 3.5: Vickers Armstrong factory workers** (Source: www.journallive.co.uk\(^{11}\))

---

Figure 3.6: Newcastle Quayside in 1915 (Andrea Armstrong)

Figure 3.7: Newcastle Quayside in 2007 (Andrea Armstrong)
Retrospective accounts describe the projects for ‘Industrial Tyne and Wear’ as involving anything but a revival of industry. As Byrne (1999:135) argues, “with the politically induced closure of the shipyards, the TWDC came in like a vulture to the sites and has turned the traditional use of the river inside out”. The TWDC sought non-industrial uses for former industrial sites. One of the first developments was St Peter’s Village in the East End of Newcastle – a yuppie development in the style of London’s docklands (Byrne, 1999). The TWDC promised the creation or safeguarding of 28,000 jobs (TWDC, 1998). Yet Robinson et al (1993:44) concluded that in reality the number of jobs created was much less than 1,000. Byrne (1999:144) further argues that the “TWDC is a classic illustration of the failures, not of free market capitalism with which it has little connection, but of anti-democratic central direction conducted without reference to the political culture of the place concerned”.

The TWDC dissolved in 1998 and was succeeded by City Challenge (see Robinson, 1997) and the Single Regeneration Budget. Indeed, such is the extent of urban policy responses that Coaffee (2004: 443) argues,

“The city of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, has become an urban laboratory where numerous nationally prescribed regeneration partnerships and strategies have been “tried-out” over the last 30 years”.

Figure 3.8: The Baltic and Millennium Bridge, Gateshead (Andrea Armstrong)
Since the 1960s, a full range of national urban regeneration programmes have been implemented at neighbourhood level (see Benwell Community Project, 1981; Byrne, 2000; ReUrbA, 2001; Robinson and Shaw, 2001, Coaffee and Healey, 2003). According to Coaffee (2004:446), the policy focus “has been especially evident in the West End of Newcastle, which has become a 30-year test-bed for mainstream regeneration programmes”. Although Newcastle, and especially the West End of the city have received most policy attention over the years (Mandanipour and Bevan, 1999; Coaffee, 2004) the East End of Newcastle and areas in Gateshead have experienced high levels of deprivation, well above national averages (DETR, 2001 cited in HMR Prospectus, 2004:9).

In 2000, a radical and extensive urban regeneration programme was announced by Newcastle City Council (NCC) – ‘Going for Growth’ (GFG) – a local initiative in response to the failure of earlier urban regeneration policies. As ReUrbA (2001:6) argue,

“Going for Growth – motto here – sweeping change rather than dribs and drabs. One has learned from the mistakes of the past that the fundamental, structural problems of the city could not be solved by the hitherto pursued tactic of single projects, geographically, narrowly defined, concentrated on and reduced to striking problems, with low budgets and short project time frames”.

GFG was intended to be a “20 year project building 20,000 new homes mainly on derelict, inner city sites” (ReUrbA, 2001:7). This is a misleading statement because as we shall see in chapter 7, ‘derelict, inner city sites’ meant people’s homes due for demolition. The origins, impact and failure of GFG are discussed in chapter 7. However, one of the reasons for its collapse was because it coincided with national urban regeneration plans, most notably Housing Market Renewal (ODPM, 2002b) which was then incorporated into the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) (ODPM, 2003a) a year later (see Sections 3.4 and 3.5). Newcastle and Gateshead or as it became known ‘Bridging NewcastleGateshead’ (BNG) was one of the nine original Housing Market Renewal Pathfinders (HMRP) announced in the SCP (see Figure 3.1 map of HMRP) and is introduced next.
3.6.1 Bridging NewcastleGateshead (BNG)

‘Bridging NewcastleGateshead’ or BNG is one of the nine original HMR pathfinders announced as part of the SCP. BNG is a partnership between Newcastle City Council and Gateshead Council (see Appendix 1, 2, 3 and 4 for governance frameworks) to deliver and create sustainable communities via housing market renewal within a designated ‘BNG area’. The BNG area has a population of around 140,000 living in 77,000 homes (52,000 in Newcastle and 25,000 in Gateshead). There is a large amount of social rented stock, flats and terraces. The BNG area (see Figure 3.9) cuts across the local authority boundaries of Newcastle upon Tyne and Gateshead (to the north and south of the River Tyne respectively). To emphasize the ‘bridge’ between the two places, Newcastle upon Tyne and Gateshead are renamed ‘NewcastleGateshead’.

**Figure 3.9: BNG area (BNG, 2006)**

One of the requirements to receive HMR funding from the ODPM was the production of a ‘prospectus’ to be scrutinized by the Audit Commission. The draft prospectus was submitted to the ODPM in 2003 and after scrutiny and changes that acknowledged the
importance of an evidence base to monitor and respond to the dynamic process of market renewal the final prospectus was published in 2004 (HMR Prospectus, 2004). In the Foreword, Leo Finn, then the Chair of BNG paints a picture of a fragmented, polarized urban landscape in NewcastleGateshead whereby cultured glamour and decay are juxtaposed,

“To too many people in Newcastle and Gateshead own their own properties where the value is less than their mortgage and their homes are close to rental properties, both private and public, where no one wants to live. Abandonment and decay are common in some areas not far from the glamorous dwellings now dominating the cultured banks of the Tyne” (HMR Prospectus, 2004:3).

Interestingly, Leo Finn, refers to home owners experiencing ‘negative equity’ and appears to blame the close proximity of ‘rental properties’ for this rather than the interest rate rises and recession of the early 1990s. The prospectus initially provides a context for ‘the place’ by narrating a story of ‘growth’ then ‘decline’. The growth section emphasizes history, culture, education, business and identity and situates NewcastleGateshead within and as part of Europe and as “leading the renaissance of the North East” (HMR Prospectus, 2004:5). Such language echoes the New Labour policy discourse of ‘urban renaissance’ and in the HMR Prospectus, renaissance means growth and success. In contrast, the decline section relates the story of job losses in traditional sectors, out migration amongst those able or willing to move for jobs, housing and/or education and increased concentrations of poverty in certain wards, linked to joblessness, health inequalities, poor educational achievement, high levels of crime and fear of crime and low aspirations (HMR Prospectus, 2004:6).

To stem the decline, the HMR/SCP initiative is seen as an opportunity to “restructure housing markets and help develop and extend the vibrant inner core conurbation of NewcastleGateshead outwards, building attractive communities in which people want to live” (HMR Prospectus, 2004:6). This will be achieved “though a combination of clearance of unwanted abandoned housing, developing new high quality housing in sustainable communities, improving and refurbishing properties and supporting neighbourhoods through periods of great change” (HMR Prospectus, 2004:6).
Another section of the prospectus details the vision, values and objectives. Here we clearly see the commitment to, and translation of, national policy at a local level via ‘cross-cutting’ themes, both vertically (national to local) and horizontally (local-to-local), for example, vertical coordination:

“The NewcastleGateshead vision and values were developed in consultation with the communities involved, along with partners. They transpose Government guidelines into a local context to meet NewcastleGateshead’ aspirations and need’s” (emphasis added, HMR Prospectus, 2004:18).

Horizontal coordination:

“Pathfinder objectives have been developed in parallel with wider regeneration plans to ensure the maximum benefits and complement other regeneration work” (HMR Prospectus, 2004:19).

Similarly, the vision statement clearly echoes themes such as ‘renaissance’, and ‘liveability’,

“Our vision is that by 2018, the housing market in NewcastleGateshead will be revitalized, strong and stable, fully integrated with the renaissance of the region. The changing needs and aspirations of local people will shape the development of liveable communities, where residents will benefit from increased housing opportunity and choice in lively, cohesive neighbourhoods that provide the best quality of life in a healthy, safe and sustainable environment” (HMR Prospectus, 2004:19).

However, we get an early indication of the local interpretation of ‘sustainable communities’ - lively, cohesive, healthy and safe. The ‘values’ are more detailed and clearly demonstrate themes previously discussed in section 3.2 for example, liveability, the compact city, mixed development, social mixing and urban design. In other words, they echo the ‘urban renaissance’ policy discourse rather than ‘sustainable communities’. This could literally mean - to borrow the title of the HMR Prospectus ‘Creating places where more people want to live’ – creating places by physically building
them so not fully encompassing the concept of ‘holistic regeneration’ encouraged in HMR and SCP national policy documents, see below for a list of values,

- **Fostering community liveability**: nurturing a sense of community and place, shared values and common enterprise; creating a safe area for residents and visitors; enhancing the public transport networks
- **Balanced land use**: developing a vibrant mix of residential land and business communities, fully integrating tenures to create more balanced mixed economy communities. Promoting cohesive physical, economic and social development
- **Excellence in urban design**: ensuring the highest quality contemporary design
- **Sharing prosperity**: ensuring the area is sought after for businesses; promoting inclusive training and learning opportunities
- **Building on the assets of the area**: preserving and enhancing the environment and heritage (HMR Prospectus, 2004:19).

Furthermore, the values are ‘general’ i.e. not a tailored approach to the different areas within BNG. As seen in Figure 3.9 the BNG area is large, it is meant to be a ‘sub-regional’ approach however, over the years, since the programme’s initiation the area of ‘active regeneration’ has been redrawn to reflect changes in the housing market, private developer interest and completed interventions (BNG, 2008:3). Active regeneration refers to the areas in BNG where a range of interventions such as demolition, refurbishment and building houses are actually happening – they have gone beyond the planning phase.

**Active regeneration I: Strategic Commissions**

Since its inception, national policy documents have claimed that HMR is a ‘sub-regional’ approach to regeneration (see Section 3.4 on HMR). This language also permeates local policy documents,

“In a 15 year timeframe we intend to achieve long term restructuring and meet changing demand, taking a truly integrated sub-regional approach that effectively links housing, planning and economic policy” (HMR Prospectus, 2004:6).
Two years on from the publication of the prospectus, the BNG Corporate Strategy and Business Plan for 2006-2008 introduced the concept of ‘strategic commissioning’ stating,

“Learning from the first stage of the programme, we have developed a new and more robust commissioning and appraisal process. We call our approach strategic commissioning and it provides a framework for delivery of HMR in BNG” (BNG, 2006:10).

Strategic commissioning has emerged from the public sector, especially health and social care, as a management tool to explain the process of “specifying, securing and monitoring services to meet the needs of individuals [and communities] both in the short and long term” (Audit Commission, 1997:6). As the Audit Commission (1997:7) adds,

“if [local] authorities are to meet future as well as current needs, they must be thinking strategically about the framework in which commissioning takes place and consider what action is required to help the process work more effectively”.

Since New Labour came to power, the notion of ‘strategic commissioning’ has spread beyond health and social care to other public sectors (e.g. Department for Education and Skills). There are many models of strategic commissioning and most describe a cyclical process of activities that has four key elements – analysis, planning, doing and reviewing (North West Road Map, 2008). The basic components of the strategic commissioning cycle are now being adapted and used as part of the regeneration process. However, there is no published literature on strategic commissioning in urban regeneration and very little on strategic commissioning itself – although two reports are due in 2009 from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Broadly, the strategic commissioning process involves assessing needs; reviewing service provision and identifying gaps; deciding priorities; designing services; writing a strategy or prospectus; managing performance and providing public feedback. BNG have followed these principles and produced documents called ‘Strategic Commissions’ setting out the proposed interventions to target housing market renewal in nine areas within BNG (Figure 3.10).
The rationale behind the use of ‘strategic commissioning’ in the BNG area is

“to target resources at areas which show the greatest need along with the possibility of recovery” (Audit Commission, 2005:21).

Although BNG is anxious to stress the ‘inter-relatedness’ of each strategic commission as Figure 3.10 illustrates, the division of the sub-regional BNG area into nine strategic commissions (that mostly follow ward administrative boundaries) does hark back to ‘area-based’ regeneration initiatives of old. The nine strategic commissions are areas of ‘active regeneration’ yet the “connections between the different strategic commissions are not always articulated or clear……none of the strategic commissions considers the issue of adjacency and displacement sufficiently” (Audit Commission (2005:21).
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This suggests that problems are beginning to emerge with the ‘sub-regional’ housing market approach. The problems centre on the ‘delivery’ of urban regeneration policy and the ‘connections and/or disconnections’ between places and communities. The framework for delivering ‘active regeneration’ always involves the demarcation of boundaries – who, what, where is the policy intervention focused? In the case of BNG, there are two overlapping sub regional boundaries:

1. The original BNG area of housing market failure and high levels of deprivation defined in the 2004 Prospectus
2. The nine strategic commissions within the BNG original area defined in the Business Plan of 2006 as the most in need and recoverable – these are the areas of ‘active regeneration’

In consequence, although the original BNG area exists in maps, some areas within it are now excluded from ‘active regeneration’ because they are not deemed as needy.

**Active regeneration II: Focus Areas**

In 2008, BNG produced another map that redrew the areas of ‘active regeneration’ to reflect their change in focus as they argue,

“Our programme will be more focused, reflecting changes in the market, where the private sector is considered to be more likely to invest and where our earlier activity has produced assets that can be used to deliver future regeneration. The changes to our programme therefore reflect how areas will be transformed and the scale of our involvement; our programme 2008-2011 is a combination of need, opportunity and unfinished business” (BNG, 2008: 3).

Figure 3.11 shows a map produced by BNG that illustrates the demarcations quite well. As Figure 3.11 shows, the nine ‘strategic commissions’ have now being reduced to three ‘focus areas’ – Scotswood and Walker Riverside in Newcastle and Bensham in Gateshead. As BNG (2008:3) argue, these areas

“remain our highest priorities. Though very different places, they face fundamental challenges with their housing markets and require ongoing support
to rebalance housing choice through clearance, new build and refurbishment. They require investment in neighbourhood centres and public realm”.

The other ‘strategic commissions’ such as Benwell, Felling, Byker, Elswick, Dunstan are now classified as ‘areas of change’. This means that although the areas remain a priority, HMR funding will be controlled and where possible private investment will be encouraged (BNG, 2008). The blue areas on the map show ‘other areas of change’ such as the city centres, Science Central, Baltic Business Quarter, Blakelaw, Staithes and Deckham. The regeneration of these areas continues but is funded by other organizations and the private sector (BNG, 2008).

Figure 3.11: BNG ‘focus areas’, 2008-2011 (Source: BNG, 2008:4)
Due to these changes in focus, the areas of active regeneration have been reduced and now only three ‘focus areas’ are deemed the most needy, urgent and recoverable and benefit from continued state funding. In contrast, the BNG ‘areas of change’ are now ranked lower in priority and will only receive ‘controlled’ state funding. Whereas, the wider ‘BNG area’ is not specifically mentioned in any documents as having received or due to receive any interventions. In consequence, the map shows a series of discrete, demarcated, ranked places that emphasizes exclusion from ‘active’ regeneration and disconnection between places. Yet again, the issues of adjacency and displacement are not addressed in the BNG Business Plan (BNG, 2008) for example, the connections between areas of ‘active’ regeneration and areas where people are relocated. The rationalization of nine strategic commissions to three focus areas can be viewed in several ways – either the initiative has been successful and started to transform areas; housing markets have recovered on their own in line with national trends; the local and national political focus has changed or the original sub-regional approach was too ambitious.

Conclusion

Chapters 2 and 3 have charted the evolution of urban regeneration policies in Britain since the post war period to the announcement of the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) in 2003. Both chapters have paid particular attention to the ways in which discourses of ‘community’ and ‘sustainability’ have been interpreted throughout this time. The final section of Chapter 3, introduced the ‘Bridging Newcastle Gateshead’ area in relation to the local urban policy interpretations over the same time period. The main finding is that British urban policies have evolved over recent decades and display elements of continuity and change. The Blair government has drawn from previous urban initiatives for instance, the physical approaches of demolition and new house building from the 1940s and 1950s; property-led regeneration from the 1990s; the area approach has continued from the 1960s and been used in policy delivery by successive governments; the social pathology perspective from the 1960s has been raised again in Blair’s explanation of a ‘pathological underclass’ and economic regeneration approaches such as competitive bidding and private investment are all now part of the SCP.
CHAPTER 4

Understanding urban governance in spaces of urban regeneration

4.1 Introduction

Chapters 2 and 3 charted the key moments in the evolution of urban regeneration policies in the UK from the post war period to the introduction of the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) in 2003. The first part of this chapter follows the same chronology to explore how urban policy, at a more general level and much of it based in the US, has been approached in academia. The chapter begins with a brief discussion of the ‘community power’ debate between elite and pluralists theorists that dominated the post war period. The discussion then charts the evolution of urban theories such as ‘the city as growth machine’ (Molotch, 1976) and the concept of an ‘urban regime’ (Fainstein and Fainstein, 1983; Stone, 1989) and assesses their contribution and limitations. The main argument of the chapter is that, while extremely insightful in examining a range of urban political processes, these conventional approaches to understanding urban governance and regeneration are not sufficient for understanding the emergence, governance and impact of the SCP. The chapter illustrates their conceptual shortcomings in terms of understanding the relation between urban regeneration community, sustainability and materiality, all of which are central to conceptualising sustainable communities. By moving away from fixed, static notions of community and an emphasis on ‘elite governance’, growth coalitions, ‘power over’ or ‘power to’ (one of Stone’s key arguments was about how regime theory turns attention in favour of the latter) towards a relational understanding of fixity and flow, the chapter offers an alternative framework for conceptualizing urban governance in spaces of contemporary urban regeneration. Further, by moving away from theorizations that emphasize the most powerful involved in urban regeneration to one that focuses on the relationality of space and power the thesis provides fresh insights into the processes of transforming people and places.

The chapter begins by considering interpretations of urban governance from the post war period through to the 1990s because they are the most widely used urban theories of the urban policy discussed in Chapter 2. These theories (e.g. Elite Theory, Urban
Growth Machine and Urban Regime Theory) are useful for understanding the most powerful involved in urban regeneration but this thesis aims to conceptualize the complex relations of urban governance in spaces of regeneration. Thus, the chapter moves on to the work of David Harvey and considers his work as the bridge between earlier theories of urban governance and the search for a more relational understanding. The two final sections develop the relational understanding of urban governance in spaces of urban regeneration.

4.2 Interpreting urban governance: elites, coalitions and regimes

This section considers, in turn, and following the chronology of urban policy in Chapter 2, the key urban theories for interpreting urban governance – Elite Theory, Pluralism, Community Power, Urban Growth Machine and Urban Regime Theory. During the early stages of the research, these theories were each considered as a conceptual framework. Therefore, this section also charts the evaluation of the theories and the reasons why alternatives require to be introduced.

4.2.1 Elite theory, pluralism and the community power debate

During the 1950s and 1960s, the ‘community power debate’ raged between elite theorists, who focused on the concentration of power in urban political elites (Hunter, 1953; Bachrach and Baratz, 1962), and pluralists (Dahl, 1961; Polsby, 1963), who conceived of power in the city to be fragmented, decentralized and distributed. The competing sides of the community power debate “used different methodologies to answer slightly different questions”; for example, the “elite theorists asked ‘who rules?’ whereas the pluralists asked ‘does anybody rule?’” (Harding, 1995:40). The concept of elites and elitism dates back to Ancient Greece, but ‘modern’ elite theory of the 1950s and 1960s can be summarized in the following three approaches;

1. **Normative** - believe in elite rule and elitism and not democracy or socialism
2. **Technocratic** – suggests that elite rule, whether good or bad is necessary in a complex, modern society
3. **Critical** – opposite of the normative approach and is the application most used in urban studies. Sees the ‘power elite’ as neither natural or desirable, but as the worrying product of historical trends (see C. Wright Mills, 1956)
Hunter (1953) was the first to apply elite theory to urban studies to analyze local ‘power structure’ - a term he brought into social science discourse for the first time. Hunter’s study focused on what was called ‘Regional City’ which was in fact Atlanta, Georgia and it was the first study to show evidence that local representative democracy in the US was a smokescreen for dominant economic interests. Using ‘reputational method’ he asked fourteen upper-middle-class professionals who were knowledgeable about the city to pick out the top ten leaders from a list he had collated of business leaders, government officials and civic and society leaders. They chose 175 names and from this list Hunter picked out 40 with the most votes and managed to interview 27. To gain other perspectives he interviewed 34 black community leaders and 14 planners and welfare workers. He found that they named the only a small number of power wielders in Atlanta and they lived in the same neighbourhoods, belong to the same clubs and sat on each other’s boards of directors. Hunter concluded that there was no single power pyramid in Atlanta rather there were overlapping cliques within the business community that formulate policy. Amongst the Atlanta elites growth was the only concern whereas the 14 planners and welfare workers housing and slum improvement, race relations and growth received equal mention. The 34 black community leaders thought improved schools and better housing were a main concern.

Pluralist reacted strongly to Hunter’s study and in particular to the reputational method for the bias it could introduce. The criticisms initiated the ‘community power debate’ between elite and pluralist theorists that dominated urban politics, particularly in the US for twenty years (Harding, 1995). The community power debate centered on a series of claims and counter claims between elite theorists and pluralists about the distribution of power in city politics. Yet Hunter went on to show that the reputational method yielded similar findings in Salem, Massachusetts (Hunter, Schaffer and Sheps, 1956) and at a national level (Hunter 1959; see also Domhoff, 2005). Two other studies based on Atlanta also vindicated Hunter’s findings (Jennings, 1964; Stone, 1976). There is only one in-depth study that came to different conclusions – Dahl’s (1961) study of New Haven, Connecticut.
Pluralists such as Dahl, Wolfinger and Polsby rejected the elite view of highly stratified urban politics discovered by Hunter’s reputational method in Atlanta. For pluralists society was,

“fractured into congeries of hundreds of small special interest groups, with incompletely overlapping memberships, widely diffused power bases, and a multitude of techniques for exercising influence on decisions salient to them” (Polsby, 1980:118).

This was an important “characteristic of New Haven and most cities in the United States” (Dahl, 1986:183). Dahl’s study began by examining lists of ‘social notables’ (the local upper class) and ‘economic notables’ (the local business community) to see if they overlapped as much as elite theorists would argue. Of the 231 social notables and 238 economic notable he found, only 14 were in both groups. He concluded that the business community is not part of the social elite. Commentators have since criticized Dahl’s methods and findings. For instance, Dahl defined social notables as those that attended the local debutante ball yet one study of New Haven pre-dating Dahl and subsequent studies argue that social club membership is a better indicator of upper-class standing (see Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958; Domhoff, 1970, 1975). To explain and describe the process of decision making in New Haven, Dahl focused on three ‘issue areas’ – urban redevelopment, public educations and political nominations. Criticisms stemmed from these methodologies yet Dahl (1986:198) states, “one of my disappointments was that my professional colleagues often have not fully grasped the diversity of techniques that we used” and ‘Who Governs?’ reveals in the 11 page appendix the range of methods (Judge, 1995). In summary, Dahl found that over the course of two centuries New Haven had changed from oligarchy to pluralism. Policy success, he argued, depended upon the capacity for anticipating what the organized interests, the political stratum, and the voters would tolerate and support (Dahl, 1961). As Judge (1995:21) explains,

“Different groups/elites wielded different degrees of influence in different policy areas at different times. In other words, there was a plurality of political institutions, elites, organized interests, individuals, and voters involved in decision making”.
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**Challenging elite theory and pluralism**

Harding (1995:40) makes the important assertion that the phrase ‘community power debate’ was really a misnomer, since the debate was about power with virtually no debate about community. He adds that this was unfortunate, as some of the limitations of the debate were due to “vague notions of community” (Harding, 1995:40); a problem that has continued to bedevil studies of urban regeneration. Further criticisms highlight the fixed, limited geographical boundaries within which elite theorists and pluralists operated i.e. the boundaries of the city (Harding, 1995). Within the defined area, researchers asked community members who were the most influential in determining decisions made within local government politics. Harding (1995:41) highlights problems with this approach,

> “An unrealistic degree of local autonomy was inferred because elite theorists conflated geographical places with communities and power over local government decisions with power per se. The powerful were assumed to reside in relevant boundaries. The most significant expression of power was seen as being able to influence local government policies. Non-local influences on the power exercised by local people was assumed away as constant, non-existent or too difficult to cope with empirically”.

In consequence, some important issues were ignored such as “non-local ownership of productive assets and the capacity of higher levels of government to influence the structures, processes and outcomes of local government decision-making” (Harding, 1995:41). This is significant for the current thesis, given its concern with the local interpretation, deployment and impact of central government policy and the ways in which the local context and place shapes, enables or constrains the capacity to achieve the policy to create sustainable communities.

The definition of power in the pluralist-elitist counterpoint rested on notions of power as involving one actor’s ‘power over’ another (Gedron, 2006). As Stone argues, it involved a definition of power as “command and control” as part of a “social control paradigm”
(Stone, 1989: 222–223). In 1976 the ‘city as growth machine’ (Molotch, 1976) entered the lexicon of urban theories. This was followed in 1983 by the phrase ‘urban regime’ when it was used by Fainstein and Fainstein to describe the “circle of powerful elected officials and top administrators in US city government” (Fainstein and Fainstein, 1983:256). Urban regime theory was then developed by Elkin (1987), Stone and Sanders (1987) and Stone (1989). Stone, following Elkin, reconceptualizes power to reformulate an understanding that power struggles concern not domination and subordination but gaining and fusing the capacity to act and achieve goals - “power to not power over” (Stone, 1989:229). From the late 1980s onwards, Urban Growth Machine and Urban Regime Theory dominated urban scholarship within the US political economy (Harding, 1999). The next two sections briefly outline the growth machine theory and the urban regime thesis and discuss their impact and limitations, especially when applied to a UK context.

4.2.2 Urban growth machine

The primacy of growth and development has an historical precedence in the US. Growth activities and city building in frontier towns became the springboard for the much celebrated taming of the American wilderness. Early urban place makers were in the business of manipulating places for exchange values and their fortunes were made from growth. The rise of Los Angeles, for example, is explained as “a remarkable victory of human cunning over the so-called limits of nature” (Logan and Molotch, 1987:55). The ‘booster spirit’ and desire for growth in the US is achieved through ‘place-based elites’ (Molotch, 1976) or ‘rentier elites’ (Logan and Molotch, 1987). Borrowing from classical Marxism, Logan and Molotch (1987) distinguish between ‘use-values’ and ‘exchange-values’ with regards to property. For some, property, be it land or buildings is valued because of its everyday use whereas others, view property as an asset from which to derive a financial gain. It is the latter group interested in the exchange-values of property that Logan and Molotch (1987) refer to as ‘place-based elites’ (Molotch, 1976) or ‘rentier elites’ whose own priorities “affect patterns of land-use, public budgets and urban social life” (Logan and Molotch, 1987:50). The desire to maximize the value of their property generates growth and development, however, rentier elites cannot achieve their aims alone, and they require a coalition of allies. United by a commitment to economic growth, various local actors participate in the growth machine – politicians, local media and utilities (Logan and Molotch, 1987:66) and ‘auxiliary players’ including – universities,
museums, theatres, expositions, professional sports, organized labour (unions), self employed professionals and small retailers and corporate capitalists (Logan and Molotch, 1987:75). As Harding (1995:43) argues,

“This list of key players roughly describes a business elite that collectively wields power over the pattern of urban development by virtue of its control over substantial material and intellectual resources and its ability to smooth access to external investment”.

Places with active and creative elites may have a competitive advantage over other places. As Lyon et al (1981) discovered in a comparative study of 48 communities, those cities with more powerful elites had stronger growth rates. Growth as both an issue and desire generated consensus among local elite groups and separated them from people who used the city to live and work (Logan and Molotch, 1987).

The applicability of the ‘growth machine’ system to the UK has been discussed (see Harding, 1991; Bassett, 1990,1996; Wood, 2004). According to Harding (1999:680), traditional urban political analysis (i.e. Section 3.1.2) focused more narrowly than US counterparts upon “local government politics and administration, relations between national and local governments, and the delivery of social and welfare services”. Studies generally concluded that “although the notion of a growth coalition was a useful one….its applicability in the British context often served to highlight the nature and extent of British differences” (Bassett, 1999:182). Logan and Molotch (1987:149) were aware that there were differences between the way land issues were politicized in Britain and US and that these issues undermined “some of the energy of a growth machine system. Harding (1991) provides a summary of such differences, which include the British government’s more central role, the dominance of party political organization, the existence of strong links to central government, the limited role of property interests, the lack of resources to fund local coalitions and the disorganized nature of local capitalist interests. However, it could be argued that some of the ideology and practice of Urban Development Corporations (see Section 2.4.1, Chapter 2) warrant a comparison with the growth machine thesis to understand the public-private partnership process rather than the standard interest (of most US studies) in public-private partnership institutions (see Harding, 1998, 1999). This is supported by Bassett (1999:182) who states with
developments such as competition, place marketing and urban partnerships since the 1980s “the concept of growth coalition might be coming more rather than less relevant”. Indeed, my thesis considers at key moments whether the perspective of Logan and Molotch, with its focus on land use, land ownership, place competition and conflicts over this, might offer a relevant insight into the process of regeneration and in particular conflicts over demolition, community and governance as they unfold in subsequent chapters.

**Challenging the growth machine thesis**

Although some would argue that the ‘growth machine’ thesis can be applied to Britain (e.g. Lloyd and Newlands, 1988; Axford and Pinch, 1994) there are reservations (Wood, 2004). As Logan and Molotch (1987:58) suggest “contemporary places differ in the type of economic base they strive to build e.g. manufacturing, research and development, information processing or tourism but any one leads to the same pot of gold – more intense land use thus higher rent collection”. There are several issues here; contemporary places not only differ in the type of economic base they strive to build, but in the type of economic base they exist in. Because of differences in ‘economic bases’ there is always going to be competition and winners and losers. Although it has been said that during the 1980s urban development policies in the US and UK converged and claims were made that inner city decline had been reversed, numerous studies showed that the growth had an uneven impact (Fainstein and Campbell, 1996). Growth mainly benefited highly skilled professionals and managers and offered very little to the displaced manufacturing workers except in the low paid service sector. Furthermore, the contraction of social benefits and restructuring of the economy broadened the income gap, increasing social inequality and residential segregation. Moreover, rapid, unfettered development produced negative environmental effects (Fainstein and Campbell, 1996).

The urban growth machine thesis is useful when considering ‘growth politics’ – the processes of coalition formation such as public-private partnerships that have influenced local governance since the 1980s. The way in which local growth coalitions create the conditions to attract capital investment to transform places is relevant when considering urban regeneration. However, concerns over cross-national differences have dogged the applicability of the growth machine thesis beyond the US. For my thesis, ‘growth’ in its
political and economic sense is relevant for understanding urban regeneration in the case study areas, as is the conflict that unfolds over certain changes in land ownership and land use. However, the urban growth machine thesis does not sufficiently engage with the diversity of spatial and social arrangements within cities. Critical controversies over community, materiality and sustainability are conspicuously absent from urban growth machine literature. In light of such criticisms “ignoring cultural issues, place diversity and environmental crises”, Molotch (1993:29) defended the growth machine thesis. Two of these arguments have particular relevance to the conceptual development of my thesis. For example, Molotch (1993:31) clarifies his ‘sense of urban’ stating that it “arises from the fact that economic activities ultimately are rooted in some place and utilize the earth’s resources not only for location, but also as raw material and waste site”. He adds,

“Urban analysis is directed toward the place system and issues related to it: I avoid social problems, like race and violent crime … [because] … it is important to distinguish issues with an authentic urban ‘real object’ from matters that happen to arise in cites but which could arise anywhere and sometimes do not exist in cities at all” (Molotch, 1993:31).

Before commenting on this, it is important to move onto the second argument that Molotch makes concerning the environment and materiality (which is referred to in his explanation of urban above). Molotch (1993:46) argues,

“The growth machine thesis approaches the physical environment from the bottom up, stressing the way individual projects impact the physical world…..By focusing on the way land is used locally for economic purposes (rather than studying transnational capital flows) it becomes easier to notice the ways development impacts the physical world”.

The defence by Molotch considers community but only as a rooted place – as a site of economic activity. ‘Social problems’ are dismissed because they transcend static boundaries and cannot be located solely in the city – thus, they are not authentic or real. By not acknowledging social problems, the urban growth thesis fails to recognize that in regeneration areas, it is often the social problems that attract the attention of policy
makers and are thereby crucial for stimulating coalitions for funding and governing regeneration space (see Chapter 6 for more on governing communities). Social problems and therefore vulnerable communities cannot be seen in isolation, there is a relational aspect to be considered as this chapter will reveal. Molotch also views sustainability and materiality as one and the same, as the ‘physical environment’. Again though, the economic perspective is privileged – the physical environment, the land is used and developed - yes literally from the bottom up but by no means a ‘grass roots’ environmental justice perspective. Molotch is influenced by the ‘limits to growth’ perspective (see Meadows et al, 1972, 1992) - “the limited capacity of the physical environment to absorb the impacts that the political and economic apparatus have placed upon it” (Molotch, 1993:44). Thus, the complexity of urban regeneration spatial arrangements is not fully explored by the urban growth thesis. The three themes of community, sustainability and materiality are central to understanding the sustainable communities approach to urban regeneration; therefore, the urban growth thesis offers only a limited perspective. Later in the chapter an alternative approach for understanding urban regeneration is offered but first ‘urban regime theory’ is discussed in the next section as it was one of the dominant political economy perspectives from the late 1980s to the late 1990s and still dominates journals like Journal of Urban Affairs and Urban Affairs Review.

4.2.3 Urban regime theory

From the mid 1980s onwards Urban Regime Theory gained credence, particularly in the field of urban politics. Stoker (1995) argues that Urban Regime Theory offers a distinctive approach to the study of urban politics and in particular, the issue of power by going beyond concepts that stress the domination of elites and the consent or resistance from the ruled. Urban Regime Theory changed the focus of the pluralist – elitist debate from ‘social control’ or ‘power over’ to ‘social production’ or ‘power to’. It directed attention away from ‘who rules’ to the question of how public purposes are accomplished and in particular, to how long-term effective governing coalitions to achieve such purposes are constructed and constrained (Judge et al, 1995:6). By extending its horizons beyond the elite structures of the urban growth machine (Logan & Molotch, 1987) urban regime theory offers the potential inclusion of actors from the public, private, and voluntary sectors and pressure organizations (Holman, 2007). This “broader base of potential coalition partners” is what makes regime analysis so attractive to researchers
from differing traditions and ideological backgrounds, as it widens the scope for examination further than the issue of growth (Dowding, 2001:8).

Unlike elite theorists, and theories of urban growth machine, complexity is central to the urban regime perspective (Stone, 1986) because the modern urban system is characterized by complex relationships, diverse and extensive patterns of interdependence plus fragmentation and lack of consensus (Stoker, 1995). Urban regime theorists argue that complexity and fragmentation limit the authority or control of the state therefore, “to be effective, governments must blend their capacities with those of non-governmental actors” (Stone, 1993:6); in other words, they must form regimes. Stone (1989:4) defined a regime as “an informal yet relatively stable group with access to institutional resources that enable it to have a sustained role in making government decisions”. In subsequent work, Stone (1993) identified four types of regime to be found in American cities: Maintenance Regimes that preserve rather than change the existing regime. The core governing task is of routine service delivery. Development Regimes are characterized by positive action to promote growth or stem decline. Middle-class Progressive Regimes seek environmental protection and control over growth and/or social gains from growth. Lower-class Opportunity Expansion Regimes aim to achieve ends that would require substantial mass mobilization but resource and coordination prerequisites often absent in American cities.

Regime theory then is different to the mayor-centred coalitions identified in some pluralist work (see Dahl’s study of New Haven, 1961). Regime theorists such as Stone (based on US research, Atlanta specifically, just like Hunter) stress that the regime is based upon networks, partnerships and cooperation to accomplish stable relationships and ultimately goals. The task of regime formation is about gaining a shared sense of purpose and direction (Stoker, 1995). The strength of regime theory according to Stone’s articulation is that it helps understandings of local governing arrangements.

The premise in Urban Regime Theory is that power in urban politics can be viewed in a variety of forms and Stoker (1995:64-66) argues that there are four forms of power: systemic, command, coalitional and pre-emptive. Systemic power is available to certain interests (e.g. business) because of their position in the socioeconomic structure. Systemic power reflects the advantages and disadvantages conferred on certain groups
in society based on their position in the socioeconomic structure (Stoker, 1995:64). Therefore, the participant may not have made a conscious effort to gain their position or indeed be aware of the consequences of their power position. For example, business may inhabit such a privileged power position that it may not need to act for its interests to be taken into account in community decision-making (Stoker, 1995). In this sense, systemic power has similarities with the idea of an elite.

Urban Regime Theory argues that command power has a limited domination and control capacity in most urban politics. Command or social control would involve the mobilization of information, finance, reputation and knowledge to achieve domination over other interests therefore, the resources, skill and time to achieve it are only available to certain interests in limited areas (Stoker, 1995). The notion of command power does seem to be contradictory given the argument that urban regime theory is concerned with ‘power to’ rather than ‘power over’. In contrast, coalition power rather than seeking domination hopes to achieve power by bargaining, sharing compatible goals and complementary resources. This is why co-italional power tends to be unstable (Stoker, 1995).

To build regimes, regime theory contends that those with systemic and command power have an advantage. To turn that advantage to pre-emptive power Stoker (1995:65) argues that “they have to manipulate their strategic position and control over resources into an effective long term coalition”. Collective action is required to gain long term results and Stone (1988:102) identifies that a coalition requires the ability to attract participants; the ability to succeed or convince people it will succeed in achieving attractive goals; offer a range of incentives to partners to achieve commitment and a common sense of purpose and have the ability to manage its relationship with the wider political environment.

**Challenging urban regime theory**

For my thesis, urban regime theory was an early contender as the main theoretical framework because it offers the potential to understand power in urban politics. The applicability of urban regime theory for understanding the Going for Growth coalition that pre-dated the Sustainable Communities Plan and the coalition of actors involved in ‘Bridging NewcastleGateshead’ (BNG) was considered. In light of critiques such as
Stoker (1995:64-69) who identified three main criticisms - “care needs to be taken when defining and applying the regime understanding of power; regimes need to be placed in context and regime continuity and change needs to be explained” doubts began to arise. In addition, a close examination of Stone’s four ‘types of regime’, three of the four are about ‘power over’ rather than ‘power to’ as claimed.

Thus, after further consideration, urban regime theory was rejected because of its focus on ‘elite governance’. This would enable an understanding of the institutional power of BNG and the various partnerships but it would be about the **making and delivery of policy** rather than the **consequences**. Urban regime theory asks questions of politics and economy rather than community, materiality and sustainability. It asks question of inclusion and the capacity to act, of enabling power rather than inclusion and exclusion. By concentrating on elite governance that enables power within the regime, the excluded and restricted people and spaces are ignored i.e. the relational aspect of power and space. Urban regime theory is **about power but not space**. As Molotch identified in his defence of challenges to urban political economy theories such as urban regime theory and urban growth machine, one of the criticisms claim such theories are,

“Totalistic, assuming logics yield homogeneity across places, without regard to potential for diversity and actual instances of variation in spatial and social arrangements”.

He adds that,

“While overly concerned with structures, urban political economy has failed to acknowledge the most important structure of them all: the physical environment within which all human activity must take place and its inevitable shaping, at least at some ultimate point of human outcomes” (Molotch, 1993:30).

From my perspective, these two criticisms are most relevant because they highlight that urban regime theory (and urban growth machine) do not sufficiently engage with space or materiality. In particular, a critical account of **spaces of regeneration** is missing from these two approaches. It is from a re-conceptualization of space that flow new ways of
thinking about community, materiality, sustainability and governance. Therefore, the next section turns to considerations of space from the perspective of David Harvey.

4.3 Towards a relational understanding of urban governance and urban regeneration

One of the most influential insights into the ‘transformation of urban governance in late capitalism’ is David Harvey’s identification of the move from ‘urban managerialism to urban entrepreneurialism’ (Harvey, 1989). In Chapter 2, Sections 2.3 and 2.4, the policy implications of the shift from “the management of cities within a framework of state sponsored planning and the delivery of services to residents to one dominated by competition for economic success” (Harvey, 1989 cited in Cochrane, 2007:89) were discussed. The promotion of place marketing and urban entrepreneurialism is most explicitly clear in the example of Urban Development Corporations (Section 2.4.1) during the Thatcher years. Subsequent administrations have continued to promote the entrepreneurial culture of competition.

Looking beyond the policy implications of urban entrepreneurialism, a close reading of Harvey’s seminal work reveals spatial conceptualizations of relevance to my thesis. In effect, Harvey’s work bridges the gap between urban growth machine and urban regime theories and my search for a more comprehensive theorization of space and power that helps me understand urban governance in regeneration areas. Of particular interest is Harvey’s explicit mention of ‘space’,

“Urbanization should be regarded as a spatially grounded social process in which a wide range of different actors with quite different objectives and agendas interact through a particular configuration of interlocking spatial practices” (Harvey, 1989:5).

Furthermore, according to Harvey (1989:6) the ‘spatially grounded set of social processes’ (that he call urbanization),

“produce innumerable artifacts - a built form, produced spaces and resource systems of particular qualities organized into a distinctive spatial configuration.
Subsequent social action must take account of these artefacts, since so many social processes (such as commuting) become physically channelled by them. Urbanization also throws up certain institutional arrangements, legal forms, political and administrative systems, hierarchies of power, and the like”.

He then adds,

The domain of spatial practices has, unfortunately, changed in recent years, making any firm definition of the urban as a distinctive spatial domain even more problematic. On the one hand, we witness the greater fragmentation of the urban social space into neighbourhoods, communities, and a multitude of street corner societies, while on the other telecommuting and rapid transport make nonsense of some concept of the city as a tightly-walled physical unit or even a coherently organized administrative domain. (Harvey, 1989:6)

Here, it would appear that Harvey is interpreting the nature of cities and urban governance ‘relationally’; of urbanization in terms of active spatially stretched relations. Thus, in contrast to urban growth machine and urban regime theory that focus on ‘elite governance’, Harvey is beginning to think of spaces and places as more open and engaged with other places and spaces within the context of the emerging era of urban entrepreneurialism. He also considers how the physical environment influences social processes and comments on the ironic juxtaposition of urban space fragmentation alongside extensive and extending transport and telecommunication networks that raise questions of conceptualizing the city in structuralist terms as a contained space.

In his later work, ‘Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference’ (Harvey, 1996:261), he develops his relational thinking in his contention that “any kind of spatial permanence arises as a system of extensive connection out of processes”. The process of place formation then becomes “a process of carving out permanences from the flow of processes creating spaces. But the permanences - no matter how solid they may seem – are not eternal: they are always subject to time as perpetual perishing. They are contingent on the processes that create, sustain and dissolve them” (Harvey, 1996:261). According to Harvey, space is not made by structures but by physical, biological, social, cultural and economic processes and in turn, relations established between entities of
various kinds (Murdoch, 2006) make these processes. As Harvey (1996:294) states, “this relational perspective leads us to seeing discrete spaces and places as dynamic configurations of relative permanences”. The idea of ‘relative permanence’ and ‘perpetual perishing’ are useful when considering the processes involved in regeneration. The spatio-temporal dynamics of urban regeneration are complex and thus difficult to conceptualize. By thinking of space and place as a ‘semi-permanence’ rather than contained and permanent is a challenge, especially when a particular space and place is intertwined with history, family, memories and it is home. By emphasizing ‘elite governance’ urban growth machine and urban regime theorists do not consider the subjective and emotional dimensions of regeneration, what Raymond Williams would call ‘structures of feeling’ (Williams, 1977) or even 'emotional geographies' (see for example, Anderson and Smith, 2001; Davidson and Milligan, 2004; Davidson, Bondi and Smith, 2005).

This thesis argues that the processes of demolition and relocation generate strong emotional feelings and reactions amongst those experiencing the transformations because their sense of belonging and culture associated with a particular place and lifestyle is being reshaped. Thus the emotional dimensions of regeneration also contribute to understandings of materiality, community and sustainability as well as political economy interpretations. The thesis also argues that certain urban spaces and places are the target of ‘perpetual perishing’ more than others; examples being the ‘state led’ perpetual perishing of poor areas/communities undergoing the processes of regeneration, what Fred Robinson would recognize drawing on the example of the West End of Newcastle as ‘policy laboratories’ (Robinson, 2005). Thus it is important to consider how urban regeneration spaces, as a particular spatial configuration are generated – the interactions and interrelations. As Murdoch (2006:20) argues, “the relational making of space is both a consensual and a contested process”. It is consensual because of the alignments and agreements and contested because of exclusion and/or forcible enrolment. Thus, relational space is power filled in that some alignments dominate and others are dominated (Murdoch, 2006, emphasis added).

By reading Harvey, a relational perspective was introduced to my understanding of urban regeneration. The next section elaborates on this conceptual development and explores in more detail relational space and power.
4.4 Space and power: developing a relational understanding of urban governance in spaces of urban regeneration

In Section 4.3, Harvey’s understandings of urban spatial configurations were used to move the thesis towards a relational understanding of urban governance in spaces of urban regeneration. This section develops these conceptual ideas further by focusing on relational space and power.

4.4.1 Spaces of regeneration: a relational perspective

Within the discipline of geography, the ‘structuralist’ spatial science of understanding space in terms of order, boundaries and patterns i.e. structure was being replaced by ‘post-structuralism’. As Woodward et al, (2008:2-3) argue,

“post-structuralism brought to the field of geography in the late 1980s and 1990s a critique that unsettled both the epistemological (that is theories on how we know the world) and ontological (theories on what that world consists of and how it works) moorings of the then dominant frameworks: spatial science, critical realism, Marxism and humanism”

Post-structuralism opened up new understandings of geographies of resistance and marginalization. The making of space, by either dominant or marginal groups came to be seen as an exercise in power relations (see for example, Jackson, 1989; Keith and Pile, 1993; Rose, 1993; Bell and Valentine, 1995). Thus, geographers began to engage with multiple perspectives, multiple spaces and multiple sets of spatial relations that led some to argue that space is much more complex and dynamic than some spatial analysts realized (Murdoch, 2006). In particular, Doreen Massey (1992, 1998, 1999, and 2005) explored the various aspects of relational space. In summary, according to Massey (2005:9) the significant features of relational space are,

“First, we recognize space as a product of interrelations; as constituted through interactions. Second, that we understand space as the sphere of possibility of the existence of multiplicity in the sense of contemporaneous plurality; as the sphere in which distinct trajectories coexist; as a sphere therefore of coexisting
heterogeneity. Without space, no multiplicity; without multiplicity, no space. Third, that we recognize space as always under construction”.

These three features of relational space reinforce Harvey’s argument that spaces are ‘relative permanences’ of ‘perpetual perishing’ in that they are provisionally stabilized out of complex interrelated processes. The way in which space is conceptualized as ‘always under construction’ is particularly interesting when considering ‘regeneration spaces’. It helps to think of ‘regeneration space’ rather than just ‘regeneration’ in order to understand the multiplicity of social, cultural, political, economic, and environmental interrelations that contribute to the ‘construction’ of regeneration space. Furthermore, regeneration space is a dynamic space because it is “in the process of becoming....in the process of being made” (Massey, 1998:37). Regeneration space is being made by processes and entities rather than being a container for entities and processes.

Nigel Thrift in a series of publications stresses the need for a deeper reconceptualization of space (for example, 1996, 1999, 2004a, 2004b). Thrift argues that space can no longer be seen as a ‘practico-inert container of action’ and develops what he calls ‘non-representational theory’ (Thrift, 1996). Non-representational theory is based on the view that:

“we cannot extract a representation of the world because we are slap bang in the middle of it, co-constructing it with numerous humans and non-human others for numerous ends”(Thrift, 1999:296-7)

would be better if geographers approached space as a verb rather than a noun. In this
sense, “spacing is an action, an event, a way of being […] Space is immanent” (Doel,
coming”.

But is it all about flow?

“We should treat post-structuralist celebrations of the ‘becomingness’ of space
rather cautiously for, as Allen (1999: 328) points out, “we still live in a world of
fenced off territories and exclusions” (cited in Murdoch, 2006:107)

It is easy to be carried away with the ‘becomingness of space’ especially when
considering spaces of regeneration because for planners and other regeneration
professionals they are spaces of transformation – the space is literally being re-created.
Indeed, from the late 1960s, urban regeneration policies were targeted at certain urban
spaces that exhibited ‘problems’ (see Chapter 2). For commentators at the time, these
spaces were understood as topographical and contained (Murdoch, 2006). In other
words, topographical spaces were seen in terms of their surfaces (maps, lines, contours
etc) with contained, discrete and “very often homogenous social spaces” (Law and Urry,
2004:398). The homogenous social spaces i.e. mainly white working class communities
were portrayed as static, immobile and rooted to place. Although a relational
understanding of spaces of regeneration looks beyond the contained, homogenous
social conception of space’ and instead engages with spatial relations between the
social, environmental and the material. As Allen (1999) argues, ‘we still live a world of
territories and exclusions’, thus the interrelations and interactions between fixity and flow
have to be considered (repetition from quote above). Spaces of regeneration in the case
study areas tend to be ‘spaces of becoming’ and ‘spaces of home and territory’. This
does not necessarily mean a static space but it does mean that spaces of regenerations
can be understood in terms of a multiplicity of ‘spaces’ each with their own entities and
interrelations. The next section explains the thinking behind fixity and flow and considers
in particular how home, class and connectivity contribute to my thesis.
Fixity and flow

In 2000, John Urry argued for the need “to develop through appropriate metaphors a sociology which focuses upon movement, mobility and contingent ordering, rather than on stasis, structure and social order” (2000:18). The emerging mobilities paradigm is a response to ‘static’ ‘sedentarist’ research that binds human identity to place and/or territory (notable examples being the community power debate, and the Urban Growth Machine and Urban Regime perspectives). Such static views, mobility theorists argue, have ignored the mobile, fluid, nomad or liquid aspects of life. However, Cresswell (2006:40) also warns us how:

“In contemporary social thought words associated with mobility are unremittingly positive. If something can be said to be ‘fluid’, ‘dynamic’, ‘in flux’ or simply ‘mobile’ then it is seen to be progressive, exciting and contemporary. If, on the other hand something is said to be ‘rooted’, based on ‘foundations’, static or bounded then it is seen to be reactionary, dull and of the past”.

Put simply there are two pervasive geographical imaginations of mobility, each of which attempts to understand mobility, spatial order and place and both contribute to an understanding of regeneration. The first sees mobility through the lens of fixity, place, rootedness, spatial order and belonging. As Cresswell (2006:40) argues, “mobility in this formation is seen as morally and ideologically suspect, a by-product of a world arranged through place and spatial order”. As we shall see in later chapters this particular geographical imagination of mobility is pervasive within urban regeneration policy and politics and the mindsets of practitioners who view rootedness and stasis as a contemporary urban problem. In contrast, the second geographical imagination of mobility, a post structuralist conceptualization, puts mobility first and has little time for notions of attachment to place and instead sees mobility through the lens of dynamism, flow and flux.

Since 2000, there has been a proliferation of ‘mobility’ research (for example, Urry, 2000; Sheller and Urry, 2006; Binnie et al., 2006; Cresswell, 2006). Early work on mobility maintained that we now live in a post societal culture in which mobility is the determining feature that frames social relations, not structures or positions (Urry, 2000). He adds, “In such a maelstrom of social and intellectual mobility I ask whether any fixed
points can remain” (Urry, 2000:17). According to Urry (2000), mobility can best be understood through a horizontal rather than vertical sense, thereby flattening out any differences. However, as McNay (1999 cited in Skeggs, 2004:48) argues, there are problems of analyses that flatten out difference “enabling certain subjectivities to become amenable to change and self-fashioning whilst others remain intact”. Furthermore, as Skeggs (2004:48) illustrates, drawing on Bourdieu’s analysis and use of spatial metaphors of capital (economic, social, cultural and symbolic) “the central difference between Urry and Bourdieu is that Bourdieu’s metaphors enable us to understand who can move and who cannot, and what the mobile /fixed bodies require as resources to gain access to different places” [original emphasis]. Therefore, viewing mobility as a universalizing condition is being contested (Skeggs, 2004) and critiques of mobility have been plentiful. In particular, three developments of the ‘mobility turn’ can be identified that contribute significantly to considerations and understandings of regeneration and creating sustainable communities because they recognize the relationship between fixity and flow – home, class/power and connectivity and each are discussed in turn. The three themes identified here contribute to conceptualizations of community, sustainability and materiality the three areas of conceptual ‘insufficiency’ in the urban theories identified in Section 4.1.

**Home**

When we think of home, most people in the modern Western world would envisage a certain house, or a place, something fixed. As Cresswell (2006:43) suggests, “the warm cosiness of home as a general concept rubs off on the geographic appreciation of place”. Viewing home through the lens of fixity and rootedness, as bounded places, fits in with the desire to clearly divide spaces into territorial units, the segmentation of the world into nations, states, places (Cresswell, 2006). According to Malkki (1995) such notions assume the primacy of fixity in space and place and are rooted in conceptions of culture and identity and reinforced by language that simultaneously produces discourse and practice that treats mobility and displacement as pathological for example, the refugee and asylum seeker. In this sense, “homelessness is a serious threat to moral behaviour….. At the moment the refugee crosses the frontiers of his own world, his moral outlook, his attitude toward the divine order of things changes…[The refugee’s] conduct makes it
obvious that we are dealing with individuals who are basically amoral, without any sense of personal or social responsibility...They no longer feel themselves bound by ethical precepts which every honest citizen.....respects. They become a menace, dangerous characters who will stop at nothing” (Malkki, 1995 cited in Cresswell, 2006:41).

In contrast, to the rooted, moral existence of place, community and home, the movement of people, be they the refugee, the tramp, the asylum seeker, the nomad are seen as amoral and a threat to those who have a place. If we look back at portrayals of English working class cultures (for example Hoggart, 1957; Williams, 1983), working class culture is firmly rooted in local place with everyone knowing each other. The watchwords are family, community, place and tradition. As Hoggart (1957 cited in Cresswell, 2006:45) argues,

“Unless he gets a council house, a working class man is likely to live in his own local area, perhaps even in the house he ‘got the keys for’ the night before his wedding, all his life........He is more likely to change his place of work than his place of living; he belongs to a district more than to one works”.

As we shall see in later chapters, this is of particular relevance when considering regeneration and creating sustainable communities – the conflict between the old working class communities and the desire to transform places and people. However, there is a difference when considering regeneration because the fixed, rooted communities are seen as the ‘problem’ and mobility one of the solutions. Mobility in this case, involves central state intervention with various measures to regenerate that include people being moved at best around their community and at worst out of their community (see Chapter 7) hence the need for a relational understanding of fixity and flow.

Developing a relational understanding of home, Morley (2000) identified how fixity and mobility are figured differently depending on national spaces and historical periods. In the nineteenth century, the private, internal space of the home and family were vital for establishing middle class respectability (Davidoff and Hall, 1987). There was a clear distinction established between the private, domestic home and the external community
and work. The desire for fixity, for knowing and naming their place was restricted to the middle classes and this kind of privatized lifestyle “only became widely available to some other sections of the population in the period of affluence after 1945” (Skeggs, 2004:48). In this early period, the fixity associated with family and home was a demonstration of respectability and of belonging to place. The choice to be fixed in this historical period is with the privileged few. Similarly, mobility, according to Urry exists with the privileged few, in other words those that can move – the middle classes and in the next section, I discuss class in relation to fixity and flow in more detail.

**Class and power**

According to the nostalgic vision of Hoggart (1957), working class culture in Northern England revolved around home and community with travel only occurring for the occasional funeral, wedding or trip to the seaside. This romantic view of working class culture persists in some literature but as Morley (2000:142) illustrates,

> “for those living in sink estates with little local employment, nothing but poor quality run-down shops, no car and with poor (or in some cases) non-existent public transport links to enable residents to get elsewhere, and in situations where those from elsewhere (from doctors to pizza delivery services) are reluctant to enter their territory, it is their very disconnection which is both symbolic and in practical terms, constitutive of their material poverty”.

Such areas become the focus of regeneration initiatives (as in this thesis) with working class spaces portrayed as static, immobile and rooted to place, which, if compared to trans-national travel they might be. However, as Binnie et al (2007) suggest most people experience mundane, commonplace mobilities as they walk, cycle etc around their home, community or workplace and indeed the notion of ‘liveability’ is associated with, amongst other things, ‘walkability’. Far fewer experience the spectacular, expansive journeys across trans-national boundaries to which Sheller and Urry (2006) refer.

For some commentators then, the politics of mobility is imbued with the power geometries of class. For Michel de Certeau (1984) in ‘The Practice of Everyday Life’ power is about territory and boundaries and the weapons of the strong are strategies
such as classification, mapping, delineation and division. The politics of regeneration have similar power geometries, for example, central state organizations write policy for ‘areas’, then local planners interpret the policy by classifying, mapping and dividing urban spaces to target regeneration interventions. According to Doel (1999), such tasks (e.g. mapping surface phenomena) have dominated geographical practice.

Also, as Massey (1991) argues, the politics of mobility is premised on power geometry: that is, who moves and who does not. The idea that we all somehow experience the same form of postmodern nomadology can be seen as little more than a cruel nonsense (Massey, 1991). Mobility and control over mobility both reflect and reinforce power (Massey, 1991) and in turn, the power geometries of mobility can be thought of in terms of class and this is important for understanding regeneration. A relational understanding of regeneration draws on Massey’s (1991) conceptualization of power geometries that emerge once relations meet in space,

“different social groups and individuals are placed in very distinct ways in relation to these flows and interconnections. This point concerns not merely the issue of who moves and who doesn’t, although this is an important element of this; it is also about power in relation to the flows and movement. Different social groups have distinct relationships to this anyway differentiated mobility: some people are more in charge than others; some initiate flows and movement, others don’t; some are more on the receiving end of it than others; some are effectively imprisoned by it” (Massey:1991:25-6).

As Davis (1990) argues in his analysis of ‘Fortress LA’ the power to fix and defend one’s space by excluding others is with the privileged middle classes. Davis (1990) identifies the continual emphasis on respectability; the ‘good citizen’ based on self-protection, by gating enclaves against the risky, dangerous other. In the UK, Massey (1991) examined middle class male scientists working at Cambridge University who had highly mobile working lives (via email, fax, telephone, travelling to international conferences etc) and concluded that one can be highly mobile from a fixed location. Therefore, as Skeggs (2004:49) argues, “middle class mobility requires located security”. From that secure, fixed position, the middle classes can become connected and mobile in a variety of
ways. In contrast, the working class communities explored in this thesis are disconnected from such mobile networks and it this we turn to next.

**Connectivity**

Issues of mobility are also about connectivity (Graham and Marvin, 1998). In this sense, the city is viewed as a 'sociotechnical process' whereby "economic, social, geographical, environmental and cultural change in cities is closely bound up with changing practices and potentials for mediating exchange over distance through the construction of networked infrastructures" such as “technological networks (water, gas, electricity, information etc)” (Graham and Marvin, 1998:10). Infrastructure networks (railways; telegraph and telephone; electricity grids; highways; airports and air traffic control; telecommunication systems) through a series of sociotechnical processes provide the essence of modern life (Hall and Preston, 1988; Graham and Marvin, 1998). As Amin and Graham (1998) argue, infrastructure networks interconnect (parts of) cities across global time zones and mediate the multiple connections and disconnections within and between contemporary cities.

However, the pattern of infrastructural networks also “unevenly bind space together across cities, regions, nations and international boundaries whilst helping also to define the material and social dynamics and divisions, within and between urban spaces” (Graham and Marvin, 1998:11). Thus, Graham and Marvin (1998:11) drawing from Massey (1993) suggest that infrastructure networks are involved in sustaining "sociotechnical geometries of power in very real but often complex ways". Experiences of infrastructure are differentiated and relational. As Graham and Marvin (1998:11) illustrate,

> “the construction of spaces of mobility and flow for some, however, always involves the construction of barriers for others” and “we must therefore recognize how the configurations of infrastructure networks are inevitably imbued with biased struggles for social, economic, economic and political power to benefit from connecting with (more or less) distant times and places”.

This means that connectivity and disconnection are important factors when developing a relational understanding of regeneration, and especially the *materiality* of regeneration
and the ‘sociotechnical geometries of power’ (see Massey, 1993; Graham and Marvin, 1998). Actor-network theory (ANT) (Latour, 1983, 1987; Callon and Latour, 1981) contributes to this understanding as it provides a framework for human and non-human networks. According to actor-network theorists, space emerges from the weaving together of localities and localities are ‘localized’ according to the rationalities and practices that make the network what it is (Murdoch, 2006). So space is seen in relational terms and networks do not exist within space; rather space is the effect of network activity and multiple networks make multiple spaces (Murdoch, 2006). Power is conducted within these networks and “power, in this view, lies in the heterogeneous materials assembled in networks in accordance with the need to make actions (scientific or otherwise) durable through space and time (Murdoch, 2006:78). So an actor-network reading of regeneration would explore two aspects, first, the way in which the multiple networks of humans and non-humans materialize as multiple spaces rather than investigating regeneration as ‘areas’, as contained spaces. Second, the way in which power is conducted and negotiated within the multiple network formations. Furthermore, the notion of repair and maintenance developed by Graham and Thrift (2007) provides a useful framework from which to develop an understanding of the material connections/disconnections and assemblies/disassemblies of regeneration and in particular, demolition (these ideas are developed in Chapter 7).

Thus, by focusing on how relations are constructed which entail social, technical and environmental connections and disconnections across time and space a new understanding of regeneration will emerge that considers the sociotechnical geometries of the powerful and the powerless. As Skeggs (2004:50) argues,

“In poor inner city areas in the UK the proportion of households with telephone connection can still be as low as only 25 per cent. The ultimate issue is not who moves or is fixed, but who has control – not only over their mobility and connectivity, but also their capacity to withdraw and disconnect. The point is that the poor have to put up with that from which others can move”. 
4.4.2 Power: a relational understanding of urban governance

“The UK is no longer conceived as a single governable space; rather, community is increasingly becoming the new terrain of governance” (Atkinson, 2003a:102).

“Our policies, programmes and structures of governance are about engaging local people in partnership for change and enabling communities to take a decisive role in their future (Blair, 1998:2).

Many commentators have spoken about the new forms of governance emerging during New Labour’s administration (see Imrie and Raco, 2003 and Chapter 6 of thesis). Indeed, the new forms of urban governance are related to the success (or failure?) of the numerous urban policies such as the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP). According to Thompson (1993), successful governance requires the existence of a substantial degree of intersubjective agreement and the exclusion or marginalization of potentially disruptive interests and groups that have to be persuaded by material benefits, symbolism or the art of rhetoric to accept governance as established by the powerful groups. Thus, an understanding of power is fundamental to an understanding of governance. If we remind ourselves of the third research question – how are the themes of ‘community’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable community’ being interpreted by the different individuals involved in the Bridging NewcastleGateshead (BNG) area? This calls for an interpretation of the themes from the perspective of ‘individuals involved’ – thus this does not only mean the ‘elite governance’ – whether power over or power to – as seen in the Urban Growth Machine and Urban Regime theories. It also means the less powerful - the residents. Thus, the next sub-section proposes the notion of governmentality (Foucault 1979) as,

“Foucault's work emphasizes power to – that, is the importance of the exercise of power and its relational nature” (Atkinson, 2003a:106, original emphasis).

Governmentality

Further to the relational view of power and class discussed in Section 4.4.1, this section draws on the ideas of Foucault (1986:252) who argued, “space is fundamental in any form of communal life; space is fundamental in any exercise of power”. In particular, this
section draws on Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish* published in 1975 because using a genealogical perspective, he “pays particular attention to the relationship between power, knowledge, practice and space” hence “it is during this phase that the relational character of space comes most fully into view” (Murdoch, 2006:37). In this work, Foucault took Bentham’s *Panopticon* – an inspection house in a prison – to develop the idea that hierarchical observation lays the groundwork for ‘normalizing judgement’, in that, the assessment of prisoners culminates in the pronouncements of ‘normality’ or ‘abnormality’ (Foucault, 2004). The close observation i.e. surveillance of prisoners’ conduct and movement is intended to establish normal behaviour and prevent and/or quickly apprehend deviant behaviour. Foucault termed this type of power, ‘discipline’: “comprising a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of application, targets” (Foucault, 1977:215). In effect, the Panopticon internalizes discipline and encourages self-discipline as the “external eye of the inspection tower was replaced by the internal eye of conscience” (Sharp et al, 2000:14). According to Hannah (1997:347),

“Panopticon power brings together a completely visible, distinguishable and precisely punishable human object, and a unified, infallible, omniscient and anonymous authoritative subject”.

As Flynn (1994:41) argues,

“Jeremy Bentham’s Panopticon relates power and knowledge, norm and surveillance, in an interplay of architecture and social science”.

In later works, Foucault extended the ‘normalization’ perspective beyond the prison to understand the normalization of behaviour at the societal scale i.e. towards ‘societal government’ (Foucault, 2004). Increasingly, Foucault sees disciplinary and other forms of behaviour in terms of ‘shaping conduct’ in line with governmental strategies of ‘normalization’ (Foucault, 2004:49). However, some commentators believe that Foucault did not mean to apply this notion to any governmental activity. For example, Hindess (1996:106) believes Foucault intended the notion to be applied to “those exercises that are more calculated and considered”. Indeed, as Murdoch (2006) argues, the development of the notion of ‘governmentality’ brings together government and calculation. He adds that “the semantic link between governing (‘gouverner’) and modes
of thought (‘mentalite’) indicates that it is not possible to study the technologies of power without an analysis of the political rationality underpinning them” (Murdoch, 2006:41).

Here we have the two aspects of governmentality that add to an understanding of urban governance in spaces of regeneration (see Chapter 7) – the rationalities of government and the technologies of government. The rationality of government is “a way or system of thinking about the nature of the practice of government (who can govern; what governing is; what or who is governed)” (Gordon, 1991:3). The technologies of government consist of “mundane programmes, calculations, techniques, apparatuses through which authorities seek to embody and give effect to governmental ambitions” (Rose and Miller, 1992:175). Governmentality allows us to understand and explain the rationalities, that is, the justification for governing communities undergoing regeneration in certain ways. The technologies allow us to understand the techniques of governing community, such as surveys, experts, management, that explain the means by which the rationalities are put into practice. Chapter 6 develops these arguments and indeed governmentality provides a framework for all three empirical chapters (6-8).

Foucault focused our attention on the inter-relationships between spatial relation and spatial formation. As Huxley, (2007:187) argues,

“Studying governmentality...involves not only examination of practices and programmes aiming to shape, guide and govern the behaviour of others and the self, or the calculations, measurements and technologies involved in knowing and directing the qualities of a population; but it also pays attention to the aims and aspirations, the mentalities and rationalities intertwined in attempts to steer forms of conduct. These mentalities or rationalities of government are framed within ‘regimes of truth’ that inform the ‘thought’ secreted in projects of rule”.

To understand the power relations of urban governance in spaces of regeneration, it is important to understand the ‘regimes of truth’, the “ways of speaking the truth, persons authorized to speak truths and the costs of doing so” (Rose, 1999:19). However, one has to be wary of the ‘programmers view’ (Dean, 2002:121) that “can appear to suggest that governmental aims and rationales are capable of automatically producing the reality for which they hope” (Bennett, 2004:11). As Atkinson (2003a:105) argues, “power
always engenders resistance, and domination is only ever partial. Moreover, the programmes of government and their associated technologies are rarely realized as they were intended". In an analysis of the 'meshes of power', Foucault (1976) considered negative conceptions of power and suggested a way of analyzing power in its positive mechanisms - "a conception of a technology of power" (p154). A negative conception of power is a ‘juridical conception’ whereby power is seen the rules, the law, the limit between what is permitted and what is forbidden (Foucault, 1976). Thus, Foucault (1976:156) called for “an analysis of power not just of representations of power, but of the real functioning of power". Again, Foucault looked to Bentham and also to Karl Marx (Volume II of Capital) to develop an analysis of power in its positive mechanisms. It is here that several aspects can be drawn upon for my thesis.

Drawing from Marx, Foucault (1976:156) found that “there exists no single power, but several powers” (emphasis added). Thus, when conceptualizing spaces of regeneration it is important to consider whether there is a single top-down power-imposing rule, or instead, a multiplicity of competing and contested powers. As Foucault (1976:156) argues

“ a society [and here we might look to substitute ‘community’] is not a unitary body in which one power only exercises itself, but in reality it is a juxtaposition, a liaising, a coordination, a hierarchy, too, of different powers which nonetheless retain their specificity”.

By thinking in terms of ‘powers’ the governmentality perspective for understanding rationalities and technologies begins to open up to the notion of powers as networks beyond prescriptive ways of normalizing behaviour The next sub-section discusses what this means for understanding power in spaces of regeneration.

**Topological networks of power**

By recognizing ‘powers’ Foucault is beginning to consider ‘networks of power’ in the plural and that an extension of power relations will meet resistance. These networks of power can be described in spatial terms as ‘spaces of prescription’, the tightly ordered, normalized spaces, and also ‘spaces of negotiation’. Spaces of prescription tend to construct space in a formal and prescriptive way whereby, “the process of negotiation,
mobilization and displacement aims to establish enduring relations between actors, entities and places” (Murdoch, 2006:81). An example of this prescriptive process is found in accounting procedures that work as a mode of regulating action across space (Robson, 1992). In other words, techniques such as accounting, prescribe normalizing behaviour within regulated, standardized networks. Rose (1991) has developed this notion further in line with the governmentality perspective. For instance, Rose (1991) argues that the collection of statistics - with its technologies for classifying and enumerating allows civil domains to be rendered visible, calculable and therefore governable. The governmentality perspective implies that prescriptive mechanisms are ubiquitous and that space is strongly prescribed by powerful government networks (Murdoch, 2006). In contrast, other commentators view network spaces as ‘spaces of negotiation’ arguing that formalized arrangements do not arise simply from the imposition of powerful network builders but from a series of ‘trade-offs’ between network builders and enrolled entities through negotiations and compromises (Leigh Star, 1995). Thus, network relations can be seen as a mixture of local specificities and network regularities.

However, the dual typology of prescription and negotiation has been challenged. For instance, spaces can combine multiple processes, relations, identities, material arrangements that require a sophisticated array of spatial typologies (Hetherington, 1997). With this in mind, Law (1999) suggests that a topographical view of space, in which the space of fixed coordinates, contours and lines (like a map surface) are dominant should be replaced with a topological viewpoint. Topology refers to relations and interactions between relations and does not refer to surfaces. This conceptualization enables geographers to “go below the surface to study the process of spatial emergence” and argues, “any spatial coherence on the surface only serves to disguise the relational complexities that lie ‘underneath’ spatial forms” (Murdoch, 2006:12). Space, in this sense is not fixed but mutable and the ‘performer’ (i.e. social agent) and the context of performance (e.g. space or place) are entangled in the heterogeneous processes of spatial becoming (Murdoch, 2006:18). Therefore, by thinking of regeneration in these terms, the performers are the various social agents involved, be they policy makers, planners, residents etc and the context of the performance are the urban spaces targeted by the policy makers. Thus, in the process of becoming (a
sustainable community?), there can be struggles over whose reading of space takes priority.

**Conclusion**

In summary, a relational understanding of urban regeneration involves three key propositions that inform our understanding of community, sustainability and materiality. First, *community* can be best understood as fluid and unstable *and* permanent and stable, in other words flow *and* fixity as illustrated in the domains of home, class and power and connectivity. Second, within and between these spaces of regeneration, movement and transformation are negotiated, constructed, imposed and contested, influencing the power geometries in and between *community* networks and the sociotechnical power geometries of *material* networks. Third, social and material *sustainability* and unsustainability (i.e. of communities and built infrastructure) is understood as flow and connection (sustainable) or fixity and disconnection (unsustainable).

This chapter has progressively moved further into a relational understanding of spaces of regeneration. The starting point was an engagement with the urban theories that understand urban regeneration from the perspective of ‘elite governance’ or ‘power over’. This included a discussion and critique of elite theory, pluralism and community power debates from the 1950s and 1960s, the ‘Urban Growth Machine’ thesis of the 1970s and ‘Urban Regime Theory’ of the 1980s onwards. The main argument is that these theories do not sufficiently engage with issues such as sustainability, materiality, or community because these perspectives do not go far enough in examining the relationships between political (and economic) power and space that one requires in order to examine contemporary urban regeneration. Instead, this chapter has laid the foundations from which to develop a more spatially sensitive understanding of regeneration. A spatial understanding of regeneration focuses on the relationality of space, in order to understand the process of transforming places and people. Hence, a relational understanding of regeneration takes into account the multiplicity of space and draws on the two pervasive geographical imaginations of mobility to understand fixity *and* flow. By thinking in terms of fixity and flow, we can develop an understanding of the relationship between urban cultures (conceptions of home and social class), the
materiality of regeneration and the ‘sociotechnical geometries of power’ that shape and materialize localities.

Furthermore, in order to develop a relational approach to the production, circulation and exercise of power in the process of urban regeneration, two aspects of governmentality have been identified i.e. the rationalities of government and the technologies of government. Governmentality allows us to understand and explain the rationalities, that is, the justification for governing communities undergoing regeneration in certain ways. Furthermore, by extending Foucault’s understanding of ‘powers’ beyond seeing them as a duality between spaces of prescription and spaces of negotiation, the thesis develops the notion of topological networks of power. This notion contributes to Foucault’s governmentality perspective because it ensures that power is seen in terms of the many performers involved in the transformation of spaces of regeneration. In sum, then, the chapter advocates a relational understanding of urban governance in spaces of regeneration and these concepts are developed in the three empirical chapters.
CHAPTER 5

Researching communities

5.1 Introduction

Within the field of social sciences there is a long history of studying communities, for example the classic study by Ferdinand Tonnies of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft published in 1883. Since the publication of Toennies book, there has been a plethora of research devoted to understanding ‘community’. Other seminal works include Simmel (1905/1950); Wirth (1938), and the ‘Chicago School’ (Park, 1929, 1952). Other studies were less abstract about the concept of community and instead focused on in-depth research of certain communities. For example, Whyte’s (1943) study of ‘Street Corner Society’ explored community in a poor, working class area of Boston, US. Similarly, in the UK, Young and Wilmott’s classic study, explored working class social cohesion in the 1950s East End communities. As understandings of community have evolved so have methods of researching communities. The remainder of this chapter explores the process, problems and solutions encountered when researching communities in a regeneration area. The initial research proposal involved qualitative research methods such as interviews with ‘elites’ and focus groups with existing community groups. However, half way through the year long fieldwork problems of negotiating access emerged as many of the residents were suffering from (to use their words) ‘consultation fatigue’. To overcome the problems of negotiating access the research became more ethnographic and I ‘immersed’ myself in the communities for a month, in order to establish and build relationships of trust with existing residents. Ethnography has long been the favoured method for studying communities in their traditional sense (of place and locality) (Allan and Phillipson, 2008). The strength of ethnography is that it enables the researcher to view relationships, the patterns of connections and disconnections within the context of social and economic processes (Allan and Phillipson, 2008).

The chapter begins by considering the influence of ESRC/CASE funding on the research approach and choice of methods. This involves a discussion justifying the choice of research strategy and details the strengths and weakness of the chosen methods. The subsequent sections chart the process, problems encountered and solutions of ‘casting
the net’ and negotiating access into communities undergoing regeneration. In particular, the clash between policy practitioner’s efforts to consult communities, residents experiencing ‘consultation fatigue’ and my efforts to negotiate access are considered. In contrast to other chapters some parts are written in the first person.

5.2 An ESRC/CASE Studentship: influencing the research approach and methods

This PhD is a CASE studentship funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the Building and Social Housing Foundations (BSHF). BSHF ‘promote innovative housing policy and practice’ in the UK and established the World Habitat Awards for the United Nations (UN) in 1985. Their offices are based in Coalville, Leicestershire and an integral part of the collaboration was regular visits. Each visit (about six per year) lasted one week and gave me the opportunity to work on my own research alongside the researchers in BSHF. The time spent at their offices gave me the opportunity to meet and discuss my work with my collaborative supervisor in BSHF – the Director, Diane Diacon. I also had the opportunity to liaise with their researchers and disseminate my findings and receive feedback from a policy practitioner’s perspective.

Further to the collaborative aspect of the PhD, a CASE studentship also means that research proposal was written by my supervisors. The research area of ‘NewcastleGateshead’ was already chosen and the research aims and questions established. In the early days of research this proved beneficial because I could concentrate on the academic and policy literature related to the field of urban regeneration policy. It may appear to some that a CASE studentship is restrictive because of the pre-defined research area and questions. For me the pre-defined research area and questions did not restrict my input and I found there is enough scope for change and originality within the CASE format. I knew beforehand where the research would take place and the research approach but it was up to me to choose the case studies (Section 5.2.2). This first section considers the advantages and disadvantages of the pre-defined research approach and methods for researching communities.
5.2.1 Case studies

In order to pursue the research questions (Box 5.1) a case study approach was used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 5.1: Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How and to what extent have the themes of ‘community’ and ‘sustainability’ been incorporated into local and national urban regeneration policies within in recent decades?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How significant is the ‘local context’ and ‘place’ in shaping, enabling and constraining the capacity to achieve policies for sustainable communities in this particular urban region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are the themes of ‘community’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable community’ being interpreted by the different stakeholders involved in the BNG area?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a research strategy, case studies were chosen because they allow for a variety of methods. In contrast to a survey of large numbers, the case study approach prefers small numbers (i.e. small scale research), investigated in depth in their natural surroundings. The case study allows me to examine the ways in which relationships and processes are interconnected and interrelated in spaces of regeneration. Rather than dealing with isolated factors, case studies have a holistic nature therefore; processes and outcomes can be investigated in detail. To compile the case studies a multitude of sources were used, for example, policy and other official documents, academic journals and books, methods such as interviews and focus groups to elicit opinions and information, photographs, the internet and newspapers together provide a detailed written (via written documents and verbal testimony) and visual (photos) picture of the case study area. From this the analysis, conclusions and recommendations can be made. Of course, there are disadvantages to using the case study approach. As Denscombe, (2003:39) notes, “the case study approach is most vulnerable to criticism in relation to the credibility of generalizations made from its findings”.

**Case study choices**

The case studies were chosen from the Bridging Newcastle Gateshead (BNG) area. The case study choices were influenced by two factors; first, the BNG timetable of key interventions as shown in Figure 5.1 and the time limitations of the PhD.
Figure 5.1: BNG key interventions 2006 to 2018 (BNG, 2006:16)
The fieldwork period was between October 2006 and October 2007, therefore, the case studies were chosen with these practical time considerations in mind to overlap with key intervention within BNG. Table 5.1 summarizes the process of choosing the case studies. The first column shows the four BNG areas – Newcastle East, Newcastle West, Newcastle North and Gateshead. From this it was ascertained which wards were in each BNG area and they are shown in column two. The strategic commissions (Chapter 3) in each BNG area are listed in column 3. Based on Figure 5.1 the intervention dates from September 2006 to October 2007 (the period of fieldwork) are listed in column 4. From this it can be seen which strategic commissions ‘best fit’ the fieldwork time period and the final choices are shown in column 5. In some cases, there were two potential choices, for example, in Newcastle East, Walker Riverside and Byker and Ouseburn. Walker Riverside was chosen over Byker and Ouseburn because the interventions started in 2006 and were therefore more advanced than Byker and Ouseburn.

Table 5.1: Process of BNG case study choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BNG Area</th>
<th>Wards in BNG Area</th>
<th>Strategic Commissions</th>
<th>Intervention Dates (until Oct 07)</th>
<th>Case Study (possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle East</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Walker Riverside (WR)</td>
<td>Sep 2006 (WR)</td>
<td>Walker Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walkergate</td>
<td>Byker &amp; Ouseburn (B/O)</td>
<td>Apr 2007 (WR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Heaton</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2007 (B/O)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle East</td>
<td>Elswick</td>
<td>Scotswood &amp; Benwell (S/B)</td>
<td>Nov 2006 (S/B)</td>
<td>Scotswood &amp; Benwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benwell &amp; Scotswood</td>
<td>Elswick &amp; Discovery (ED)</td>
<td>Jan 2007 (S/B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fenham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 2007 (Brewery site)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wingrove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle North</td>
<td>Blakelaw</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>Aug 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fawdon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>Dunston &amp; Teams</td>
<td>Bensham &amp; Saltwell (B/S)</td>
<td>Sep 2006 (FBC)</td>
<td>Felling Bypass Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>Felling Bypass Corridor (FBC)</td>
<td>Apr 2007 (B/S)</td>
<td>Bensham &amp; Saltwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felling</td>
<td>Dunston &amp; Teams (D/T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saltwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pelaw &amp; Heworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobley Hill &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bensham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deckham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four case studies from the strategic commissions were chosen initially - Walker Riverside (Newcastle East), Scotswood and Benwell (Newcastle West) and Bensham and Saltwell and the Felling Bypass Corridor in Gateshead. Interventions in these areas were either in progress or due commence in early 2007 so different stages could be witnessed over the fieldwork period. Although four case studies were chosen, early attempts to contact willing participants within the case study areas proved difficult. In consequence, the case studies were reduced to three – Walker Riverside, Scotswood and Benwell and Felling because there was no response from potential participants in Bensham and Saltwell. The loss of Bensham and Saltwell as a case study was disappointing but allowed more time and attention on the remaining three (Box 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4).

**Box 5.2: Walker Riverside**

Walker Riverside is located alongside the River Tyne in the east of the city of Newcastle. It was an area traditionally associated with ship building but with the loss of such a major employer, Walker (as it was known earlier) has suffered a severe decline for over thirty years. Despite previous interventions high deprivation levels persist. In 1971 the population of Walker Riverside was about 13,000. By 2001, the population had fallen to just below 8,000 which is a fall of 40 per cent between 1971 and 2001 (UK Census online, 2006). The population loss was worsened by two main factors, the loss of ship building as a major employer and housing that no longer fitted with aspirations and income levels. For example, 73 per cent of homes in Walker Riverside are social rented with owner occupation at only 22 per cent (BNG, 2005). The loss of families from the area has impacted on the four primary schools who have experienced falling numbers and growing surpluses (161 in 1996 to 529 in 2004) (Walker Riverside Area Action Plan, WRAAP, 2006). The perpetual loss of people and families from the area has had the most devastating effects on the remaining population who were ranked the most deprived ward in Newcastle and the thirtieth worst of all wards in England against the 2000 Index of Multiple Deprivation. Unemployment is higher than the rest of Newcastle (9 per cent in Walker Riverside, 4.7 per cent in Newcastle) and there are low levels of skills and income. There is poor access to jobs and services and a loss of local shops all of which has contributed to poor health, high levels of crime and low educational attainment in the area. In Walker Riverside, 16.2 per cent of the population are classified as permanently sick or disabled whereas the figure is 8.5 per cent in Newcastle.

These trends are still continuing and whereas the demand for social housing in Newcastle is increasing, the demand in Walker Riverside has decreased. The Walker Riverside Area Action Plan sets out the development vision to tackle the decline strategically. Seven neighbourhoods have been identified in Walker Riverside by BNG, each distinctive with their own character (WRAAP, 2006). The seven neighbourhoods have been given names in the WRAAP (2006) and are: Western Gateway, Losh Terrace, Community Focus, Pottery Bank, Churchwalk, Cambrian Dovercourt and the Industrial Area. The vision for Walker Riverside is to make it a location of choice by creating mixed and balanced communities that build on the character, humour, strong families and informal community networks that exist (WRAAP, 2006).
Figure 5.2 Photos of Walker Riverside in 2007 (Andrea Armstrong)
Box 5.3: Felling

Felling is located in the East of Gateshead on the South bank of the River Tyne. Felling has distinctive and restrictive physical and topographical barriers. Between the topographical barriers the strategic east-west road and rail transport links have evolved such as the Sunderland Road, its successor the Felling Bypass and the railway lines to South Hylton and South Shields. The ‘old’ Sunderland Road still reflects its past sense of importance as a turnpike road, an electric tram route and the main route to link Felling to Gateshead as there are some fine architectural buildings still in use. But the sense of abandonment is palpable even though the evidence of former glory still exists in the form of large, ornate but slightly shabby buildings. The old Sunderland Road has suffered because of a long period of motor traffic dominated public realm management (Gateshead Council, 2006:15). The newer Felling Bypass has brought environmental problems to the Felling associated with heavier traffic use such as, noise, dust and pollution. In consequence, the Felling has a fragmented, isolated settlement pattern although land use is generally equally divided between the industrial area north of the bypass and the residential area to the south. Each housing area has a name and distinctive character and although there is some discrepancy between the different documents about the number of estates the consensus agrees on six neighbourhoods in Felling and they are; the Old Fold, the Nest Estate, Felling House, Brandling, Stoneygate and the Industrial Estate. The environmental quality is poor and is due to the industrial legacy and current motor traffic. Such environmental strains have left the Felling vulnerable to the negative impacts of economic decline and social change (Gateshead Council, 2006:9). Demographic data has been compiled for Felling and shows that the population is 8,582 with 24 per cent of the households consisting of single people, which is the fourth highest level in Gateshead. The percentage of households which consist of a lone parent with dependent children is the second highest in Felling of all wards. Felling has the highest level of adults with no qualifications in Gateshead at 50 per cent. Thirty per cent of the population in Felling have a limiting long term illness, this is the highest level of all wards in Gateshead. And Felling has the second lowest level of car ownership (Gateshead Strategic Partnership, 2005). The vision for Felling is,

“to promote Felling as a strong, well connected centre for communities between the River Tyne and the Tyne and Wear Metro, offering quality urban housing around facilities, taking advantage of the excellent transport access and local employment opportunities “ (Gateshead Council, 2006:13)

Figure 5.3 Photos of Felling in 2007 (Andrea Armstrong)
Box 5.4: Benwell and Scotswood

Benwell and Scotswood are located in West End of Newcastle. They were developed from the late nineteenth century to the 1930s to house the workforce employed in the heavy industries along the River Tyne. More than thirty years of industrial decline has more than halved the population and despite a range of regeneration initiatives in the 1980s and 1990s, the area remains among the country’s most severely disadvantaged areas (Benwell and Scotswood Strategic Commission, 2007). The area has an above average white population (95.8 per cent) with ‘other ethnic groups’ below average (4.2 per cent). Unemployment is higher than in Newcastle as a whole - 11.3 per cent versus 8 per cent. Car ownership is lower with 54 per cent of households not owning a car compared to 45 per cent across Newcastle. There is below average owner occupation (46.6 per cent) and private (9.6 per cent) compared to Newcastle with 53.3 per cent owner occupied and 10.7 per cent private and above average local authority and housing association tenures (UK Census, 2006).

A number of small, sub communities have been revealed in Benwell and Scotswood that are divided by principal roads, natural boundaries, tenure or property type or historic divides. The sub communities or neighbourhoods have been identified in the Benwell and Scotswood Area Action Plan (2006) as: Chepstow and Horndale, YNCA, Scotswood Village, DAS Area, West Benwell Terraces, Delavel, Pendower Estate, Hodgkin Park, North Benwell Terraces, Gill Street and Courts, High Cross, Rachel Maughan Estate and the Guinness Trust Estate. The vision for Benwell and Scotswood is to create,

“a family friendly district of the City Of Newcastle that will successfully compete with other parts of the city region, which is characterized by distinctive neighbourhoods and sustainable communities that are built to last” (Benwell and Scotswood Strategic Commission, 2007:1).
Figure 5.4 Photos of Benwell and Scotswood in 2007 (Andrea Armstrong)
5.2.2 Casting the net

In any qualitative research, the first step is to develop early contacts in the area in which one is interested (Cook and Crang, 1995). My first step was to contact ‘Bridging NewcastleGateshead’, Newcastle City Council, Gateshead Council and voluntary and community groups. To do this, the internet was invaluable as it provided contact names and addresses which I contacted by letter or email in the first instance. I maintained records of contacts and response rates. At this early stage I cast my net as widely as possible and established ‘gatekeepers’ who often suggested other people to contact and/or provided an introduction (i.e. snowballing). At the local authority/BNG level the response was good. I contacted all the councillors within the case study areas (three in each) and the response was quite poor. Two replied and agreed to interviews in Benwell and Scotswood and the third was ill. In Gateshead, one responded and he was also on the BNG Board. In Walker, no councillors responded and this unfortunately was an early indication of things to come in Walker (see Section 5.3).

5.2.3 Interviews

Semi-structured one-to-one interviews were used to gather in depth information from a wide range of people involved in planning and/or regeneration in NewcastleGateshead and these constitute the ‘elite’ interviews (Appendix 5). They are considered elites in this situation because they are the decision makers and/or responsible for the communities in question. Of course one has to be aware when conducting elite interviews that they may want to portray a particular image of the policy or have a political bias (Tansey, 2006; Richards, 2007). In order to address this potential problem, I developed a clear list of themes to be addressed (and this also included some specific questions) but there was an emphasis on the interviewee being able to elaborate on answers. The ‘semi-structured’ approach was preferred because of the flexibility it gives both researcher and interviewee (Denscombe, 2003). This method of interviewing was used because particular opinions or views were required from certain individuals with specific responsibilities within BNG. I followed the same technique for interviews with residents. Interviews were recorded using a digital Sony recorder and backed up with field notes and a research diary.
Negotiating access into the communities is discussed in Section 5.3. To gain access to elites I used my affiliation with Durham University and the fact that the research was funded by the ESRC and BSHF to give me credibility. Depending on the social setting I either described myself as a researcher, PhD researcher or post graduate researcher. The disadvantages of interviews mainly pertain to the ‘interviewer effect’, in other words, the way people respond differently depending on how they perceive the questioner. Personal identity, self-presentation and personal involvement are all potential problems. As Denscombe (2003:170) suggests, “our sex, our age, our ethnic origin, our accent, even our occupational status, all are aspects of ‘self’ which for practical purposes, cannot be changed”. I was thus aware of my own positionality, or the political aspect of self (Cloke et al, 2000) and used my multiple personas to portray an image of postgraduate from Durham University or working class, Northerner depending on the situation. I cannot disguise my northern accent, so in some cases particularly with the residents I emphasized my North Eastern or Teesside credentials. If this was not well received because of Tyneside/Teesside rivalries I used my Yorkshire identity. Furthermore, I live in a pathfinder area in Middlesbrough in a house classed as ‘older housing’ so I have experienced the consultation and then lack of action first hand. Divulging this experience often changed the dynamics of a conversation or interview. As Hall, (1992: 258) argued,

“researchers will not produce the same findings because we all speak from a particular place, out of a particular history a particular experience, a particular culture, without being contained by that position”.

Some have criticized this level of reflexivity as contributing to a never ending spiral of relativism (Parker, 1992) but others have argued that by revealing the social structure or position from which one writes can lead to a more insightful analyses (Harding, 1987).

5.2.4 Focus groups

Focus groups were chosen as they are a good method of eliciting group meanings, processes and norms within existing community groups such as residents and tenant associations. The interaction between participants is the key feature of focus groups so group composition with sufficient diversity is vital (Bloor et al, 2001). As the main purpose of the focus group is to access group norms, processes and understandings Bloor et al
(2001) argue that there are clear advantages in recruiting from pre-existing social groups, especially as they are more likely to attend. Pre-existing groups (such as residents and tenants associations) can take a variety of forms: work acquaintances, families, social groups, support groups or friendship groups are all examples. As Kitzinger’s (1994) study showed, participants from pre-existing groups may bring shared experiences and events and may challenge any discrepancies between expressed beliefs and actual behaviour. Lucas and Fuller (2005) recruited participants from ‘communities of interest’ (e.g. older people, younger people, parents etc) from six neighbourhoods in the first stage of four, all of which involved focus groups. Such an approach was thought useful for this project and pre-existing residents and tenants groups were contacted in the two Newcastle case study areas via gatekeepers (Appendix 5). In Felling there were no pre-existing residents groups so this proved quite difficult. Section 5.3 discusses the problems of negotiating access in areas with pre-existing groups and areas with no community groups.

Focus groups are not without their limitations. The information gained from them can only represent the perspective of the participants and can only indicate the range of views of a community not their prevalence (Liamputtong & Ezzy, 1999: 97). Focus group data is concerned with quality not quantity. It attempts to gain information about the participants that was not known before rather than attempting to specify the quantity of the information. Despite the in-depth data generated by the group, focus groups can not investigate the in-depth knowledge’s and beliefs of the individual as one to one interviewing can. Time constraints, the number of the group and the nature of group interaction also reduce the individual’s ability to express their self in any great depth. Information derived from a focus group may not be accurate for all members of the group. Strong personalities may dictate the views of some members making them conform to themselves or the majority. Especially when exploring a sensitive topic some members may be afraid or embarrassed to speak out their true beliefs. In some instances, the residents were hesitant in speaking about their particular circumstances so I offered the opportunity of one-to-one interviews and this was taken up by a number of focus group participants. The focus groups were useful for eliciting the variety of experiences and feelings towards demolition and relocation.
5.2.5 Participant observation

During fieldwork the researcher may adopt a number of observational roles for example, participant or non-participant observation and within either of these contexts the observations may be made covertly or overtly. However, as Atkinson and Hammersley (1994) suggest, the simple dichotomy between participant and non-participant observation implies that such research is static and polemic in nature. Instead, the typology of fieldwork roles devised by Junker (1960) is more appropriate as it highlights a spectrum of observational roles, from a comparatively involved role with the researcher as ‘complete participant’ and/or ‘participant as observer’ to a comparatively detached role whereby the researcher adopts the role of ‘complete observer’ and/or ‘observer as participant’. As the research developed and to deal with the problems negotiating access an ‘immersion technique’ was developed (Section 5.3). This borrowed from emerging forms of ‘mobile ethnography’ which involve participation in patterns of movement while conducting ethnographic research (Sheller and Urry, 2006). And Laurier (2002) suggests a similar approach called ‘copresent immersion’ whereby the researcher can be copresent within modes of movement and then employ a range of observation, interviewing and recording techniques. Combinations of these methods were used in my research. At times I was the complete participant taking part in a resident’s association meeting or focus group; at other times I was a detached observer, using my eyes and ears to record in a written form (field notes) or in a visual form photographs. Over the year I took a lot of photographs, though not many have any people in them. This is partly because people did not walk around the communities that much because there is not much there, or because they dodged into doorways or hid their faces as I took a picture of the street (this was mainly young men, the so called ‘hoodies’) so issues of consent and confidentiality made it difficult to take photos of people. Sometimes I was a covert observer, just walking or driving around the communities and at other times I was an overt observer, for example, attending project boards, ward and council meetings. The combination of these techniques enabled me to get a wider impression of the regeneration process and the impact on communities.

5.2.6 Analysis

Qualitative, ethnographic research generates a lot of text. I recorded all pre-arranged interviews and focus groups on a Sony digital recorder and used these for transcription.
Field notes were written during visits to the community at various public meetings or after visits in the form of a research diary reflecting on the day. I took numerous photographs and collated local, regional and national policy documents as well as ‘grey literature’. I joined web-based lists to receive alerts about regeneration policy at national and local levels. All this information was sorted according to themes to make it more manageable. In the second year of the PhD I decided on four main themes through which to explore the process of regeneration and the interpretation of ‘community’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable communities’ and these are governance, demolition, mobility and transformation. The four themes emerged strongly in the literature, policy and interviews/focus groups as a way of exploring and discussing the shifting nature of the regeneration process rather than a static comparison of three communities. To analyze the data I manually went through each transcript writing annotated comments and ‘colour highlighting’ according to my codes/themes. I then created new documents according to the themes. Policy documents were analyzed in the same way. Folders were created to save the data on computer and paper copies were filed according to the same themes.

5.2.7 Ethical considerations

The research was subject to both the ESRC’s code of ethics, and an ethical review in the Department of Geography, Durham University, in accordance with the University’s policy on Ethics in Research. Two specific ethical issues arose – relations with and responsibilities towards research participants and anonymity, privacy and confidentiality.

Relations with and Responsibilities towards Research Participants

As the researcher, I am aware of the moral and personal relationship between research participant and researcher and I understand the responsibility of ensuring that the physical, social and psychological well-being of the participants is not adversely affected. I made every effort to protect the rights of the participants and their interests, sensitivities and privacy. The research transcripts were anonymized and confidential and permission (informed consent) was gained before conducting the interview and focus groups. The research detail, funding and dissemination was explained beforehand in terms understood by the participant and if the participant made any special request regarding
the data or refuses use – this was adhered to. I explained to the participants that the interview transcript can be viewed and altered if they wish prior to use.

**Anonymity, privacy and confidentiality**

The anonymity and privacy of those who participated in the research process is respected. Personal information concerning research participants was kept confidential and the identities and research records of those participating in research was kept confidential whether or not an explicit pledge of confidentiality had been given. Appropriate measures were to store research data in a secure manner and I have regard to my obligations under the Data Protection Acts. Where appropriate and practicable, methods for preserving anonymity were used including the removal of identifiers, the use of pseudonyms and other technical means for breaking the link between data and identifiable individuals. I have taken care to prevent data being published or released in a form that would permit the actual or potential identification of research participants without prior written consent of the participants. Potential informants and research participants, especially those possessing a combination of attributes that make them readily identifiable, were reminded that it can be difficult to disguise their identity without introducing an unacceptably large measure of distortion into the data. Guarantees of confidentiality and anonymity given to research participants were honoured. I recognize that there may be fewer compelling grounds for extending guarantees of privacy or confidentiality to public organisations, collectivizes, governments, officials or agencies than to individuals or small groups. Nevertheless, where guarantees were given they were honoured.

**5.3 Negotiating access**

During the early stages of the fieldwork I conducted many elite interviews (Appendix 5) and I took the opportunity to explain that later on I would like to talk to residents either in one-one interviews and/or focus groups. They said this should be no problem, especially in Scotswood and Benwell and Walker where residents and tenants associations was well established. In Walker Riverside, a community engagement team was located within the community and I was advised to contact the Community Engagement Manager so I envisioned few problems. I wrote letters of introduction explaining who I was and what I was doing (Appendix 7). In Scotswood and Benwell I had established contact with a
'gatekeeper’ in this case the Ward Coordinator who said they would forward the letters to the 12 or so residents/tenants groups in the area. He said that due to confidentiality I could not have the direct contact details of the groups so I had little option but to go along with this. In Walker I emailed and telephoned the community engagement manager as recommended. The initial telephone conversation did not go very well, he seemed to resent yet another university researcher coming to the area and commented that he’d already had Newcastle and Northumbria undergraduate students ‘doing a project’. His attitude was dismissive but he asked me to send further details via email and promised to get back to me about speaking to residents groups. I heard nothing. So I sent another email and rang after a few weeks but he was either busy or not available. I decided that I needed to contact other people who could act as gatekeepers in the area because it was impractical to knock on doors (plus because of demolition there were not many doors to knock on) and details of residents groups were not publicly available. I contacted the Ward Coordinator for Walker Riverside and the Regeneration Teams in Newcastle Council responsible for Walker and received no reply. I was also having similar problems in Scotswood and Benwell. My introductory letters had been forward by the Ward Coordinator to the Community Development Manager who sent them to the residents and tenants groups but I received not one reply. By now it was Easter 2007 and at a meeting with my supervisors I discussed the problem of access because it could now potentially jeopardize the whole research process.

As mentioned in the introduction, to overcome the problems of negotiating access the research became more ethnographic in that I immersed my self in the communities for a one month period. Ethnography has long been a favoured method of studying communities (Allan and Phillipson (2008). The benefits of ethnography as a qualitative research approach, is that in contrast to quantitative research it is more suitable for eliciting a deeper understanding of people’s opinions, values, and generates in-depth, rich data on a social phenomenon (Denscombe, 2003). Ethnography allows the researcher to understand the complexities and dynamics of communities undergoing the process of urban regeneration. Ethnographic methods, such as interviews, focus groups, participant observation and photographs provide an excellent way of understanding communities as “they are experienced and understood in the everyday lives of people who actually live them out” (Cook and Crang, 1995:4). This is in contrast to predictable and controllable quantitative research methods whereby sheer numbers, ‘typicality’ and
the ‘representativeness’ of people matters (Denscombe, 2003). However, ethnographic research is not without its critics and to some it is subjective, biased and produces anecdotal or soft data (Hammersley, 1995). As Allan and Phillipson (2008:164) argue, “[Ethnographic] community studies research was often portrayed as impressionistic, with its findings influenced by the individual characteristics of the researcher as much as the social formations being studied”. Yet as Cook and Crang (1995:12) argue, 

“the prospective ethnographer may have to use multiple methods to gain a more rounded picture of the research topic. Thus, rather than been a weakness, the always already positioned and intersubjective nature of ethnography can be seen as a strength out of which more rigorous understandings can be built”.

To continue the research I had to raise my profile and get my face known in the communities rather than wait for gatekeeper access though this was still used. I had written or emailed all the councillors, the vicars and priests and community and voluntary groups in the area in addition to those purely involved in regeneration. Plus with my supervisors an ‘immersion’ method was discussed and thought appropriate whereby I literally immersed myself in the area rather than expecting to be invited into designated community spaces (Section 5.2.6). As I live in Middlesbrough the daily drive to Newcastle and Gateshead was no problem, so for one month I ‘immersed’ myself in the communities. I was familiar with the areas now as earlier in the fieldwork year various community workers had given me conducted tours. I was aware of the stigma attached to the communities related to crime and the potential safety risks of moving alone around the communities so this aspect was addressed in a risk assessment for the fieldwork. For instance, walking around the areas is quite an eerie experience especially in Scotswood where the scale of demolition has left a bleak, blank landscape devoid of people as shown in Figure 5.5. Indeed in all three communities the problem was ‘where to find the people’ as there were so few community spaces. I found out about two community cafes in Scotswood, one in the church on a Tuesday and Thursday and one in the ‘Pink Palace’ a community centre with a community bakery that supplied the café. So I went in the cafes as often as I could and observed and chatted generally if the opportunity arose. In Walker I did the same – I used the shops and take-aways. In addition, I just walked around the areas and took photos. This aroused interest if people were passing by and if I could catch their attention I used an introductory line like ‘are
these being demolished soon?’ which usually developed into a conversation. I dropped into some of the local shops and just asked some questions and in general people were interested in what was going on but pretty resigned to that fact that they could not alter the decisions.

Figure 5.5: Scotswood in March 2007 (Andrea Armstrong)

Websites have been an excellent resource throughout the research though there are limitations because not all community information is publicly available. Even though the contact details of residents groups are not available, public meetings such as ward committees and project boards were posted online if you knew where to look. I noticed that project board meetings were coming up for Walker and Benwell and Scotswood and ward committee meetings so decided to go along. This proved very useful because I put faces to names, picked up documents and heard from the different actors involved, including residents. I was recognized at the meetings and introduced to the residents. In Scotswood I spoke to two residents and the conversation started with general chit chat
and smiles. They asked who I was and I explained and they recognized my name from the introductory letter I had sent. From then on the conversation did not go well; they explained that they had been ‘consulted to death’ (Section 4.4). They also revealed that in the same week that my letter was sent, an undergraduate student from Newcastle University had sent a questionnaire for their dissertation as they explained, ‘we are sick of been consulted and asked questions’. I admired their frankness and they were very polite about the refusal to participate but underneath I was very concerned about what to do, could I turn this situation round? And should I? I decided to try. As Moore (2008) reveals in a review of his own community research,

“Wherever there are concentrations of unemployed and poor people it is to be expected that they will be suspicious of people who look like officials, especially if they come asking questions and writing down the answers. Sociology, social security and social work probably seem much the same to people up against the state and its agents. During the 1980s it was therefore not surprising that researchers found increasing difficulty in working in inner city areas of high unemployment. Response rates have been low and researchers abused verbally, spat upon and threatened with violence” (p 124).

My experiences were minor in comparison though still quite difficult to negotiate because if people do not want to participate, should you persuade them? And what is the best way to achieve this? For me the solutions were found in building relationships of trust over time, and it here that the immersion method helped.

In Walker however, despite ‘immersing’ myself in the area and various attempts to contact people I seemed to be hitting a brick wall all the time. Eventually, I got through on the telephone to a newly appointed regeneration officer in the council. I repeated my requests and he admitted that I had been kept out of the area while their consultation efforts were going on because they didn’t want someone else in there ‘muddying the waters’ as he said. I asked if it was now acceptable to consult the communities and he said yes so the issue of access was resolved with patience and persistence.

Felling, at the time of the fieldwork had no pre-existing residents or tenants associations. The Ward Councillor for Felling who is also on the BNG Board and the Senior Planner
for Gateshead Council proved to be valuable contacts. In contrast to the two Newcastle case studies, Felling is some way behind in the process. At the time of the research they were still ‘assembling land’ for clearance. Despite attempts to contact the three churches in Felling because in the Newcastle case studies they had been valuable gatekeepers, I received no response. The Senior Neighbourhood Manager failed to attend two pre-arranged interviews. Similarly, no response was received from the Sure Start programme in Felling and the Felling Local History Society responded to say they were not interested because their group had experienced falling numbers, apathy and it was difficult to get anyone involved. There is only one community centre in Felling and despite numerous letters, emails and phone calls to the project manager I received no response. Eventually a phone call to the centre made progress. A new and temporary project manager had been appointed and was willing to participate. The Interface project is a community education project in Felling working with older groups, families and young people to provide educational opportunities. After an initial meeting I arranged a focus group with ten residents of Felling experiencing the effects of urban regeneration. The extracts below from an interview and the focus group in Felling give some indication of the levels of apathy and reasons for withdrawing from the process,

“what’s the point in getting involved they’re just going to do it any way”
(Felling Resident, 2007)

“And you had no say whatsoever you wasted your breath at the meeting we went to, and me father-in-law has lived there all his married life, all his kids were born there and he was 76 and they told him your house is safe Mr McCabe don’t you worry. Next day he got a letter saying they’re pulling down the bottom half of Friars Dene Road for the cycle way and he was 76 and he’d lived in that house all his life and he died a year later because he couldn’t cope with not living in Friars Dene Road

It sickens me with the council because they’re knocking down all these houses and building new ones but there not new council houses its to make sure you buy” (Felling focus group, June 2007)
5.4 Community consultation, ‘consultation fatigue’ and research

Consultation, community engagement and participation have become a core features of New Labour urban regeneration policies. The origins of community participation, consultation and self help can be traced back to area-based initiatives of the late 1980s (see Chapter 2; Hastings, 2003). In the US, community participation is an integral component of urban planning initiatives such as ‘smart growth’ and ‘New Urbanism’ (Jennings, 2004). In the UK, a series of initiatives such as Neighbourhood Renewal (see Chapter 3), Neighbourhood Management and Neighbourhood Wardens (see Chapter 6), the Together We Can Civil Renewal Unit (2005) and of course the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinders (HMRP) signal the governments ‘community’ and ‘citizen’ focus. The three key elements of ‘Together We Can’ namely, active citizenship (see Chapter 6), strengthened communities and partnership working contributed to the Local Government White Paper ‘Strong and Prosperous Communities’. The need to consult and engage with communities undergoing the regeneration process is justified in the local Bridging NewcastleGateshead (BNG) policy prospectus in terms of community support. According to BNG, community support is related to the long term sustainability of regeneration efforts,

“If the change which Pathfinder will create in the NewcastleGateshead housing markets is to have a lasting and meaningful effect, community support is vital” (HMR, 2004:33).

They go on to argue,

“People affected by Pathfinder’s actions need to be able to take ownership, feel involved, have their say AND be heard. That is why effective consultation, communication and engagement are key to success” (original emphasis, HMR, 2004:33).

Thus, in spaces of regeneration, a range of techniques are used to foster community support (see Chapter 8 for more on the relationship between urban branding and

13 Together We Can was launched by the Civil Renewal Unit in 2005 to “enable people to engage with public bodies and influence decisions that affect their communities (CLG, 2007:18)
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community support). In my case, the community consultation efforts of BNG posed unexpected ‘practical methodological issues’. As Maginn (2007:426) argues,

“Despite the “community turn” in British urban regeneration policy, research has tended to focus almost exclusively on theoretical and empirical matters related to decision-making structures, processes, and policy discourses rather than any practical methodological issues (Hastings and McArthur 1995; Atkinson 1997; Atkinson and Cope 1997; Raco 2000; Smith and Beazley 2000; Taylor 2002). As a result, the urban policy literature lends itself to suggesting to new researchers, especially doctoral and master’s candidates, that all they need do is turn up at regeneration neighbourhoods and simply start doing research, unhindered”

In my case, the practical methodological issue was related to past and current consultation efforts, in Newcastle in particular. The intense focus of consultation that accompanies communities targeted for regeneration programmes has led Robinson (2005) to call such areas ‘policy laboratories’. As the Benwell and Scotswood Area Action Plan, (2006b:1) warns,

“Engaging and consulting with communities in areas with a long history of consultation and engagement, but with arguably little positive end product, is likely to be difficult therefore it is important to build on previous knowledge and previous consultation”.

In discussions with the Director of Isos Housing, a Registered Social Landlord involved in the Walker Riverside area of BNG made a similar point,

“We’ve had quite an amount of consultation and one of the criticisms from the residents point of view is that they have been consulted to death and there is this perception that we’ve been here before not just once but two, three, four times and nothing ever happens” (Director of Isos Housing, 2007).
Therefore, as Maginn (2007) argues, ‘simply turning up in a regeneration area and starting to do the research’ was not going to be that easy. Although consideration was given to the potential problems of ethnographic research, in particular negotiating access, it was not until half way through the fieldwork that particular issues and problems arose. The main problem was ‘consultation fatigue’ whereby residents living in communities undergoing transformation experienced sensitivities and pressure from those responsible for delivering the transformation. To detail and discuss every consultation initiative in BNG is beyond the scope of this thesis but one example is the BNG Roadshow (Figure 5.6). The BNG Roadshow was a six week consultation period between June and August 2005. At four roadshow events (Newcastle East, West, Central and Gateshead) an inflatable branded tent was raised with activities and entertainment to “attract and inspire people to participate, comment, discuss and give opinion” (Urbanistix, 2005:16). Within each tent there was a range of consultation “techniques to make communities real” (Rose, 1999:189) – a BNG interactive story

14 It may be worth noting here that Maginn (2007) researched ‘ethnically diverse’ communities whereas I researched ‘ethnically homogenous communities’ and the problems faced during the fieldwork were very similar.
board, BNG update film, BNG community audit map, ‘What makes a great place to live? Picture board and newsletters (Urbanistix, 2005). Other events include a ‘Stakeholder Question Time Event’ with Richard Moss a local TV presenter on the Politics Show, postal surveys and the Benwell and Scotswood Big Idea Bus.

My first indication that ‘consultation fatigue’ amongst residents was going to be a problem, was when a long standing Scotswood resident spoke to me after a public meeting about a letter of introduction I had sent and said,

“oh no pet, we’re sorry like but you’re the fifth one this week to ask us, we’ve been consulted to death – whether you’re a researcher or its for consultation its all the same to us – why should we speak to you?” (Scotswood Resident, 2007).

Why should they speak to me? An ‘outsider’ at this early, messy stage in the regeneration process was not welcome so to overcome these obstacles took time, patience and the adaptation existing methods. As Maginn (2007:425) argues, “negotiating access can be a lengthy complex process as it involves developing relationships and earning the trust of a wide range of informants via asserting a portfolio of identities. Thus, there are different phases to gaining access. I had now gained access to the community, or more specifically to the residents but as the following extract from my research notes show, it is also difficult to negotiate access and gain trust amongst the community.

**Syd’s Hut in Scotswood: an extract from research notes**

Through a local councillor I’d been given the phone number of ‘Syd’ the namesake of ‘Syd’s Hut’ in Scotswood, a wooden, purpose built hut also known as the Ferguson Lane Community Centre. I’d rang several times but Syd (in his 80s) was busy with the pensioners dinners so couldn’t come to the phone but eventually I spoke to Syd and said who I was and what I was doing and wondered if there’d be a convenient time to go along and chat. He said that it would be fine for me to visit them the next day but arrive about 10.30 so there’d be a few around to talk to but bear in mind they’d be getting ready for the pensioners dinners.
So on a sunny June day in 2007 I arrived at Syd’s hut in Scotswood. Syd could be seen in the doorway sat at a table surrounded by papers and a cash box. I found out later he was the treasurer. A little nervous, I entered the hut and introduced myself. Syd also seemed a little nervous and asked me what it was I wanted to know. I explained briefly and he named a few women who would be good to talk to and guided me to a series of formica topped tables arranged in a long row where a few women were sat around chatting and smoking. I smiled and said hello and sat at the table amongst them, then Syd went back to his seat near the door. As I looked around I realized a few women were also in the kitchen cooking the dinners and the rest of the hut was arranged for the pensioner’s lunches. I looked around at the women sat at the table, they were aged between 40 and 80 and I tried to gain eye contact. But it felt a little awkward and tense at first with all of us just eyeing each other up. In particular, the body language of a woman about my age was off putting. She sat sideways on, legs crossed reading the Sun newspaper and appeared to be deliberately ignoring me. I tried to start a conversation but she answered in monosyllables and didn’t lift her head up. So I began speaking to some of the others who were looking at an Avon book. I commented on the Avon book and its contents and one of the women asked if I’d like a look. This felt like a bit of a breakthrough. I looked at the book and commented on some of the things in it.

Most of the women smoked and as it was just before the smoking ban they were still smoking in the hut. The conversation turned to the letter they’d received from the council saying they would have to smoke outside once the ban came in or would be prosecuted so they wondered about giving up. This proved to be an icebreaker as two years earlier I’d given up smoking after a 20 year habit. I spoke of my smoking history, what I smoked, how many, when I smoked and then how I gave up. There has been and probably will be among smokers a type of camaraderie. Smoking has become an antisocial, unacceptable habit but paradoxically as ‘smoking spaces’ become fragmented and isolated the camaraderie amongst smokers and ex-smokers (you can never be a non-smoker) can strengthen. The conversation turned to giving up smoking. One elderly woman gave up three weeks ago with patches and two others a mother and daughter (the one deliberately ignoring me earlier) told me that they both had Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD). The mother, in her 70s had quite severe COPD (previously known as emphysema) and had restricted mobility, couldn’t sleep or eat very well. But despite her health problems she came to the hut several times a week to cook the pensioner’s meals (most of those cooking the pensioners dinners were pensioners themselves) and managed to do her shopping. She didn’t shop locally though, saying Westgate had too many nationalities and too many takeaways, Asda at the Metro centre was too busy so she shopped at the Asda in Gosforth where her other daughter lived.

They asked me where I came from and I said I lived in Middlesbrough. This also acted as an icebreaker (I’ve found this in other communities too) as one woman was born in Middlesbrough so she asked me what it was like now. They all thought that the drugs and crime were worse in Middlesbrough and said they couldn’t live there. By now the pensioners had started to arrive and were sat at the tables ready for their dinner. The woman born in Middlesbrough pointed out all the elderly people aged 92, 93 and 99 that were sat waiting. Age, well longevity seemed very important to the community, be it the very old and/or the length of residency. For example, one woman said to me she was a newcomer to Scotswood. Oh I said, how long have you lived here? 18 years she replied. That seems a long time to me, I said. She looked pleased and surprised when I said this. Does it, she said, but my mother-in –law (she pointed to a woman sat opposite her in her late 70s) has lived here 50 years, so I’m still seen as a newcomer.
During this time the atmosphere changed and I could tell I was been accepted and trusted. The women opened up and people were wondering what I was doing there. The word got round that I wanted to know what it was like living in Scotswood, what it had been like, what they thought of the changes etc and they were keen to talk to me. By this time there were 40-50 people in the hut, 10 made up the committee who cooked the lunch and the rest were from the local community and had come for their dinner. I offered to help but they said it was ok. The woman of about my age who I now knew had COPD and had ignored me to begin with now began to chat. She told me that her husband aged 42 was a drug user and had overdosed on amitryptilline last August (2006) but she didn’t know if it was on purpose. She had left him because of the children because as a drug user he had become selfish and violent, his personality had changed. The death of their father had affected the children badly she said and she’d had to give up her main living five years ago, running a fruit and veg stall on the markets because trade had declined. I now understood her attitude to me. The small, close knit community of mainly women, there were a few men apart from Syd, provide the comfort, security and purpose to an otherwise hard life. To enter that world as a stranger is difficult but a privilege. They quite quickly accepted me and included me in their activities. I knew I was accepted when they asked if I’d like to stay to dinner which I did. After dinner, the whole place knew why I was there and wanted to tell their stories so I went round the tables and talked to everyone. One man went back home and brought his collection of local history cuttings and photographs. I spent the afternoon talking to everyone and at the end of the afternoon, Syd and the other committee women invited me back the next day to their AGM and buffet.

The experience in Syd’s hut is typical of many of the encounters amongst the communities. The following description from my research notes describes my encounter to negotiate access and gain trust amongst the demolishers.

My first demolition, Armstrong Road, Scotswood, March 2007

10.15am Arrived at the area on Armstrong Road on a sunny, bright day with a clear blue sky and was surprised that it was only two houses (in fact 4 Tyneside flats built like 2 semis) surrounded by large area of grass (though these were the sites of houses already demolished and turfed over to improve the appearance). So I parked the car along the road from the houses so as not to interfere with the vehicles involved in demolition but close enough to keep an eye on it and a bit nervously approached the men working. I was hoping to be quite inconspicuous but as there were only 4-5 men I realized that I would be very obvious. So I approached them hoping that Margaret Davison who had informed me of the demolitions had let them know. As I approached at first I was just looked at – no smiles – I think they thought I was been nosy so I said hello to who looked in charge and introduced myself and what I was there to do. Luckily I think it had been mentioned so I asked if it was ok to hang about for about an hour because I had to go then for an interview and I would pop back after that. Giving the timescale seemed to help and I also established how long it would take to demolish the houses and was surprised that it took 2 -3 days so there would be no dramatic filming. I think I have watched too much Fred Dibnah!
This day was just setting up – surrounding the houses with fencing and danger signs. A huge skip was in place and a JCB digger with two bucket attachments. It was quite a slow process, slower than what I thought. It almost seemed like nothing was happening.

10.50 Have filmed all around the houses and area around them to provide a context. Spoke to a couple of the men and while the boss was away I was shown in the house to film. It had obviously been empty a while. Dark and damp. Relics of wallpaper and flooring - evidence of habitation. Quite a large house (didn’t realise at first it was 4 flats). There is a tree in the ‘zone’ with a magpie nesting. What will happen to them and the tree? Realized that I am not going to be able to film the whole process of demolition but stages within the process. At least I am here at the beginning. One oldish man walked by with his dog and was watching the process, he seemed interested. But younger people walked by and did not look up from texting on their mobile phones.

13.50pm Arrived back at the site. Work has progressed at the back of the houses. Only two men there now the boss Jimmy (Irish lives near the Angel of the North) and his ‘deputy’ Steve (local from Fenham). Seemed different and friendlier now and seemed to know more about me so must have double checked why I was there. We chatted more generally and they asked me questions about where I was from and what I was doing. I said I was from Middlesbrough which they knew of and they said ‘I couldn’t live there’ which is by now a familiar response. I said I’d worked for a number of years but on moving to Middlesbrough and only getting offered one interview for £1.97 an hour in 1997 I was determined to do something about it, so did a degree. By offering personal information this opened the conversation and they then discussed their children and grandchildren. But I was still surprised when Jimmy said ‘come on then you can have a go’ a go doing what I thought – ahh a go on the JCB! Thoughts of ‘risk assessment’ flashed through my mind but it would have seemed priggish to say ‘sorry I don’t know if I’m covered in my risk assessment’ so leapt into the cab enthusiastically. He explained the different levers etc and the important one that disables the whole thing! And helped me have a go at first moving some rubbish material into the skip and then actually demolished a bit of wall. Seemed to amuse all involved and I was given a plate they have had in the cab for a while as a memento, this made me feel accepted.

After this initial contact, whenever I went to Scotswood I looked out for the demolishers and they looked out for me in my red Escort and we waved at each other. I visited them several times as they worked around Scotswood and they always made me welcome and explained what they were doing and we chatted in general.

5.5 Power relations in research

Power is intertwined with the positionality and personality of the researcher (and participant) and the challenge of negotiating access. Power inequalities pervade many research projects on multiple and intersecting levels (for example, see Swanson, 2008) and power relations were certainly part of this project as illustrated in the field note extracts above. However, in most cases it was me as the researcher who felt marginalized and powerless. Much has been made of the powerful researcher
controlling and directing the questions and defining the research area (England, 1994; Katz, 1994) or the influence of race, class and nationality (Gilbert, 1994; Kobayashi, 1994). Others though have commented that “researchers may not always hold as much power as they think” (Swanson, 2008:57). As Swanson (2008) goes on to argue about her research with Kiva the research dog on the streets of Ecuador, she became very aware of both her dominant and marginal position in the community. I too was aware of both positions and how this could change quite quickly during the course of an afternoon once I was accepted and trusted.

When interviewing planners, community development managers and other regeneration professionals I usually felt powerless and marginal and by some was deliberately made to feel this way. I had entered their territory (physically and intellectually) and they knew far more than me, which was fine, so I adopted the ‘teacher/student’ persona to hopefully learn as much as possible. Later on as the research progressed and I interviewed more senior people, I adopted a more professional persona and revealed my knowledge throughout the interview to gain trust and respect. However, with residents the power dynamics fluctuated more intensely. Those residents who participated regularly in residents associations and were on the project boards had years of knowledge and experience and were expressing their dissatisfaction of being consulted to death by non-participation.

In Walker and Scotswood and Benwell the residents I met who were involved on the project boards were knowledgeable and articulate and could see the bigger regeneration picture. Others though, did not understand the process and felt powerless in it. In this situation I felt more dominant, but it was an uncomfortable dominance based on their marginalization. In these cases sometimes I became a translator or teacher, explaining the regeneration process, the relocation, demolition, and the compensation packages available. Many of the residents I spoke to were either elderly (in Walker, Benwell and Scotswood) or young (in Felling) and were facing the loss of their home. So in a way I became a liaison between the local authority and community, as I gathered information about the practicalities of what they were facing I passed the information on. On reflection I think this was my way of giving something back to the community. After the problems of gaining access, the reality of facing several people who are about to lose
their homes made me acutely aware of the selfish side of my research and I wanted to give something back.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has discussed the influence and benefits of a CASE funded studentship in relation to the research approach and methods. The pre-defined research area, approach and questions have not restricted my research but provided a focus for it. The chapter has also highlighted some of the problems encountered when researching communities in spaces of regeneration. As Maginn (2004) warned, one can not just turn up to the communities and expect to conduct the research unhindered. For a start, policy practitioners may have clearly defined maps of ‘community’ but as I found ‘finding community’ is not that easy especially when most of it has been knocked down or there are no established groups or community centres. Community then is about relationships between people and places. Living in a ‘community’ as a place does not necessarily mean participating in ‘community’ as people. The disruption to everyday community life – of working, shopping, travel, of visiting and being visited and so on brought about by regeneration means that people react in various ways. In this chapter, we saw the reactions of some residents in response to excessive consultation and lack of progress on the ground – they experience consultation fatigue. For the researcher, trying to negotiate access at the same time as consultation efforts the problems are two-fold – the sensitive policy practitioners and the ‘fatigue’ of residents. In this case, building up trust over time was an important aspect of researching communities. Attending community events, using the (few) shops and cafes and so on. In Felling, the problems of access were the same for me but caused by another issue – this time community apathy. This stemmed from feelings that ‘the regeneration was going ahead despite what they thought’. For them, they had no control over their community except resistance to any efforts to organize or consult them.
CHAPTER 6

Governing communities

6.1 Introduction

This chapter develops the two aspects of governmentality that add to an understanding of governing communities - the rationalities of government and the technologies of government. Governmentality allows us to understand and explain the rationalities, that is, the justification for governing communities undergoing regeneration. The technologies allow us to understand the techniques of governing community, such as surveys, experts, management, that explain the means by which the rationalities are put into practice. Developing in particular the Foucault influence in the work of Rose (1999), this chapter considers the ways in which ‘community’ is being made real via ‘action at a distance’ (see Section 6.2). Within the wider context, state-community relations are being redrawn as the welfare role of the state recedes and are arguably replaced by an ‘enabling’ state. This chapter critically examines particular aspects of the ‘enabling’ state as part of the process of transforming spaces of regeneration, that appears to promise a shift from ‘power over’ to ‘power to’.

The chapter begins with a discussion of the rationalities of community governance, in other words how national and local policy; in this case, the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) and Bridging NewcastleGateshead (BNG) problematize community or as Gordon (1991:3) stated, “who can govern; what governing is; what or who is governed”. This discussion considers in particular the notions of active citizens, active communities and social capital. The second half of the chapter explores the techniques deployed to govern communities that promise ‘power to’ and draws from the example of neighbourhood management to discuss three ‘techniques’ – neighbourhood wardens, active children and residents’ associations.

6.2 Community as problem and solution

The new discourses of community (see Chapter 1) offer a diagnosis and cure, in that “they present themselves simultaneously as a description of certain social and economic ills and a solution to them” (Rose, 1999:173). This dual role for community has arisen
from the changes in society whereby the "stable historical, cultural and institutional markers that used to provide the bearings for life have been eroded or subverted" (Rose, 1999:173). In other words, the more mobile ‘autonomous self’ has replaced the fixed traditional authority of centralized government and the idea of deferent, obedient, fixed communities. As Rose (1999:173) argues,

“Community here would appear as an essentially nostalgic wish for a solution to the perplexities of the autonomous self, condemned to search for meaning in a fragmented world resistant to stable sense making procedures”.

The process of change, according to Rose (1999), should not be viewed in terms of cultural change but as empirically identifiable differences in the ways of thinking and acting. The old arrangements exist alongside emerging new ones and are “conceived out of the intersection of heterogeneous social, political, discursive and technological shifts…..but in this process…a novel sense of community is emerging as a means of problematization and as a means of solution” (Rose, 1999:173).

Central to this argument, is the restructuring of state-community relations towards ‘action at a distance’ (Miller and Rose, 1990) alongside ‘autonomization and responsibilization’ (Rose, 1999). The term ‘action at a distance’ was coined by Miller and Rose (1990) to describe the forms of power outside the state apparatus, which “often sustain the state more effectively than its own institutions, enlarging and maximizing its effectiveness” (Foucault, 1980:73). The idea of ‘action at a distance’ has developed as the social, welfare state has been replaced by the ‘facilitating state’ the ‘enabling state’ whereby the central state apparatus is relieved of some of its powers and obligations to know, plan, calculate and steer from the centre (Donzelot and Estebe, 1994). The state is no longer required to provide all the cures or shoulder all the responsibilities and instead has instilled new ways of thinking and acting that effectively absolve the state of its obligations by ‘enabling’ others and to return ‘politics to society’ (Rose, 1999). In other words,

“individuals, firms, organizations, localities, schools, parents, hospitals, housing estates must take on themselves – as ‘partners’ – a portion of the responsibility
for resolving these issues…..[and] this involves a double movement of autonomization and responsibilization” (Rose, 1999:174).

They are ‘autonomous’ because they are set free from a complex and bureaucratic state apparatus and ‘can find their own destiny’ (Rose, 1999:174). However, with the new found freedom comes responsibility. The notion of ‘responsibilization’ (Rose, 1996; 1999) is especially pertinent, as according to Rose (2000) the state is meant to be enabling the return of politics to society. However, in doing so, the state retains the ability to manipulate the relationship to make communities responsible for citizens and citizens responsible for community (Staeheli, 2008). This type of power and politics he labels “ethopolitics” that “works through the values, beliefs, and sentiments thought to underpin the techniques of responsible self-government and the management of one’s obligations to others” (Rose, 2000:1399). The discourse of self-regulation and responsibility is variously termed ‘technologies of self’ (Foucault cited in Lemke, 2001), ‘politics of conduct’ (Rose, 1996) and ‘technologies of citizenship’ (Dean, 1999). Responsibilization is characterized by individuals taking responsibility for their own life outcomes (Kearns and Forrest, 2000; Flint, 2002). Responsibility in this sense is defined in terms of moral norms of behaviour and obligations for self-conduct (Rose, 1996). However, the construction of norms is contested (Flint, 2002). Governmentality involves the notion of ‘problemization’ of certain behaviours and the resulting classification of deviant behaviour (Foucault, 1991). Rose (2000:1395) similarly argues that governing involves a way of imagining political problems, or in his words “…a rationality for rendering [political problems] thinkable and manageable, and a set of moral principles by which solutions may be generated and legitimized”.

Thus, through the process of responsibilization (Rose, 1996; 1999) responsibility is no longer see as a relationship with the state but as one of obligation to those for whom the individual cares most: the family, the neighbourhood, the workplace, and ultimately, the community” (Crawshaw et al, 2003: 37). Behaviour is increasingly governed through the realm of ethics, whereby individuals are ethically obliged to act for the benefit of their group to become masters of their own collective destinies by becoming ethical citizens of their community (Summerville et al, 2008). Norms of behaviour are related to ‘community’ as a ‘technology of government, influenced by Communitarian and Third Way thinkers (Etzioni, 1995; Giddens, 1998 and see Chapter 1). As a technology of
government, community is used to “shape, normalize and instrumentalize the conduct, thought, decisions and aspirations of others in order to achieve the objectives [authorities of various sorts] consider desirable” (Miller and Rose, 1990: 8).

The next section explores the discursive field in which the exercise of power is rationalized; i.e. the broad justifications for governing certain spatial domains in certain ways (Murdoch, 2006). The rationalities of government involves thinking about what or who is governed and why. As Lemke (2001:191) notes, “a political rationality is not pure, neutral knowledge which simply represents the governing reality; instead, it itself constitutes the intellectual processing of the reality which political technologies can then tackle” (see Section 6.4 for technologies of community governance). Therefore, the next section draws from interviews, policy documents and grey literature to argue that the ‘problems’ of community are rationalized ‘in the intellectual processing of reality’ as active citizenship, active communities and social capital

### 6.3 Rationalizing community

‘Action at a distance’ (Miller and Rose, 1990) requires the development of political rationalities that,

> “conceptualizes and justifies goals as well as the means to achieve them, thus defining the proper parameters of political action and the institutional framework appropriate to those limits. They do so through discourses that make it seem as if techniques are addressing a common problem through shared logic and principles” (Simons, 1995:38).

Through the ‘intellectual processing of reality’ (Lemke, 2001) programmes of government are developed that translate political rationalities into action in a particular space to address specific problems (Atkinson, 2003). According to Rose (1996, 1999) community has become the site of problems and solutions because it is constituted as “a new territory for the administration of individual and collective existence, a new place or surface upon which micro-moral relations amongst people are conceptualized and administered (Rose, 1996:331). Thus, “government through community” whereby “communities and individuals are classified and problematized on the basis of their
‘cultures’ as responsible, active citizens, entrepreneurial or as pathological, dependent and inflexible” (Atkinson, 2003:1-5). Programmes of government involve constituting communities in a particular way to understand them thereby making communities amenable to action and open to a ‘diagnosis’ and therefore open to a ‘cure’ (Rose and Miller, 1992). In this context, the common themes in the language of government that rationalize community are active citizenship; active communities and social capital and each are discussed in turn.

6.3.1 Active citizenship

“Active citizens are not born that way. They are made. For many, the experience of frustration when society fails to meet our expectations is a catalyst for social action, but we need to develop understanding and learn new skills if our commitment to action is to be effective. For society to work well we need more people to be active citizens who have a say in the decisions that affect their lives” (Home Office, 2004:1).

The notion of the active citizen first entered political parlance in 1988 following a speech by Margaret Thatcher to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in which she discussed the citizen’s role to be responsible, merciful and generous to others. Thatcher (1988) stated,

“what is certain....is that any set of social and economic arrangements which is not founded on the acceptance of individual responsibility will do nothing but harm. We are all responsible for our own actions. We cannot blame society if we disobey law”

In part, the above 1988 speech echoes the (in)famous “there is no such thing as society” interview in 1987. In this interview conducted by the journalist Douglas Keay for Woman’s Own magazine on the 23rd September 1987, Margaret Thatcher asserted,
“There is no such thing as society. There is living tapestry of men and women and people and the beauty of that tapestry and the quality of our lives will depend on how much each of us is prepared to take responsibility for ourselves and each of us is prepared to turn around and help by our own efforts those who are unfortunate……Life is a reciprocal business and people have got the entitlements too much in mind without the obligations, because there is no such thing as an entitlement unless someone has first met an obligation…..”

The themes of responsibility, obligation, entitlement and generosity were developed by the Home Office and Education Department to include ‘active business’ and voluntary sector partnerships (see Kearns, 1992 and 1995). However, as Kearns (1995) notes, much of the rhetoric behind the notion of ‘active citizenship’ was in response to the adverse reaction to Margaret Thatcher’s ‘no such thing as society’ speech and the labels of greed and selfishness imbued by Reagan-Thatcher politics. In addition, “the public’s perception was that social provision was being run down, social problems were intractable, and the government in the face of this was uncaring” (Kearns, 1995:158).

To address such criticisms the Thatcher led government stressed that neo-liberal ideals such as liberalization, entrepreneurialism and wealth creation laid the foundation for active, responsible and caring citizens. Welfare benefit cuts were justified by reiterating moral themes, by saying that the state and taxation have removed the opportunity for citizens to exercise individual, Christian responsibility towards others by sharing their wealth and doing good (Wintour, 1993). In the light of Thatcherite welfare reforms (cutbacks), the ‘active citizen’ was given a joint role alongside the notion of ‘local governance’ that involves a transfer of power away from elected local authorities to other organizations, including the voluntary sector (Kearns, 1995).

Thus, the focus on the active citizen is not original but under New Labour, the rationality of active citizenship has been developed to produce “self managing citizens taking on more personal responsibility for their welfare while avoiding dependency” (Johnstone and Whitehead, 2004:135). Furthermore, as Johnstone and Whitehead (2004:135) argue, the New Labour approach is underlined by an “extension of obligations and urban policy has focused on conditional rights to communities and citizens based upon
fulfillment of responsibilities”. Early on in the New Labour administration, Richard Rogers made the relationship between cities and citizenship stating,

“Active citizenship and vibrant urban life are essentially components of a good city and civic identity. To restore these where they are lacking, citizens must be involved in the evolution of their cities. They must feel that public space is in their communal ownership and responsibility. From the modest back street to the grand civic square, these spaces belong to citizens and make up the totality of the public domain, a public institution in its own right which like any other can enhance or frustrate our urban existence. The public domain is the theatre of an urban culture. It is where citizenship is enacted, it is the glue that can bind an urban society (Rogers, 1997:16).

These ideas were integrated into the Urban Task Force (1999) and the Rogers’ axiom ‘people make cities but cities make citizens’ became the key statement of the Urban Renaissance White Paper (DETR, 2000). The concern with community as the primary mode of citizenship promised to sweep away the dark days of Thatcher’s individualism (Holden and Iveson, 2003). As Rose (1999:475) argued,

“the person whose conduct is to be governed is not seen as living their life as an individualized isolate, but neither are they understood as a member of a national collective, a society. They are understood as citizens of communities, of associations, of networks, of belongingness, of cultures, of identities, by building networks, enhancing trust relations, developing mutuality and cooperation – through a new relationship between ethical citizenship and responsible community, fostered by, but not administered by the state – citizens can now be governed through community”.

The concern with active citizenship and ‘governing the self’ with “citizenship becoming conditional upon conduct” (Rose, 1999:489) clearly underpins the rationalities of the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) (ODPM, 2003a) as the following quotes illustrate,
“Effective engagement and participation by local people, groups and businesses, especially in the planning, design and long-term stewardship of their community, and an active voluntary and community sector” (ODPM, 2003a:5)

“Creating communities that can stand on their own feet and adapt to the changing demands of modern life” (ODPM, 2003a:5)

Similarly, in a statement supporting the SCP John Prescott makes it clear that the responsibility for an improvement in the quality of urban life lies in part with ‘active citizens’,

“We need to make people realize these public spaces belong to them. We want people to take care of their parks, be proud of their streets and their community gardens – to make them their own” (Prescott, 2003).

In the same year, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department - Fiona Mactaggart commented on the then Home Secretary’s (David Blunkett) statement on civic renewal by noting,

“It is fundamentally about unlocking the power and potential of local communities and their citizens, enabling active citizens to provide solutions to their own problems. We are bringing the civic renewal agenda into everything we do in the Home Office, whether criminal justice reform, policing or the development of assets in the community. Community engagement and active citizenship are key to a healthy society and crucial to delivering the Government’s objectives” (Hansard, 2003).

Here then there is evidence of New Labour’s ‘joined up’ policy approach\(^\text{15}\) (see Morrison, 2003; Edwards, 2001; Fairclough, 2000; Amin and Thrift, 2002; Cochrane, 2007) with

\(^{15}\) The notion of a ‘joined up’ approach emerged from the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) that promised to produce “joined up solutions to joined up problems” (Morrison, 2003:141) in other words a holistic or multi-dimensional approach (Edwards, 2001). However, as Fairclough (2000) and Amin and Thrift (2002) argue, the rhetoric of joined up government may mask the tensions and contradictions of developing a holistic policy capable of dealing with the complexities of society, the unpredictability of urban change and the range of ambitions and interests.
cross cutting themes such as active citizenship, community and civil renewal. As the Home Office Civil Renewal Unit’s, document ‘Active learning for active citizenship’ claims,

“Civil renewal – a revitalized democracy, more responsive public services, more active and sustainable communities, local people engaged in decision making – depends on active citizens” (Home Office, 2004:3)

Thus, the sustainable community policy discourse is interwoven with the notion of active citizenship, whereby the problem community is characterized as those inactive citizens who lack responsibility and form degenerate communities and citizens (Schneider and Ingram, 1997). One of the solutions to such problems is the promotion of active citizenship. According to Rose (1999a:99) we are witnessing the creation of relational citizenship that reflects “as much a capacity to act in relation to the particular circumstances of one’s environment, as well as in relation to others, as it is a ‘right’ conferred by the state”. Thus, citizenship has transformed from a possession to a capacity (Rose, 1999b:99). As Raco (2007:28) argues,

“This new citizenship of capacity becomes something to be earned, to be legitimated, and to be conferred onto individuals or groups as a reflection of their relational socioeconomic position and the extent to which they have proved their value by being good active citizens”.

Therefore, active citizenship is being mobilized as a way of justifying the creation of sustainable communities. From this has emerged the idea of ‘active communities’ as illustrated in the quote from the former Home Secretary, David Blunkett who states,

“The crucial policy imperatives are clear. We must aim to build strong, empowered and active communities. We should therefore work to improve the capacity of individuals and communities to relate to the world around them as active, critical, engaged citizens” (Home Office, 2004:3)

The next section discusses the way in which the notion of ‘active communities’ is being mobilized to justify the ‘sustainable community’ policy discourse.
6.3.2 Active communities

Under the umbrella of wider strategies such as civic renewal and creating sustainable communities, the promotion of active communities has gained momentum (see Blair, 2002; Blunkett, 2002, 2003, 2004; Brown, 2004). As part of the plan to create sustainable communities, there is a commitment to community engagement, involvement, empowerment and volunteering (Mooney and Fyfe, 2006). Communities are expected to actively engage in urban regeneration instead of having regeneration done to them (Etzioni, 1998). To promote community involvement and volunteering the Active Community Unit (ACU) was established by the Home Office in 1998. The ACU had four key principles: capacity and development at local level; community involvement; partnerships between Government and the voluntary and community sector; and a modern legal framework for the sector (Hansard, 2003).

Under New Labour, the notion of active communities is vital for fostering civic renewal. In this sense, sustainable communities are strong, active and empowered communities from which civic renewal develops. The Home Office’s stated aim is to ensure that “citizens, communities and the voluntary sector are more fully engaged in tackling social problems and there is more equality of opportunity and respect for people of all races and religions” (Economic and Social Data Service, ESDS, 2009). To monitor and justify the commitment to promoting active, sustainable communities the government produced four ‘Citizenship Surveys’ (sometimes known as the ‘Communities Study) in 2001, 2003, 2005 and 2007 (see United Kingdom Data Archive, UKDA, 2009). The surveys aim to provide,

“an evidence base for the work of Communities and Local Government (formerly the Department for Communities and Local Government), principally on the issues of community cohesion, community engagement, race and faith, volunteering and civil renewal, and is also used extensively for developing policy and for performance measurement. The survey is also used more widely, by other government departments and external stakeholders, to help inform their work around the issues covered in the survey” (UKDA, 2009)
Drawing from Rose (1999:189) the ‘survey’ is a technology of community – a device invented to make communities real. Here we are pre-empting section 6.4 which explores the technologies of community governance in detail, the reason for discussing the survey here is because it is used as a rationality and a technology of community. The survey is used as a technology to question and chart attitudes, values and participation in areas such as social networks; respondents’ feelings about their communities, including community cohesion; trust and influence; volunteering; civil renewal; race and religious prejudice and discrimination; rights and responsibilities as well as demographic and geodemographic information (see ESDS, 2009). The results can then be used to justify particular policy discourse such as active communities and participation and categorize and therefore ‘make real’ the problem citizens/communities whilst simultaneously offering a solution. For example, the 2005 Citizenship Survey characterized disengaged people as those who are:

- aged 75 or over;
- have no formal qualifications;
- are of Asian origin;
- have a long-term illness or disability;
- are living in an area of high deprivation; and
- are living in the North East. (Kitchen et al, 2006:14)

In contrast, the ‘solution’ is encouraging active, participating communities because a close-knit community with a sense of belonging is associated with participation in voluntary or civil renewal activities (Kitchen et al, 2006:5). Furthermore, the survey suggests that community participation is associated with more diverse social networks so there is a strong association between “participation in civil renewal activities, particularly civic activism, and feeling able to influence decisions in the local area” (Kitchen et al, 2006:18).

Government then uses the survey results to justify and ‘prove’ their policies are successful as this extract from the Civil Renewal Secretary, Fiona Mactaggart, illustrates,
“The Government is working to ensure that citizens, communities and the voluntary sector are more fully engaged in tackling social problems, and there is more equality of opportunity and respect for people of all races and religions. Active community participation in England has increased by 1.5 million people between 2001 and 2003” (Hansard, 2005).

Although the promotion of active citizenship and active communities is an implicit ‘UK wide’ initiative, it is the ‘unsustainable’ spaces of the city – the former industrial communities whereby allegiance to community and active, responsible citizenship is explicitly expected and promoted. Underpinning New Labour’s vision of active communities is the commitment to social capital (Johnston and Mooney, 2007) and it is this that we turn to next.

6.3.3 Social capital

New Labour’s vision of active, responsible citizens and communities draws extensively from the work of Putnam (1993, 2000) and has been featured implicitly in a number of Government policies to promote neighbourhood and civic regeneration. According to Blair (2002:11-12),

“A key task for our second term is to develop greater coherence around our commitment to community, to grasp the opportunity for civil renewal. That means a commitment to making the state work better. But most of all, it means strengthening communities themselves…The residents’ association that started with enthusiasm but disbands at their inability to convince the authorities to act on their problems. The victims who stop reporting crime because they lose faith that it will lead to a conviction….Responsive public services are part of the solution. But we also need to give power directly to citizens. That’s why we are piloting neighbourhood management of estates, where tenants and residents will commission their public services……As Robert Putnam argues elsewhere……communities that are interconnected are healthier communities. If we play football together, run parent-teacher associations together, sing in choirs or learn to paint together, we are less likely to want to cause harm to each other.
Such interconnected communities have lower crime, better education results, better care of the vulnerable”.

The ‘erosion of social capital’ that is “the contact, trust and solidarity that enables residents to help, rather than fear, each other” was identified as one of the main weaknesses facing deprived communities (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000, para 8). The government provide a typology of social capital – social bonds, which refers to the social networks and ties between people that promotes social connections, mutual respect and mutual support in neighbourhoods; social bridges, whereby there are social ties between different ethnic, cultural and faith groups, different generations and different interests and across different neighbourhoods; social links, which refer to the informal and formal ties between the community and service providers or decision makers that cut across status and similarity, allowing people to exert influence and reach resources outside their normal circles (DCLG, 2007a).

Although, the Labour government has “firmly nailed its flag to the social capital mast” (Kearns, 2004:13) to some observers the notion has a downside, as is too ‘cosy’ a concept (see Taylor, 2002 cited in Kearns, 2004; also DeFilippis, 2001). Drawing from Portes and Landholt (1998) and Aldridge et al (2002), Kearns (2004:12-13) highlights the disadvantages and misuses of social capital (Box 6.1).

**Box 6.1: The downsides of social capital** *(adapted from Kearns, 2004:13)*

| Strongly bonded social groups may exacerbate community conflicts |
| Strongly bonded social and spatially concentrated groups can become insular |
| Social capital can be used to promote damaging behaviours |
| Old-boy networks inhibit social mobility |
| Strong communities can be oppressive and conformist |

For communities targeted by urban regeneration initiatives, “the mobilization of normative notions of social capital enables the construction of particular locales as problem places” (Johnston and Mooney, 2007:134) and contributes to their stigmatized image. The problem is not material deprivation - the problem is a lack of social capital because they have not networked enough. As Johnston and Mooney (2007:134) argue,
“In place of concern with material inequalities and with unequal power relations, we see an emphasis on individual and/or community dysfunction. We have been here many times before: social capital allows for the re-entry of some of the worst kinds of stigmatizing discourse”.

6.4 Technologies of community governance

According to Rose (1999), a whole array of technologies or techniques has been invented to make communities real. The previous section discussed the way in which the notions of active citizenship, active communities and social capital have been used as rationalities, as a way of visualizing political problems to render them manageable and to legitimize the moral principles underpinning the solutions (Rose, 2000a). This section explores the various techniques used to govern community at ‘arms length’. As Summerville et al (2008:698) argue,

“liberal political rationalities and techniques oriented to governing the social through the mechanisms of the nation state have given way to a governmentality that invokes community as a means to collectivize and organize subjects of government in ways that facilitate ethicopolitical governance”.

Ethicopolitical governance refers to the way in which individual citizens are encouraged and expected to behave in certain ethical and moral ways for the benefit of the community. Thus, commentators such as Atkinson (1999), Cruikshank (1994), Raco and Imrie (2000) have come to characterize community as a new “technology of government” that is used to “shape, normalize and instrumentalize the conduct, thought, decisions and aspirations of others in order to achieve the objectives [authorities of various sorts] consider desirable” (Miller and Rose, 1990:8). By drawing on the BNG case study areas this section argues that neighbourhood management, neighbourhood wardens, active children and residents’ associations as a means of community involvement are examples of community as a ‘new technology of government’.
6.4.1 Neighbourhood management: the expert management of community

The Neighbourhood Management Pathfinder (NMP) programme was launched in thirty-five deprived neighbourhoods in 2001 as a key element of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal. North Benwell, one of the case study areas was part of the original thirty-five neighbourhoods. The model of neighbourhood management being used is based on the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) Policy Action Team 4 Report on Neighbourhood Management in 2000. The Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) consolidated the ideas emerging from the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) and the SEU and made the connection between sustainability, inclusion and public service delivery.

Communities will be sustainable only if they are fully inclusive and basic minimum standards of public services are delivered. This is true everywhere, but especially so in the most deprived neighbourhoods and for the most vulnerable groups in society. The Neighbourhood Renewal Unit will continue to work to narrow the gap between deprived communities and the rest, through implementation of its national strategy action plan. At the centre of this is a drive to ensure that these communities benefit from effective public services. The Social Exclusion Unit will continue to underpin the vision of sustainable communities through its work to understand and tackle social exclusion. (ODPM, 2003a:23)

To ensure that communities are inclusive and deliver public services, the SCP states that neighbourhood management is the preferred 'arms length' technique,

“We will build on the successful Neighbourhood Management (NM) scheme – a way to join up the delivery of public services to a neighbourhood, in a partnership between communities and service providers. We will shortly launch a limited second round of NM pathfinders to explore the potential of this approach further” (ODPM, 2003a:22).

Neighbourhood management has several key features that are noted in Table 6.1.
Table 6.1: Key features of neighbourhood management (adapted from ODPM, 2006:6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management structure</td>
<td>A dedicated full time target Neighbourhood Manager with support team (e.g. neighbourhood wardens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Based within the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood criteria</td>
<td>A clearly defined target neighbourhood, with an average population of 10,500 (with a maximum of c20,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>A multi-sector partnership, including local community representation, to hold the Neighbourhood Manager to account and steer the initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Financial, employment and legal support provided by the local ‘accountable’ body, usually the local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Core funding to support the team and provide a project fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>A clear focus on influencing mainstream public services to make them more responsive to local needs, rather than delivering services themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike other area based initiatives, neighbourhood management is meant to focus on changing relationships between service providers, improve responsiveness to local needs and build a sense of shared responsibility in local communities rather than just distribute large pots of money (Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, NRU, 2003:1). Neighbourhood management is meant to be a process not a project (NRU, 2007) implying a more inclusive, thoughtful approach rather than an imposed pre-determined project. Overall neighbourhood management aims to tackle quality of life (liveability) issues in communities through a range of interlinking processes, such as, improving management of the local environment; increasing community safety; improving housing stock; working with young people and encouraging employment opportunities (NRU, 2007). Broadly speaking, NMPs either focus on deprived areas, for example the Benwell and Scotswood initiatives, that aim to “narrow the gap between deprived and affluent neighbourhoods” (ODPM, 2006:7) or operate across the whole of their local authority area, for example, Gateshead. The authority wide initiatives aim to improve services and improve responsiveness of services to local people in all areas (ODPM, 2006).
Since 2001, a Neighbourhood Management Network\textsuperscript{16} has developed which has moved beyond the initial 35 NMPs announced by the Government and now involves around 300 organizations using neighbourhood management (DCLG & LGA, October 2007). Although the key sponsors of neighbourhood management were local authorities and Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs), with its growth in popularity other organizations have become involved, such as Registered Social Landlords (RSLs). Furthermore, funding also now comes from a range of sources including the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF), New Deal for Communities (NDCs), Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) (NRU, 2003:2) and more recently HMR pathfinders, for example, BNG funds neighbourhood management.

A recent submission by the HMR pathfinders’ chairs to the Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) highlighted that an “area of funding where greater freedom is essential is in the provision of revenue support to neighbourhood management schemes” but because HMR is “a capital programme” the “level of revenue funding is limited”. So although the Government provides some revenue support for individual projects, neighbourhood management is not one of them (HMR Pathfinder Chairs, 2006:73). Although the submission states that “pathfinders do not want to enter into long term neighbourhood management as that is not their responsibility” most pathfinders, including BNG, have provided funding for neighbourhood management, recognizing that “revenue support is necessary to ensure a smooth transition from old to new” (HMR Pathfinder Chairs, 2006:74). Indeed the BNG Prospectus recognizes that neighbourhood management is an important factor in the transitional phase of urban regeneration when neighbourhoods are at their most vulnerable,

“Neighbourhood management to reflect local needs and help to support and sustain fragile neighbourhoods throughout the pathfinder areas” (BNG, 2004:39)

Thus, neighbourhood management is being integrated into HMR which implies at the local level in BNG it is not just concerned with housing. For BNG the key characteristics of neighbourhood management were agreed in July 2002 and aimed to improve services at neighbourhood level; devolve decision-making; properly timetable urban regeneration interventions at a “pace consistent with community concerns as well as agency and

\textsuperscript{16} Neighbourhood Management Network http://www.renewal.net/NNMN/ accessed 13/12/07
government demands and bring real benefits for local communities” (BNG, 2004:39). Overall, the BNG prospectus strongly asserts that the various neighbourhood management techniques “will provide a link between governance, strategy and sustainability” (BNG, 2004:39). Specifically, there are five main objectives for neighbourhood management within the BNG area - to increase community cohesion, improve confidence amongst residents, create a more stable population, provide a responsive service delivery within neighbourhoods and provide a more attractive environment (BNG, 2004:40). The five objectives are a local interpretation of the eight components of a sustainable community as outlined in the SCP (see Table 3.5 in Chapter 3). From the objectives the implication can be made that the existing communities are unsustainable because they lack cohesion and are heavily stigmatized, the citizens lack confidence, the communities are unstable, and have poor local services and an unattractive environment.

Therefore, to tackle low demand and develop sustainable communities, BNG promises that neighbourhood management is an “approach to deal with a wider range of issues than bricks and mortar and can be applied across tenures, particularly important in areas facing a concentration of interrelated social issues” (BNG, 2004:39). Neighbourhood management is more than ‘bricks and mortar’, in other words more than a physical approach to urban regeneration. Neighbourhood management in BNG claims to “build confidence within local communities” by “tackling local issues” from within the community, thereby “symbolizing a commitment to the community itself” (BNG, 2004:39). Most of the BNG communities suffer from heavily stigmatized reputations therefore; neighbourhood management intends to partly address this issue by ‘quick wins’ to boost confidence and thus, “internal and external perceptions can be effectively challenged as people’s experience of the area improves” (BNG, 2004:39). Furthermore, according to BNG “the engagement of local communities is central to neighbourhood management, and this process in itself is part of developing sustainable and confident communities” (BNG, 2004:40 emphasis added). Similar arguments have underpinned neighbourhood renewal and community development in the US as Osborne and Gaebler’s (1992) study of a public housing area in Washington demonstrated. Particularly relevant is equating a lack of confidence with ‘unsustainability’ because the residents did not take control of their own community and instead expected things to happen to them. In contrast, by creating confident residents “the empowerment of communities like Kenilworth-Parkside
not only changes expectations and instills confidence – it usually provides far better solutions to their problems than normal public services” (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992:65-6).

For the government neighbourhood management is a crucial technique of community governance in order to fulfill their belief detailed in the Local Government White Paper ‘Strong Prosperous Communities’ that,

“Communities should be taken seriously….if they are given the opportunity, more and more residents are prepared to take on responsibility for running certain services or proactively helping to make their neighbourhood a better place to live” (CLG, 2006a:38).

The emphasis is on “empowering local people to manage neighbourhoods” and neighbourhood management is cited in the White Paper as a technique by which to empower deprived communities (CLG, 2006a:38). The next section explores the establishment of neighbourhood management in Scotswood and Benwell.

Neighbourhood Management in Scotswood and Benwell

The North Benwell Neighbourhood Management Initiative (NBNMI) was set up in 2003 in response to long-standing problems such as low demand housing (e.g. houses selling for 50p), high levels of worklessness (twice the Newcastle average), high crime rates, low levels of pay and a poor physical environment (ODPM, 2006c). The area also had low levels of owner occupation; high turnover of residents, an increasing number of private landlords and poorly maintained houses (ODPM, 2006c). The population of North Benwell is 3,750, twenty per cent of whom are from black and minority ethnic (BME) groups. NBNMI is funded through BNG and is a partnership between Newcastle City Council, Northumbria Police and Home Housing. NBNMI works with partners to,

“identify solutions and shape service delivery that meets needs…and community development is a key aspect of this work, supporting individuals and groups to take part in renewal and regeneration” (NCC, 2006:26)
The neighbourhood manager and neighbourhood wardens are located within North Benwell. According to the policy literature and interviews the neighbourhood manager regularly consults local residents and local communities have been involved in making decisions about empty properties, street cleaning and directing environmental improvements through ‘Living Streets’ (CLG, 2006a:38 and Interview, 2007). As one of the 35 initial neighbourhood management initiatives, NBNMI is often cited as an example of ‘best practice’. Indeed, the Local Government White Paper cites the ‘impressive results’ from NBNMI and these were repeated in the interview conducted with the neighbourhood manager,

“crime has dropped in the first six months of 2006 by 45%, compared to the same period in 2003; local residents, the neighbourhood management office and registered social landlords have worked together to clear litter and rubbish as part of the annual ‘Clean Sweep Week’; empty homes have been reduced by almost 70% between December 2003 and October 2006; and dedicated help is given to newly arriving communities, coupled with wider community development to existing residents, to support a diverse and cohesive local community (CLG, 2006a:38 and Interview, 2007)

According to Rose (1999) one of the array of technologies of community are the ‘new experts of community’ who advise communities and citizens how they might be governed. Rose (1999) cites the examples of advertising agencies, political parties and pressure groups. For the new experts to govern they must link up with those in the community who have moral authority. Thus, drawing from Rose (1999), neighbourhood management can be viewed as an ‘expert manager of community’ who identifies and links up with those in the local community who claim moral authority. In the local communities, those who had lived there the longest claimed the moral authority and it is such people that the neighbourhood manager and other local councillors, urban regeneration professionals and community development workers ‘courted’ as legitimate community (see Section 6.4.4 on residents associations). This behaviour of ‘courting moral citizens’ was witnessed during the fieldwork, in interviews, focus groups and as an observer within the communities and at community, council and BNG meetings. The expert managers of community sift, sort and select citizens according to moral behaviour or anti social behaviour, though of course it is not such a clear duality in practice. The
prized citizen is the one demonstrating moral behaviour, the ones who care for their community and actively demonstrates their responsibility by volunteering. As Rose (1999:172) suggests, the ‘third sector’ of volunteers, charitable works and self care is a “moral field binding persons in durable relations”. Thus we see that a discourse of moral order as perceived by governmental technologies has become an important aspect of creating sustainable communities. At the same time, the discourse of moral order as perceived by governmental technologies identifies ‘disorder’ signalled by void houses and anti social behaviour (Johnstone and MacLeod, 2007).

In 2005, two years after the start of NBNMI, Newcastle City Council commissioned baseline surveys (see NCC, 2005a; NCC 2005b) to establish local people’s opinions of service provision in their local community. As mentioned earlier, surveys are a technique to make communities real (Rose, 1999). From the surveys a ‘Strategy Plan for 2005 – 2008, Managing Neighbourhoods through transition’ (NCC, 2005c) was devised that clearly stated the main aim of neighbourhood management in Scotswood and West Benwell,

“to provide effective strategic management of service delivery and local intervention to sustain local communities through transition to raise confidence in the areas future” (NCC, 2005c:3)

The survey questions were deliberately general and open ended in order not to lead the answers. The survey found that overwhelmingly local residents were most concerned about crime, in particular a fear of crime and dereliction. For example, in Scotswood arson attacks and joy riding were regular occurrences, so regular in fact that “you got used to it” (Scotswood Neighbourhood Manager, 2007). During this period, Scotswood was a ‘forgotten area’ abandoned by the police and other mainstream services, an area where an occupied house at the end of a row of empty houses awaiting demolition would be set on fire to “see how long it would be before they fled for their lives” (Scotswood Neighbourhood Manager, 2007). Indeed, in interviews with residents, community workers and the local authority they admitted that until the riots in Scotswood (in 1991) ‘the police wrote off the area’. Commentators of this period in the early 1990s argue that the problems were effectively ignored at first because “they happened on estates, in class communities overwhelmed by unemployment and crime” (Campbell, 1993:302).
Similarly, Power and Tunstall (1997) comment that the riots took place in communities characterized by traditional houses with gardens (not the high rise towers) and involved mainly young, white men in high unemployment areas. It is interesting to note that some 10-15 years on from that time, the fear of crime persists and is a major concern for residents. In consequence, neighbourhood wardens were seen to have a key role in such areas and they are discussed in the next section.

6.4.2 Neighbourhood wardens

“Deprived neighbourhoods can be demoralizing places to live. Not only do many residents face poor living conditions and difficult personal circumstances, but they may fear becoming victim to crime or anti-social behaviour, both of which are higher than average in these areas. Local streets and open spaces, scarred with graffiti, litter and abandoned cars, can only underline this bleak outlook. Neighbourhood wardens are taking responsibility for many of these problems – problems which in the past didn’t directly ‘belong’ to anyone. They are working to make the streets safer, cleaner places to be and helping to build a greater sense of community and better quality of life for residents. (ODPM, 2003b:2)

Drawing inspiration from the Dutch Stadswacht scheme of civic wardens, in the UK neighbourhood wardens first emerged from the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) in 2000. In 2002, neighbourhood wardens became associated with the government’s commitment to revive public spaces outlined in the report Living Places: Cleaner, Safer, Greener (ODPM, 2002). A year later in 2003 the Sustainable Communities Plan (ODPM, 2003a) incorporated neighbourhood wardens into their programme,

“Neighbourhood wardens in over 500 communities, improving the local environment and reducing crime and fear of crime” (ODPM, 2003a:15)

“We will continue to tackle the symptoms and causes of anti-social behaviour such as noisy neighbours, littering, graffiti, and vandalism that undermine the quality of life in our communities and especially in our most deprived neighbourhoods” (ODPM, 2003a:22)
“We will pursue plans for neighbourhood and street wardens to be a personal presence to take care of neighbourhoods, targeting crime, anti-social behaviour and local environmental problems, such as litter, fly-tipping and abandoned cars” (ODPM, 2003a:22)

Neighbourhood wardens have a specific remit to work in the communities and tackle long-standing issues such as such as fear of crime and anti-social behaviour because failure to make the communities safe and secure would seriously hamper regeneration attempts. In Benwell and Scotswood, neighbourhood wardens work alongside neighbourhood managers as part of the neighbourhood management team. The neighbourhood management teams have a neighbourhood manager plus two to four neighbourhood wardens. In Gateshead, the scheme operates differently. There are 29 neighbourhood wardens, 3 supervisors, a dedicated first line manager plus admin support; the service is uniformed and carries out patrols. In contrast to the Benwell and Scotswood neighbourhood wardens, the neighbourhood wardens in Gateshead work closely with Northumbria Police, so their role is similar to the police but with fewer powers, although they have the authority to serve £50 Fixed Penalty Notices under legislation such as the Environmental Protection Act and the Anti Social Behaviour Act. Unfortunately, no interviews with the neighbourhood management team or wardens in Gateshead could be established despite several attempts. Therefore, this section draws from the example of neighbourhood wardens in Benwell and Scotswood.

**Observing communities**

According to Rose (1999) programmes of community policing, community safety and community development are part of the array of techniques for mobilizing territories in the name of community self management. Here we can also add neighbourhood wardens, as part of their remit is to ‘observe communities’

“Wardens provide a visible, semi-official presence on streets and estates. They work at the grassroots with police and others to improve liveability, deter crime and tackle anti-social behaviour, creating a greater feeling of security and confidence among residents. This sort of informal observation has often been
lacking in recent years, as locally based services - such as housing caretakers, and area-based social and community workers - have withdrawn (ODPM, 2003b)

Neighbourhood wardens, alongside neighbourhood managers (and community development officers, etc) develop “new expert knowledges (Rose, 1999:190) of communities. Thus, “in the name of community, political programmes [neighbourhood wardens etc] disperse the tasks of knowing and governing through a myriad of micro-centres of knowledge and power” (Rose, 1999:190). Whilst the neighbourhood managers aim to build social capital by facilitating links between the main service providers and local people, the neighbourhood wardens aim to be the ‘eyes and ears’ on the street. As the neighbourhood manager for Scotswood (2007) said,

“the neighbourhood warden’s alone gave a really good feel good factor to residents in the area and we started working with the police because for a long time everything had been very disjointed”.

She added,

“the neighbourhood wardens have been in post for four years and have worked with the community and their role is about intelligence gathering, finding out where the fly tipping, graffiti, crime is and reporting it straight away. Over the years, they have been the eyes and ears on the ground and people contact the wardens more than the police because they get an immediate response. So what the wardens do is fill an important gap for people who have a fear of crime or have experienced crime and in the perception survey of the wardens themselves we had a 76% satisfaction rate and for the same period there was only 53% satisfaction for the police we had actually overtaken the police”(Scotswood Neighbourhood Manager, 2007).

The view expressed here gives an unproblematic impression of community supported by statistics. The ‘audit’ of resident satisfaction ensures that the government maintains control at an ‘arms length’.
Signalling disorder and ensuring responsible behaviour

In Benwell, discussions with the neighbourhood management team revealed an alternative impression because one neighbourhood of Benwell has a high migrant turnover. Historically, this neighbourhood in Benwell has been the first area of settlement for migrants new to the city. In consequence, the mix of ethnicities and cultures has posed problems for the wardens. The two main problems expressed in discussions with the team were communication difficulties and absent landlords. For example, at the local primary school in Benwell, fifty languages are spoken. Therefore, communicating ‘community norms and practices’ to the migrant population has proved difficult because the ‘community’ itself has changed. For example, eliminating household waste in the required local authority (and community) fashion, be it wheely bins and separating recyclable materials may seem an everyday, habitual community custom in many residential areas. Knowledge of such practices is gathered from observing (parents, neighbours) daily/weekly procedures, alongside community observation that ensures conformity. Participating ‘correctly’ in community household waste elimination practices is established whilst living in such communities over many years. For new migrant communities, everyday, habitual community practices are unknown and unusual unless observed and/or communicated to them.

Thus, in the Benwell migrant neighbourhood daily household waste and large items such as furniture were dumped in an ad hoc fashion in the streets. Attempts to contact the landlords had proved impossible, so to ensure the offending households conformed to community norms and practices a ‘pictorial’ leaflet had been designed that illustrated in colourful, cartoon fashion how and when to eliminate household waste. As Power (2004:12) argues, neighbourhood wardens aim to address “the most visible and immediate failure in conditions – cleanliness, order, security and maintenance”. Household waste, old mattresses etc dumped on the streets in a manner that does not conform to ‘responsible community behaviour’ are seen as ‘signals of disorder’ (Innes, 2004). Furthermore, as Crawford (2006:966) argues, “unkempt public places with graffiti, broken windows, litter and discarded needles can serve both to induce fear and encourage people not to use them”. Thus, in this case the neighbourhood wardens mobilize responsible behaviour in the communities by combining their surveillance methods and novel communication literature.
**Surveillance and engagement**

Both Benwell and Scotswood neighbourhood wardens have a surveillance role to observe and report incidents within the community and intervene where appropriate. Talking daily to the residents enables the neighbourhood wardens to build up their local knowledge and gather intelligence concerning the physical (e.g. fly tipping, broken windows) and social environment. Their regular participation in local community meetings, such as residents associations means they build up a community profile of ‘who talks to whom’, and ‘who does what’ as well as ‘who does not talk to anyone’ ‘who to trust’ and who not to trust’. As Evans et al (1996) argue, such insights are crucial in the local politics of cooperation. However, in Benwell and Scotswood their surveillance role is less obvious because it is cloaked within the daily, mundane activities intended to promote community cohesion and build social capital.

In Benwell and Scotswood, the neighbourhood wardens’ preferred method of community observation and engagement is not ‘police-like’ street patrols as in Gateshead. They liaised with the police but did not want to act like the police. This goes back to the 1991 riots in Scotswood (mentioned in the previous section) after which the area became a ‘no go’ area for the police (Campbell, 1993). As Paskell (2007:157) revealed in her study of community-police relations, “wardens tended to concentrate on engagement and police community support officers on enforcement”. The Benwell and Scotswood neighbourhood wardens’ concentrated on community involvement and engagement activities for example, helping to create a barbecue for the community and a children’s play garden at one of the neighbourhood centres in Scotswood. The neighbourhood centre provided crèche facilities, computer access and training and provided a regular meeting site for one of Scotswood residents’ associations. In Benwell and Scotswood the neighbourhood wardens were recruited for the skills they could bring to the role,

“the wardens have got a range of skills; Glynn used to be a landscaper, Tommy - there’s nothing that Tommy can’t do, he’s very IT literate and can build and mend anything, Andy he’s a football coach and Jim is multi-talented as well. It means I can tap into their skills” (Scotswood neighbourhood manager, 2007).
Thus, in Scotswood in particular, the role of neighbourhood wardens had been extended beyond the usual role outlined in government guidelines for neighbourhood wardens that include,

“environmental improvements; tenant liaison and information and community development; looking after empty properties; an information source for the police or local authority and professional witness service; visits to vulnerable tenants, victims of crime or intimidated witnesses; responding to minor incidents of anti-social behaviour and low level neighbourhood disputes; and looking after community services” (ODPM, 2003b).

In Scotswood, the neighbourhood wardens were establishing an educator’s role by providing youth services such as football training and swimming. Youth service provision had declined over the years and parents complained that this contributed to teenage anti-social activities such as drinking and drug use. Such behaviour has contributed to the area’s negative image, therefore the provision of alternative youth activities intends to contribute to the overall regeneration efforts.

**CCTV as a ‘technology of community surveillance’**

The neighbourhood wardens liaise regularly with resident and tenant groups and use these fora as a means by which to communicate and gather information. For example, my methodology included attendance at various community group meetings. The neighbourhood wardens also attended to report their activities. This was an opportunity for residents to air their gripes about anti-social behaviour. However, in Benwell and Scotswood a so-called ‘no grass’ mentality has persisted for many years. Over time the neighbourhood wardens have developed a relationship with many of the residents and are trusted more than the police, as this discussion with the neighbourhood manager reveals:

(Interviewee) “The neighbourhood wardens fill a gap in the community and in Scotswood they have a niche position. They’re trusted and liked and they’ve given confidence that wasn’t there before and they are the first point of contact for anything,
(Interviewer) And people go to them instead of the police?

Yes, they go to the wardens first and then they will pass on any information. Also we monitor the CCTV, because the police weren’t doing it as much as we liked. With one of the areas at the moment we have distinct problems because people say no matter how much they ring the police they never attend, but the wardens do. But the wardens don’t have the powers to stop them drinking and move them on so they will ring the police and there’s no response - and there’s a perception from the police that the wardens are there so they can deal with it, but they can’t because they don’t have the powers. They can just verify that there was 25 kids and they were smashing up a house or whatever. That’s all they can do they can’t put themselves in a confrontational position, so the residents have a lead on where the cameras are placed in the area so we see them as a community resource. It also gives a feel good factor and gives people some respite if they’re having a really bad time because of one bad family which we do have at the moment” (Scotswood neighbourhood manager, 2007)

A long-standing resident of Scotswood reiterated her faith in the wardens rather than the police, saying,

“...I’ll ring the wardens but I won’t ring the police because I think it’s going to come back on me, especially after last time when they wrote ***** is a grass on my door because the lads all saw me, who I was, where I live and I thought I’m not going through all that again and what they did with the car and then my son got his done two nights after that, they know we’re related” (Scotswood resident, 2007)

There are several issues here worth further consideration. For instance, the ‘residents have a lead on where the cameras [CCTV] are placed so we see them as a community resource’. Many have commented on CCTV as a technology of surveillance (Fyfe, 1997; 2004) to discipline those who live in disadvantaged communities (Johnstone, 2004) as part of a “normative strategy of spatial ordering” (Coleman, 2004:200). According to Nunn (2001), the use of new technologies of surveillance generates new ‘landscapes of
domination’. Here though we have a scenario where according to neighborhood management the police did not frequently observe the CCTV - so rather than the community being observed 24/7 as is the impression once a camera is in place, the surveillance is haphazard. Instead, the neighbourhood management teams enforce stricter surveillance within the community because they work *within* the community and have to face the residents every day. The police work at ‘arms length’ relying on neighbourhood management teams and the residents to report crime. The police can then assess from the reported incidents whether their presence in the community or to a household is necessary. Cochrane (2007:82) suggests how:

“In the United Kingdom there has been a shift of emphasis from policing from the outside, towards policing from within communities, and indeed an emphasis on the management of social order (including acts that are not strictly ‘criminal’) through communities”.

Overall, my findings agree with Cochrane, although ‘policing within the community’ does not necessarily mean ‘a police presence patrolling the community’. Instead, social order is managed via ‘arms length policing’ through the technologies (neighbourhood wardens assisted by CCTV) that instill a ‘police-like’ presence within the community.

Another unusual aspect here is that the residents are engaged in the management of CCTV within their community against those whose behaviour does not conform. For many years, the long-standing residents have had no control in their community and in the absence of police and a fear of reprisals; criminal elements had gained control. Discussions with the residents revealed that CCTV technology was welcomed as they believed it allowed them to establish some control of their own lives and the wider community. In this sense, the CCTV technology is an ‘enabling technology’ for the disempowered if they are involved in its management. Involvement in the management of CCTV though is determined by selection and only those deemed ‘active and responsible’ by neighbourhood management teams can participate in the management of state owned surveillance technologies. Ironically, the ‘active, responsible citizen’ becomes part of the array of technologies used to govern their own community whereby “certain codes of conduct and social responsibilities are now being constructed around neighbourhood spaces” (Johnstone, 2004:63).
As Johnstone (2004) argues, the aim to build active, responsible communities combines self-discipline, with externally imposed policies for neighbourhood regeneration and the appointment of neighbourhood wardens and neighbourhood management coupled with CCTV.

6.4.3 Turning ‘active children’ into active adults

In North Benwell there are two Junior Street Warden Schemes for local primary school children that aims to involve local children in the management of their communities and teach good citizenship skills (BNG SCU, 2007:19). The children take part in warden patrols, visit the fire station and spend a day with local police officers. Overall, the Scotswood and Benwell Neighbourhood Management Initiatives aim to sustain and maintain long-term liveability and empower local people to have pride in their community and feel a sense of place. This, it is hoped will raise confidence and self-esteem whilst building community capacity and participation (BNG SCU, 2007:19). Also, in Scotswood there are two groups of children aged between 5 and 12 – the ‘Weeney Wardens’ and 13 and 16 who work in their free time as Junior Wardens. The Junior Wardens’ activities include planting 16,000 bulbs along Scotswood Road, learning about seasonal planting, types and names of plants and landscape management. Other Junior Warden activities include litter picking, photographic projects and presentation skills (e.g. used to present to the project board) – so a range of activities from gardening, IT to photography. The Weeney Wardens in conjunction with Scotswood Play Centre have been involved in their own gardening and healthy eating project ‘Know It, Sow It, Grow It’. The Scotswood Neighbourhood Manager and Street Wardens claim that such diversional activities have not only helped build up rapport between the children and wardens (and kept them out of trouble) but has also built up the children’s self esteem,

“they are very, very skilled imaginative and innovative children and they had such a downer on themselves at the start ‘oh we’re from Scotchy, we’re thick, we’re stupid that’s what we’ve been told’ and I was mortified and said ‘no you’re not you are what you can make of yourself’, so we got them to learn about the history and they were in awe of that because they just knew Scotswood as been thought
of as a dump so they associated themselves like that” (Scotswood Neighbourhood Manager, 2007).

This quote illustrates the damaging effects that living in a perceived ‘dump’ can have on its residents and in particular on its children and their future aspirations and life chances (see Chapter 8 for more on stigma).

In a survey undertaken by Newcastle City Council about residents’ perceptions, awareness and experiences of the neighbourhood wardens there was a call for “increased action/bonding with troublesome young people and burglary and disruptive/threatening youths were considered to be the two main anti-social behaviour problems” (Newcastle City Council, 2005a:25). In Benwell, funding from Riverside North East (a Registered Social Landlord) has enabled Benwell Neighbourhood Management Initiative to extend the Junior Warden scheme to 60 local children aged between ten and eleven who learn about the consequences of fly tipping, graffiti and fire safety. The local police explained to the Junior Wardens the consequences of crime and social behaviour for the perpetrator and from the perspective of the victim, i.e. how victims cope with crime. The Junior Wardens are expected to become the ‘eyes and ears of the neighbourhood’. Before graduating to the streets, the Neighbourhood Wardens (adult) provide training, disposable cameras and notebooks so the Junior Wardens can record and report their findings. As the Benwell Neighbourhood Manager comments in an interview,

“Young people have a vital role to play in the regeneration of this community and the Junior Warden programme encourages and trains active, responsible young citizens who can help Benwell become a safer, cleaner and more welcoming place. It also builds better relationships between them and community groups as well as teaching the junior wardens new skills”.

The encouragement of ‘active children’ is part of the governments’ wider agenda to increase civic participation. There has been an increasing recognition of children’s participatory rights and for the government, citizenship education is both a right and a responsibility of the public (O’ Hare and Gay, 2006). In England, the citizenship curriculum, in line with the Crick Report of 1998, is structured around three interrelated themes - Social and moral responsibility. Pupils learning - from the very beginning – self
confidence and socially and morally responsible behaviour both in and beyond the classroom, towards those in authority and towards each other. Community involvement: Pupils learning about becoming helpfully involved in the life and concerns of their neighbourhood and communities, including learning through community involvement and service to the community. Political literacy: Pupils learning about the institutions, problems and practices of our democracy and how to make themselves effective in the life of the nation, locally, regionally and nationally through skills and values as well as knowledge - a concept wider than political knowledge alone (Crick, 1998 cited in O’Hare and Gay, 2006:14).

In 2006, the work of Sir Bernard Crick “who has pressed for education for active citizenship so indefatigably” (Home Office/Civil Renewal Unit, 2004:1) was incorporated into the report ‘Active learning for active citizenship’. The report extended the ‘active citizenship’ curriculum beyond schools into communities because,

“As the Home Secretary, David Blunkett MP says, ‘the crucial policy imperatives are clear. We must aim to build strong, empowered and active communities’ (Edith Kahn Memorial Lecture, 2003). We should therefore work to improve the capacity of individuals and communities to relate to the world around them as active, critical, engaged citizens” (Home Office/Civil Renewal Unit, 2004: 1)

The implication here is that inactive, disengaged citizens are inward looking – they cannot relate to communities beyond their own because they lack the capacity. The techniques used to create active citizens via education in schools and within the community can be viewed as a ‘softly, softly’ approach to civilize problematic neighbourhoods troubled by anti social behaviour (see Bannister et al, 2006 for more on civility/incivility). The emphasis on citizenship curriculums for all age groups, either the formalized school citizenship programs or the less formal techniques within the community such as the promotion of residents’ associations (section 6.4.4) are ‘soft’ techniques if compared to ‘hard techniques’ such as Anti Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs), Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs), Parenting Orders or Dispersal Orders (see Atkinson and Helms, 2007). The ‘soft techniques’ foster active, respectable, civilized behaviour that ‘divert’ young people away from the anti-social alternative pathway. Boredom has been identified as one of the main reasons for anti social
behaviour therefore; to change behaviour diversionary interventions are becoming increasingly common. However, involvement in diversionary techniques is usually limited to those who behave and the very people whom it is most important to reach are those who are least likely to become involved in official projects (Environment Committee, 2004). In one sense, the ‘active children’ are allowed to participate in the construction of their environment on a similar footing to adults because they have demonstrated their respectability and civility in becoming a junior warden. For other children, their urban space, which is the same urban space, is controlled by the hard techniques of government such as ASBOs. Junior Wardens – children with a surveillance role to observe children and adults and report incidents to their adult counterparts, also control the urban space. Thus by learning citizenship in the classroom and ‘doing citizenship’ in the community, the government hopes that active children will become active adults - the ‘responsibilization’ (Rose, 1996, 1999) of children. Involving young people in regeneration increases the long-term sustainability of the improvements (Environment Committee, 2004) however, not all young people have the opportunity to participate.

6.4.4 Managerial technologies and self-management of community: the example of residents associations

The notion of community offers the prospect of self-management and a new way of management, through managerial technologies (Cochrane, 2007) such as neighbourhood management. Managerial technologies involve problematizing communities in particular ways to understand them and make them amenable to action. In the case study areas, individuals and communities are problematized on the basis of their behaviour, either as responsible, active citizens or inactive and apathetic or pathological and anti-social (or even criminal). The solution to this is a combination of targeting the already active, seeking out and encouraging the inactive and punishing the anti-social and criminal. Thus, the case study areas, amongst the poorest urban spaces of NewcastleGateshead, are subject to a myriad of surveillance techniques (CCTV, surveys, neighbourhood and junior wardens) to classify and interpret the inhabitants, thus, rendering them visible. Then in the name of ‘involving communities’ and ‘increasing social capital and cohesion’ (Neighbourhood Manager Interviews, 2007) the neighbourhood managers actively promote the establishment of resident/tenant associations and other community interest groups.
Residents’ associations are a technique of community governance that offer the prospect of ‘self-management’, as the former Home Secretary, Charles Clarke argued,

“The government is committed to promoting and developing community involvement and self-help as part of their overall aim of improving the quality of life in all communities” (Hansard, 2000).

The government allocates funds to neighbourhood managers “that provide expert advice; support and training to local community groups to help strengthen the community sector infrastructure and fight crime” (Hansard, 2000). Thus, the government ensures central control using funding as a ‘technology of power’ (Davis, 2001; Whitehead, 2003; Brownhill and Carpenter, 2009). Intervention is justified because,

“All active communities and tenants and residents associations make a massive difference in reducing crime in many communities” (Hansard, 2000).

The implication is that active participation in community actually deters crime and anti-social behaviour. The political problem of crime and anti-social behaviour in certain urban spaces is made visible and thinkable by rationalities and solutions are guided by moral and ethical principles (Rose, 2000). Thus, the behaviour of individuals can be managed at arms length through community but the ultimate goal is ‘self-management’.

In Scotswood and Walker Riverside, a number of residents’ associations already exist. Most were formed in response to the ‘Going for Growth’ demolition proposals (see Chapter 7) therefore; the participants are active and responsible citizens (Neighbourhood Manager and Local Councillor Interviews, 2007). The neighbourhood managers liaise with existing resident associations, as do local councillors, community development workers and neighbourhood wardens etc. Thus, neighbourhood management as the ‘expert manager of community’ courts those who have the moral authority within the community i.e. those who have lived there the longest.

However, one has to be cautious about the imposition of self-management. In an insightful paper, ‘The Trapdoor of Community’, Steve Herbert argues that communities can give way under the expectations that the state places upon it and therefore cannot
fulfill the obligations that the state wishes to off-load (Herbert, 2005). In this sense, community can act as a trapdoor ready to give way when overloaded with excessive political expectations. In Scotswood and Walker Riverside, the existing resident associations comprise mainly of elderly women who in discussions described their feelings of duty and responsibility, but also their concern that no-one else was willing to take over when someone moved, became ill or died. This is a particular problem in areas undergoing regeneration and demolition because long-standing residents (thirty to forty years was common) are being moved out of their community (Chapter 7, Section 7.7). As one of Herbert’s respondents complained, the self-sacrifice and responsibility can be too much and to her “the state becomes suspect as it seeks to make her and her neighbours more responsible” (Herbert, 2005:853).

In communities where few or no residents’ associations exist such as Benwell and Felling, the neighbourhood managers intervene and attempt to create such groups. There are certain factors that constitute a ‘legitimate’ resident association. Legitimate meaning the resident association has been formally recognized by the local council and thus can receive funds. For resident associations to be formal and legitimate they must have a constitution, democratically elect a chair, secretary and treasurer, hold regular meetings (mostly monthly) at which minutes are taken and circulated, keep accounts, raise funds, hold an Annual General Meeting and have a minimum of five members. A meeting place is needed for example, a local public building such as the Benwell Library and as well as neighbourhood management, the local councillors usually attend with appearances as necessary from local police, the regeneration team etc. The neighbourhood management team identifies training needs, for example, minute taking or IT and support needs as well as raising and ‘sparking’ interest in participation. However, the Benwell neighbourhood manager identified in discussions a fine line between ‘support’ and ‘dependency’,

“we can provide support but it’s that balance between supporting and actually running a group and it’s NOT (original emphasis) about us running a group” (Interview Benwell Neighbourhood Manager, 2007).
In certain circumstances though the neighbourhood manager does intervene to ensure the resident association continues, for example, chairing the meeting when a member has had to stand down.

**Conclusion**

This chapter draws on two aspects of governmentality - rationalities and technologies to understand governing communities in spaces of regeneration. Beginning with the rationalities of community governance, the discussion starts with ‘the problem and solution of community’ i.e. the way in which community is simultaneously presented as diagnosis and cure. An assessment of national and local policy documents reveals that political (and social) problems in areas of urban regeneration are rendered manageable by thinking of them in terms of active citizenship, active communities and social capital. These rationalities help legitimize the moral and ethical principles that underpin them such as responsibilization and self-management. However, the responsibilization of community involves new technologies of government. The second half of the chapter develops the argument that neighbourhood management, neighbourhood wardens, active children and residents associations are technologies of government that promise ‘power to’ the communities. Yet as the chapter reveals, at this stage in the regeneration process, ‘action at a distance’ means state agents working in communities to sift, monitor, report and intervene to control and manage ‘good and bad’ behaviour rather than shifting power and control to communities. Control that is given to communities (e.g. resident’s associations and the CCTV) is conditional on demonstrating moral, responsible behaviour and is only ‘control on a long leash’ because the local state agents still have influence.
CHAPTER 7

Demolishing community

“all that is solid melts into air” (Marx and Engels, 1848:7)

Figure 7.1 Demolition in Newcastle, 1960

7. 1 Introduction

This chapter aims to extend our understanding of the creation and recreation of ‘communities’ by focusing on something that is either taken for granted or largely ignored (in general debates on community, and indeed governance more widely): the material moments of destruction and creation; and here the chapter draws on a set of literatures on materiality, infrastructures and repair and maintenance. The chapter also focuses on the social moments of destruction and creation, of ‘being moved’ and here the thesis draws on literatures on mobility, class, home and emotion. This opens up some fresh opportunities for examining and interpreting the process of creating community by

---

17 Jimmy Forsyth/Tyne and Wear Archives accessed via Newcastle City Council website www.newcastle.gov.uk accessed 05/06/07
thinking of the power geometries that emerge once the many different relations meet in space.

### 7.2 Interpreting demolition and relocation

“No space ever vanishes utterly leaving no trace” (Lefebvre, 1991:164)

Demolition is back on the UK urban regeneration policy agenda. More than three decades after the notorious slum clearances of the 1960s and 1970s, demolition is arguably the most controversial aspect of the Government’s plans to create sustainable communities (ODPM, 2003a). But despite demolition’s re-emergence within UK urban policy combined with its potential to restructure the urban landscape, eliminate buildings of significant historic, cultural and architectural importance (Weber et al, 2006:19) the materiality of demolition, the social consequences of relocation and interrelationship between the material and social aspects of demolition have received very little scholarly attention. Academic demolition literature concentrates on the historical (for example, Page, 1999; Byles, 2005), quantitative (for example, Bender, 1979; Weber et al, 2006; Van der Flier and Thomsen, 2006), on demolition waste (for example, Hendriks and Pietersen, 2000). More broadly, additional literature involves debates concerning demolition and the deconcentration of poverty (Goetz, 2000; Crump, 2002); heritage (English Heritage, 2007) and sustainability (Sustainable Development Commission, SDC, 2007; Boardman, 2007; Power, 2008). Indeed, it would seem that more emphasis has been given to the ‘end point’ with a rush to ‘create’ rather than exploring in detail the actual processes. This is surprising given the strong emotions it evokes amongst the communities affected (see Cole and Flint, 2007) and the dramatic transformative effect it has on the material and social landscape of urban areas. Demolition has distinctive spatial aspects – the areas targeted as part of state-led planning and the areas of ‘relocation. Furthermore, the decision to demolish and the process and impact of relocation are related to complex material, social, political and environmental power geometries and networks. Therefore, this section begins with the development of conceptual ideas introduced in Chapter 4.

#### 7.2.1 Demolition as a technology of government

The process of demolition does not just happen – we are not talking here about the decay and ruin of buildings through neglect. Demolition (and relocation) as part of
sustainable community policy is ‘government-led’ therefore to understand the rationalities and techniques of demolition, governmentality is most useful. The scrutiny of spaces of regeneration in order to decide which houses will be demolished involves decisions about ‘normality’ or ‘abnormality’ (Foucault, 2004) or in regeneration language, sustainability or unsustainability. Drawing from Foucault’s (1977) understanding of power and close observation to ‘normalize’ behaviour through various discipline techniques, the argument is developed that demolition is a technology of government. Demolition is a technology of government whereby, conduct is shaped at ‘arms length’ by the erasure of certain houses, streets etc within certain urban spaces in order to normalize behaviour in spaces of regeneration. Governmentality allows us to understand and explain the political rationalities, that is, the justification for demolishing buildings and relocating communities (see Section 7.4 for rationalities) and the techniques (see Section 7.5) that put the rationalities into practice.

7.2.2 Materiality and matter

In geography, Jackson (2000) called for social and cultural geography to be ‘rematerialized’. Jackson (2000) is interested in ‘material culture’ the relationship between humans and non-humans, people and things, a relationship that in recent years has perhaps been most central to actor-network theory. In contrast, Philo (2000) called for geography to be rematerialized but the material referred to here is the more tangible matter (Lees, 2002). Philo (2000: 33) is concerned with geography’s “preoccupation with immaterial cultural processes, with the constitution of intersubjective meaning systems, with the play of identity politics through the less-than-tangible, often-fleeting spaces of texts, signs, symbols, psyches, desires, fears, and imaginings. I am concerned that, in the rush to elevate such spaces in our human geographical studies, we have ended up becoming less attentive to the more ‘thingy’, bump-into-able, stubbornly there-in-the-world kinds of ‘matter’ (the material) with which earlier geographers tended to be more familiar”.

In urban geography, Lees (2002:102) illustrates a similar material/immaterial dichotomy over the process of gentrification,
“Two names headed the gentrification debates of the time: Neil Smith focused on the material dimensions of the gentrification process, as exemplified in, for instance, his rent gap thesis; while David Ley focused on the immaterial dimensions of the process such as ‘new’ middle class attitudes towards the central city”.

For my thesis, materiality means ‘matter’ and the ‘immaterial’, the fixity and flow as mentioned in Chapter 4. Matter means the built infrastructure; in my case study areas, it means the houses and shops in residential areas due for demolition (or refurbishment). The immaterial dimension or cultural materiality means the social aspect of demolition – the loss of home, the emotional geographies and ‘being moved’. Thus to understand the entangled character of social and material relations during the process of demolition actor-network theory provides a framework for developing a materially heterogeneous account of the relations between space and politics (Murdoch, 1998).

7.2.3 Presence, ‘perpetual perishing’ and absence

Buildings are simultaneously shaped and shaping (Gieryn, 2002:35). Demolition similarly reshapes urban spaces and therefore can be seen as part of the shifting scene of urban residential landscapes not least within the context of regeneration. As Gieryn (2002:35) suggests,

“Buildings don’t just sit there imposing themselves. They are forever objects of (re)interpretation, narration and representation – and meanings or stories are sometimes more pliable than the walls and floors they depict”

Buildings, in this sense are ‘present’ within the urban landscape but they are not a permanence. As Harvey (1996:261) argues, “permanences - no matter how solid they may seem – are not eternal: they are always subject to time as perpetual perishing” (emphasis added). Thus, buildings can be viewed as a ‘semi-permanence’; with their presence in space of regeneration being contingent on the politics and process of demolition. The ‘politics of demolition’ emerge when the different individuals and groups meet in spaces of regeneration. It is then that the ‘power geometries’ of the various
performers emerge and the semi-permanent shaped matter of houses is reshaped by a network of negotiations, contestations and agreements from which a new space materializes. The process of demolition ‘dissolves’ buildings and the presence of matter is transformed into absence. Thus, thinking of spaces of regeneration in terms of matter, the space is punctuated by absence and presence. Understanding materiality as perpetual perishing enables us to consider the spatial transformations and the way in which power relations of demolition create new spaces, absent of ‘some’ built matter (those houses demolished). By thinking of buildings in spaces of regeneration as a ‘semi-permanence’ rather than contained and permanent is a challenge, especially when a particular space and place is intertwined with history, family, memories and it is home (see Section 7.7 on relocation).

7.2.4 The politics of unbuilding, subtraction and class

Certain houses, streets, places are chosen to be demolished by government. The rationalities of demolition are discussed in Section 7.4. This section considers the ‘politics of unbuilding’ (Graham, 2004) and ‘subtraction’ (Easterling, 2005) because they contribute to a relational conceptualization of demolition as a complex network of power geometries. Graham (2004) develops the notion of a ‘politics of unbuilding’ from his work on the way in which warfare is woven into the fabric of cities and practices of urban planners. However, as Graham (2004:178) argues, quoting Berman (1996) “much ‘planned’ urban change, even in times of ‘peace’, itself involves war-like levels of violence, destabilization, rupture, forced expulsion and place annihilation”. As Graham (2004:171) explains,

“place annihilation can be thought of as a kind of hidden history – and sometimes not so hidden – planning history [as] the planned devastation and killing of cities is a dark side of the discipline of urban planning that is rarely acknowledged, let alone analyzed”.

Therefore, the question arises, to what extent can the plan to create sustainable communities be seen as an attempt to erase the white working class by place annihilation (demolition and relocation) (see Allen, 2008). The focus on the ‘politics of ‘unbuilding’ rather than building is being witnessed in many old, industrial cities of the world, where the challenge is to overcome obsolescent structures, abandoned
neighbourhoods and war-like levels of gang and drug related violence and arson (Vergara, 1997) rather than plan for growth. This is the problem faced by many former industrial working class communities targeted by housing market renewal, hence the dramatic and controversial interventions.

In addition, to geographical work, architecture contributes to our conceptual development of demolition. According to Keller Easterling, most architectural scholarship has focused on building - as one would probably expect. To build something new, especially in cities, there has also to be ‘unbuilding’ or ‘the subtraction of building’. As Easterling (2005:162) argues, “the subtraction of building has arguably been at least as important as the making of building during the last half-century”. Architects, Easterling (2005) argues, are ‘in love with the tabula rasa’ which is the utopian blank slate on which a new building is conceived. For Easterling (2005:162) the tabula rasa is a “weapon of delusional superiority in aesthetic generational wars” and a “weapon of patient urban magistrates whose masquerades of cleansing and purifying diseased fabric often disenfranchise entire populations”. As Easterling (2005:178) goes on to argue,

“Whatever the destructive force of architecture, the architect’s self portrayal is often as an innocent healer who appears only in the aftermath of subtraction with a restorative plan. While building may be embedded in volatile or violent urban ecologies, the discipline often does not recognize the warfare or aggression of architecture. Nor is it accustomed to recognizing subtraction as a technique or tool used either deliberately or in collusion”

Furthermore, and importantly,

“Each species of subtraction presents different techniques, motives, or results. Some subtractions erase information; some release a flood of information and association. Some gradually recondition space, while others deliver debilitating attrition....the least spectacular deletions, which operate in subterfuge, without dynamite or bombs, may even be the most violent” (Easterling, 2005:179, emphasis added).
7.2.5 Disconnecting infrastructures

“the problem with contemporary social theory is that predominantly it has theorized connection and assembly. But there are good reasons to think that, in the overall scheme of things, disconnection and disassembly are just as important” (Graham and Thrift, 2007:11)

Focusing on ‘infrastructure’ as another dimension of materiality and drawing on the theory of ‘splintering urbanism’ (Graham and Marvin, 2001) adds to the understanding of demolition in terms of connection and disconnection. With regard to demolition, infrastructure refers to the tangible matter such as the networks of pipes, wires, roads etc and the less tangible because they are invisible to the naked eye – the flows of energy, telecommunications, water and so on. The splintering urbanism theory allows us to understand the way in which infrastructural networks are being segmented into different network elements and services (‘unbundling’) that contributes to the “fragmentation of the social and material fabric of cities” (Graham and Marvin, 2001:33). Splintering urbanism creates a widening gap between connected and unconnected (or disconnected) places and people, in which,

“the poverty that matters is not so much material poverty but a poverty of connections,” which “limits a person or group’s ability to extend their influence in time and space” (Graham and Marvin, 2001:288).

By thinking of infrastructural networks in relation to demolition in terms of connection, disconnection and fragmentation, it provides a basis for analysis that considers the way in which infrastructure and power relations emerge in spaces of urban regeneration. As McFarlane and Rutherford (2008:366) argue, “the development of urban infrastructure is always a highly political process” because

“At a given time in any city, one finds a physical fabric above and below ground being produced, altered, repaired, maintained and demolished by a host of builders, developers, architects, engineers, bulldozers and diggers” (McFarlane and Rutherford, 2008:366).
Infrastructures and technologies are not neutral, but “politics pursued by other means” (Latour, 1988: 38). The networks of material infrastructures simultaneously connect and disconnect across scales, thus McFarlane and Rutherford (2008:370) argue that “a focus on the constitution of power relations and the exercise of politics in the development of urban infrastructure is crucial”. For understanding demolition, the focus for analysis is not on the development of urban infrastructures but on the ‘sociotechnical geometries of power’ (Graham and Marvin, 1998; Massey, 1993) mediating the dismantling of material infrastructures and the social and environmental consequences of disconnection.

### 7.2.6 Repair and maintenance

The contribution of Graham and Thrift (2007) is particularly helpful in drawing attention to the notion of ‘repair and maintenance’. The main argument here is that ‘repair and maintenance’ contributes to the conceptualizations of demolition because it allows us to understand sustainability and materiality. According to Graham and Thrift (2007:3), the processes of maintenance and repair “are the main means by which the constant decay of the world is held off”. Drawing on the work of Heidegger, they argue that,

“things only come into visible focus when they become inoperable – they break or stutter and they then become the object of attention. The background is thereby foregrounded” Graham and Thrift (2007:4).

The notion of ‘housing in the background’ is discussed by King (2006:7) who argues that housing is that which we are in the midst of, that we move in, which offers us protection, which allows us comfort and security, which is incidental to our lives and has ‘thereness’. However, some houses and some communities become ‘foregrounded’ when they are the object of Government policy and they become ‘visible’ because of a ‘break or stutter’.\(^{18}\) Of course, it needs to be underlined that most housing foregrounded in urban regeneration policy is social housing and the responsibility of repair and maintenance is and has been with the local authorities or housing associations.

---

\(^{18}\) The “break and stutter” here refers to the early stages of urban regeneration, when certain communities become the focus of urban regeneration policy. In later stages of regeneration, houses, communities etc become ‘foregrounded’ and ‘visible’ because of their success – as examples of ‘best practice’.
Over time, the type and quantity of repair and maintenance interventions have changed due to several factors. First, the house and its components’ (material, technology and energy) aging. Second, the proliferation and complexity of materials, technologies and energy sources added to the house in the process of maintenance and repair or after technological advances - which then require repair and maintenance, for example, internet, cable and digital technologies (Graham and Thrift, 2007:5). Third, changes in housing governance and the role of the state, for example, the shift from ‘welfarism’ and the state provision of council housing to ‘individualism’ and the ‘right to buy’ to the provision of social housing through the ‘third sector’ in the form of housing associations. With this shift, there is a corresponding expectation in social housing that the provision of repair and maintenance is dependent on responsible behaviour. Finally, changes in ideology and popular culture concerning home ownership and media programmes encouraging DIY e.g. the repair and maintenance of home (e.g. ‘Changing Rooms’ or ‘Ground Force’) or house buying whereby repair and maintenance contributes to profit (e.g. ‘Homes under the Hammer’).

The notion of repair and maintenance contributes to our understanding of demolition in two ways. First, it enables us to ask questions concerning the role of repair and maintenance in the rationalities of demolition. The extent to which the justification for demolition is related to the deliberate stopping, failure or interruption of repair and maintenance. For example, are the houses no longer deemed worthy of maintenance and repair – beyond repair? Or can demolition be seen as part of the maintenance and repair process? Second, it contributes to our understanding of sustainability and sustainable communities from a material perspective, for example, the extent to which a house, community etc is foregrounded or remains in the background depends on regular repair and maintenance. The proposition being that a sustainable community is one where the houses are repaired and maintained regularly whereas, an unsustainable community exhibits housing with signs of disrepair. Thus, there is a relationship between repair and maintenance and sustainability because repair and maintenance contributes to longevity and for many, sustainability simply means something that lasts.
7.2.7 The emotional dimension

Demolition is not only an issue of politics, governance, policy, materiality etc because for the individuals or indeed communities ‘being moved’ it is an ‘emotional issue’. Here the work of Harrison and Smith (2001; see also Davidson and Milligan, 2004; Davidson et al, 2005) is drawn upon to understand the relationship between demolition and emotions. Policy has human dimensions and “emotions are an intensely political issue and a highly gendered one” (Harrison and Smith, 2001:7). According to Harrison and Smith (2001), emotions are viewed as subjective, essentially private and apart from the public/policy sphere. The heightened spaces of emotion evoked by professionals through music, theatre, film is the most obvious route into emotional geographies. Of concern here though is the ‘emotions of the everyday’, the human geographies when we embrace “emotive topographies and their structures of feeling” (Williams, 1977:132). Harrison and Smith (2001) suggest areas such as employment studies, economic geography, population geography and international migration and of relevance here, housing studies as possibilities for developing an emotional dimension. As they acknowledge, house buying and selling is one of the most stressful of life events because the process is charged with emotional relations between a host of parties (Anderson and Smith, 2001). If we then consider the emotional relations of demolition and relocation, it will contribute to our understanding of ‘being moved’. It is important to recognize ‘the politics of emotions’ in relation to demolition and relocation because in contrast to most house moves, this is not a personal decision and choice.

7.3 Demolition in a local historical context

Even though local authorities have had the power to selectively demolish houses for years (and have done so with around 40,000 local authority owned house demolished between 1991 and 1997, DETR, 2000) there are several reasons, within a historical context that explain why there has been a reluctance to demolish and why demolition is controversial. First, local authorities have been reluctant to demolish their own dwellings, because of a political commitment to social housing and because demolition invariably led to a net loss of dwellings (DETR, 2000). Second, the post war ‘slum clearance’ of two million dwellings to create ‘utopian’ new estates and new towns meant that city populations declined and as Dunleavy (1981) argues there was a deep contradiction between the gains of the mass housing programme in dwellings and amenities, and the
upheavals it caused. Third, the large scale compulsory purchase of houses, many of which were structurally sound and despite strong local resistance (Crossman, 1975) led to the rupture of informal family and kinship networks (Power and Mumford, 1999). In consequence, the victims of clearance, ‘the slum dwellers’ were moved to new housing estates and large tracts of inner Newcastle, Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham and Glasgow etc were virtually wiped out between 1955 and 1975 (Power and Mumford, 1999:69). Nearly five million people were compulsorily moved (Halsey, 1988 cited in Power and Mumford, 1999).

7.3.1 The legacy of demolition in Newcastle

The comparison then with the demolition plans of housing market renewal is inevitable because the same cities and in many cases the same families are once more the target of demolition and forced relocation. An irony that Power and Mumford (1999:1) notice,

“Britain ran the largest slum clearance programme in the western world after the Second World War. Yet, we are contemplating new urban clearances. We are demolishing thousands of the very homes we built to replace those slums”.

Even though the scale of demolition and forced relocation is much less, the historical legacy lingers in memories and in families’ own histories. For example, in discussions with families in Walker they told me of their ‘forced relocation’ history back through several generations. Their residential history began in the Shieldfield area of central Newcastle, in a terraced house in the early part of the 20th century. After these ‘slums’ were demolished they were moved to another terraced house in Byker, in the east of the city and then when these ‘slums’ were demolished they were moved to Walker to a new council housing estate. Now in their retirement they are being moved once again (Walker Focus Group, 2007). Another family told of a similar relocation history but theirs included quite a long residence in a pre-fabricated house after the Second World War before being moved into a council house. The lack of control over movement is perhaps most striking. For some families their choice of home has been dictated and controlled by the state for generations. Thus, it is within this historical context of demolition and forced relocation that Newcastle City Council (NCC) announced a radical and extensive programme of demolition as part of their ‘Going for Growth’ (GfG) regeneration plan (see Byrne, 2000; Cameron, 2003; Shaw, 2000).
7.3.2 Going for growth

In 1998, the Unitary Development Plan for Newcastle upon Tyne assumed that 100 dwellings per annum would be cleared through removal of the worst stock and estate remodelling (Newcastle Unitary Development Plan, UDP, 1998:25). However, the UDP cautioned that “no allowance has been made for any extensive clearance of pre-1914 housing, much of which was improved in the 1970s with a notional 30 year lifespan in view” (Newcastle UDP, 1998:25). That ‘notional life span’ was about to become an ‘end of life span’ when the ‘Going for Growth’ (GfG) Green Paper was published by NCC with a citywide vision to take the city forward to 2020 (NCC, 2000a). The council saw its options at this time to either ‘manage decline or go for growth’ (Benwell and Scotswood Councillor, 2007) and – in a politically charged enactment of Logan and Molotch’s (1987) Growth Machine metaphor – it decided to go for growth. The ‘radical’ GfG plans were based on the premise that in “certain areas the urban infrastructure is broke and cannot be mended” (NCC, 2000b:7); metaphors which resonate more with Graham and Marvin’s (2001) conceptualizations of ‘splintered urbanism’ and ‘disconnections’. According to NCC (2000b) growth means increasing the population, creating new jobs, building new homes and demolishing properties; thus it can be assumed that the ‘broken urban infrastructure’ refers to certain material, social and economic landscapes. The GfG Green Paper justifies the radical plans by predicting (or threatening) a spiral of decline arguing that if the population continues to fall then surplus school places and empty, abandoned houses will increase, which in turn will lead to 12,000 property demolitions by 2020 (NCC, 2000a:5).

7.3.3 ‘Greening’ demolition

To reverse the prediction the GfG Green Paper (NCC, 2000a:12) proposes targets of 20,000 new homes to be built with 2,500 on greenfield sites and 17,500 built on recycled brownfield land thereby exceeding the government target of 60 per cent of house building on brownfield sites. The promise of new homes, the majority of which are on recycled brownfield land, may meet the government’s policy requirements but to achieve the brownfield target, 6,600 houses have to be demolished by 2020. Yet it is interesting

19 In Newcastle between 1971 and 1998, outward migration was 15,000 per annum with families moving to North Tyneside (20%), Northumberland (20%), The South East (20%) Various Others (40%) and inward migration was 13,500 per annum
to note that in this case NCC uses the ‘greening of demolition’ i.e. using brownfield targets as justification for demolition in two ways. First, the environmental targets dominate and support their arguments for growth over social considerations. Second, the case for 6,600 demolitions is presented as the *preferred* and *only* option because a spiral of decline requiring double the amount of demolitions is predicted (i.e. 6,600 or the doomsday scenario of 12,000). As Tony Flynn then the Leader of NCC argues “a new bolder and radical approach is required if we are to deliver real change and attract more people to live in Newcastle” (NCC, 2000b:1). According to NCC (2000b:6),

“Going for Growth is not an option it is a necessity”

7.3.4 Growth coalitions and ‘red’ for clearance

To achieve the vision a ‘traffic light’ system was used to spatialize interventions throughout the city. For example, looking at housing and demolition, a *green* area meant minimum intervention such as refurbishment of existing stock; *amber* meant refurbishment and selective demolition and *red* meant clearance to create capacity for new housing (which would increase private housing). The draft Masterplan warned that ‘our approach needs to be radical’ and ‘new housing development needs to be large scale…and in a few areas will involve significant demolition” (NCC, 2000b:7). The influence behind such an approach is revealed later on in the draft Masterplan when the consultants behind the West End plans are listed as Richard Rogers Partnership, Andrew Wright Associates and DTZ Pieda Consulting who worked collaboratively with Newcastle City Council. In particular DTZ Pieda Consulting are cited as pointing out that “in order to attract investors we must identify and make available significant sites…of a scale that will give investors confidence in the potential to create a new attractive and sustainable neighbourhood environment” (NCC, 2000b:10). Kevan Jones, the Cabinet Member for Development and the main proponent of GfG said that a critical mass of land was needed to attract developers and private house builders had told the consultants named above that they would not develop land smaller than eight hectares (Wainwright and Wainwright, 2000).

Here then we arguably see the formation of a growth coalition (Logan and Molotch, 1987) in Newcastle. NCC looked to mobilize key experts in planning, regeneration and
growth to develop their plans for economic development and job creation. As Harding (1999:677) argues, the key to urban growth coalitions is their “concern with the processes of coalition building, primarily for the purposes of promoting economic exchange and employment creations”. Growth coalitions are also interested in maximizing the value of their land or property by attracting investment. Many have commented on the role of local government as ‘entrepreneurial’ ‘proactive’ and as ‘place marketers’ (see for example, Harvey, 1989; Tickell and Dicken, 1994; Cochrane et al, 1996). Thus, in this sense, the ‘critical mass of land’ required to attract developers is crucial for growth in Newcastle and the primacy of growth justifies demolition.

7.3.5 The local response

As Harding (1995:43) argues, “growth is not good for all. Its costs fall disproportionately on low income communities and marginal local businesses displaced by redevelopment strategies”. Gedron (2006) reaches similar conclusions in his study of Santa Cruz, California following the Loma Prieta earthquake of 1989. He criticizes Urban Regime Theory for its focus on ‘power to’,

“Although regime theory acknowledges the relationship between ‘power over’ and ‘power to’ …..its emphasis on the latter overlooks critical sources of conflict in the creation and implementation of local urban development policy……an analysis of both conceptions of power is necessary to understand not only how local development policies are enacted but ‘who benefits’ from them” (Gedron, 2006:5).

The critical mass of land - the spaces of demolition designated ‘red’ in the traffic light system, are mainly concentrated along the north bank of the River Tyne and include all of Scotswood, large parts of Benwell, Rye Hill, Cruddas Park and Walker. These areas are most often characterized as traditional communities with a mix of council housing and some owner occupation (Shaw, 2000).

When the demolition plans were announced in the summer of 2000, they provoked an immediate and sharp response (Shaw, 2000). In Scotswood, many residents first found
out that their street was going to be demolished in a leaked report to the local newspaper – the Evening Chronicle. A council employee informed some residents,

*What was the first thing you knew about GfG?*

I knew when Heather Davidson rang me up and said “Annette, you’re going to see in the paper that your streets are going to be demolished.” …. And sure enough, that night in the Chronicle there was a list of all the streets that were going to be demolished (Former West Benwell residents, 2006)

To residents designated ‘red’ for demolition the response was deeply emotional and troubling,

“it was a very traumatic experience that affected a lot of people. It felt like they just wanted to get rid of Scotswood” (Scotswood Resident, 2007).

Similarly, interviews with a group of ‘relocated’ West Benwell residents on a return visit to their former homes revealed a range of emotional reactions,

By time we left, we were ready to get out…..because of the situation. It was like living in Beirut, wasn’t it? … But I do think that was part of the plan as well…. The whole “Going for Growth” thing is they intimidated people. There was a woman allegedly committed suicide in Scotswood. And I met a woman who had lived 50-odd years in the same house and was in tears because there was only her – her husband had died – and they kept showing her these absolute dumps. And why would she want to go from a nice house into a dump (Former West Benwell residents, 2006)

“It was a total shock. We had no inkling of it. Then to be informed by the local newspaper really is the pits. They had adequate time to inform us in other ways, didn’t they?” (Former West Benwell residents, 2006)
“I saw a neat, well packaged brochure with pictures. And it said 20,000 homes were going to be built, but so many thousands would be demolished. And I thought ‘Nobody’s spoken to us about this. This is my home; this is my neighbour’s home. This is a huge community and we haven’t had a say’. Suddenly this big idea with this glossy brochure... So immediately it killed our aspirations, it killed our ideas about how we wanted to live. Suddenly we would have to move. So it was a real feeling of uncertainty, and it did affect us”  
(Former West Benwell residents, 2006)

7.3.6 Homes vs. plot of land

Some of the criticisms of ‘growth’ from the growth machine perspective claim that it is devoid of human agency, which leaves little room for people driven change or culture such as human interaction (Molotch, 1993). Thus, the primacy of growth - of clearance and land assembly to encourage investment sits uneasily with the related social consequences and considerations (from the perspective of those affected) such as loss of home and community. Weber and Pagano (2002) found a similar tension between the use value and exchange value in their study of developable land in Chicago. Displaced residents from Benwell explained their circumstances,

“I remember ringing the council up and talking to this lady on the end of a helpline and she kept referring to my house as a “plot of land”. And I kept saying ‘But, it’s my home’ and she just refused to call it a house - it was a plot of land. And that was the way we were treated really.

Why did they say your area had to be knocked down?

I’ve never known…

As time went on and they obviously felt they had to have reasons – or excuses, more like – then they brought out phrases like ‘sustainable homes’ and ‘standards’ and so on. They suggested that our houses weren’t up to the standards that they should be. ….. We discovered years later that the council owned tens of thousands of houses that weren’t up to this standard and that they were only pulling ours down. I just think they had a plan, and they were going to
go ahead with it regardless of how it affected people and communities....”
(Former West Benwell residents, 2006)

7.3.7 Social cleansing and the people’s protest

In my discussion with a community engagement officer in Scotswood she stated,

“some described it as social cleansing”.

The ‘politics of unbuilding’ (Graham, 2004) are revealing themselves and for the displaced, for those whose home becomes a ‘plot of land’ the feelings of loss, anger and sadness are related to the broader political objective, in Graham’s terms, to annihilate certain people and places (see Allen, 2008). The fear of displacement, of ‘social cleansing’ has been repeated many times in different interviews throughout the fieldwork period and at the time of GfG the Newcastle Journal, 26 July 2000, reported that protesters believed that Newcastle City Council was trying to,

“Socially cleanse the working class and hand the land over to build executive houses”.

Considering the issue of GfG in Newcastle, Cameron (2003:2372) interestingly notes,

“The relocation plans propose that ‘problem tenants’ subject to court proceedings or with records of ‘well-documented antisocial behaviour’ will not be given priority for rehousing, only ‘assistance in finding suitable alternative accommodation’.

As Cameron (2003:2372) suggests,

“This perhaps suggests a particularly sharp form of displacement and exclusion affecting those who are seen as a threat to the attraction of a new, middle-class population. It is possible to see here Smith’s (1996a) notion of a ‘revanchist city’ with a punitive response to the poor. On the other hand, some existing residents as well as incomers may welcome this form of action against anti-social behaviour”
It is also important to note that of the total 6,600 demolitions, the majority (5,000) are in the West End of Newcastle and Scotswood in particular. Thus, in Scotswood the residents were determined to act, launched the ‘Save Our Scotswood’ campaign, and ‘marched on the Civic Centre’ (Scotswood Focus Group, 2007). Party political protest also came from the Liberal Democrats who proposed community-led regeneration (Newcastle Liberal Democrats, 2000). The Newcastle Tenants’ Federation (NTF) (2000) produced a response to the draft Masterplan that outlined some coherent arguments against GfG. They argued that there was no clear analysis of what went wrong with previous regeneration strategies and said that GfG was a top-down process rather than people-led. Shaw (2000) similarly argued that GfG was predominantly a top-down process. They argued that the causes of neighbourhood decline were not tackled and there was a lack of understanding of how a neighbourhood declines (NTF, 2000). According to the NTF (2000), deprivation was seen as a housing problem to be fixed with bricks and mortar. As criticisms continued and the ‘Save Our Scotswood’ campaign gained momentum with protests, media and TV publicity, T-shirts and by employing their own architects and researchers, one of the consultants on the Masterplan, Lord Richard Rogers began to distance himself saying

> “it is very unsustainable to pull down houses which have a future and even less sustainable to move people who are happy where they are” (Newcastle Evening Chronicle, 10 June 2000)

In December 2000, he withdrew from the project (Newcastle Journal, 4 December 2000, ‘Rogers quits city project’).

### 7.3.8 The shift to a central state agenda

Such widespread criticism, media attention and high profile distancing from the project did not bode well for the future of GfG. When the council approached the ODPM for GfG funding it was declined. According to the ODPM, the two main failings of GfG were first, announcing the plans before consulting with residents and second, previous failings under City Challenge “had created a nervousness in very high circles of government” (Benwell and Scotswood Councillor, 2007). So when the Audit Commission looked at the
proposals they argued there was not enough evidence base for the West End of Newcastle, warning that the plans were unrealistic and could make abandonment worse (Weaver, 2005). They added that it was up to the City Council to ‘prove their case’. However, GfG was superceded by the announcement of Housing Market Renewal (HMR) in 2002 followed a year later by the Sustainable Communities Plan (ODPM, 2003a). It was as part of this central government initiative that Newcastle and Gateshead became one of the nine HMR pathfinders.

In consequence, communities included in Going for Growth are now included in the ‘Bridging NewcastleGateshead’ (BNG) HMR pathfinder. For communities included in demolition plans the change in project name means very little – their home is still being demolished. For the local authority and residents alike, the legacy of GfG lingers long in the memory.

### 7.4 Rationalities of ‘state-led’ demolition

“And it is here that one comes on the central difficulty of the housing problem. When you walk through the smoke-dim slums of Manchester you think that nothing is needed except to tear down these abominations and build decent houses in their place. But the trouble is that in destroying the slum you destroy other things as well” (George Orwell, 1937:65)

“Radical intervention is needed in some inner urban areas where the housing market has collapsed........ The alternative is that our northern cities will consist of a city centre surrounded by a devastated no man’s land encompassed in turn by suburbia” (DTLR, 2002, para 160 and 161).
Once the Housing Market Renewal (HMR) approach to creating sustainable communities replaced GfG, the ‘growth’ justification for demolishing houses diminished in light of ‘obsolescence’ arguments (Ferrai, 2007; Allen, 2008). For Bridging NewcastleGateshead (BNG) to receive government funding they had to demonstrate the ‘trinity of abandonment’ as specified by HMR architects Cole and Nevin (2004) (see Chapter 3). Figure 7.3 shows the range of processes involved in phasing demolition and relocation and Table 7.1 shows the number of proposed demolitions and new builds in the BNG, Scotswood and Benwell, Walker Riverside and Felling between 2006 and 2018. Looking at Table 7.1, it appears as if more houses will be available because the numbers of new builds are greater than the number demolished. However, to achieve the desired mixed communities the tenure options in BNG are been restructured and owner occupation is increasing from around 40 per cent in existing communities to around 65-70 per cent in the newly created ones. For instance, of the 2000 new homes been built in Scotswood, 25 per cent will be affordable with a minimum of 10 per cent socially rented (BNG, 2007c). This means that housing choice for the poorest who
cannot afford a mortgage even with the compensation packages is severely restricted (see Section 7.5 and 7.7 for more on how forced relocation affects the existing community).^{20}

**Figure 7.3: Phasing demolition and relocation** (Cole and Flint, 2007:17)

**Table 7.1: Number of proposed demolitions and new builds in the BNG area, Scotswood and Benwell, Walker Riverside, Felling between 2006 and 2018** (adapted from BNG, 2006:8; BNG, 2007c; BNG, 2007e; Gateshead Council, 2010a; Gateshead Council, 2010b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Number in BNG</th>
<th>Scotswood and Benwell</th>
<th>Walker Riverside</th>
<th>Felling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Build</td>
<td>13700</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^{20} Furthermore, at the time of writing in May 2010, the credit crunch and recession have meant reduced levels of new build construction and falling land prices. According to some the most vulnerable regeneration sector is the private residential house building especially in areas of weaker demand like housing market renewal pathfinders (see Parkinson et al, 2009; Savills Research, 2009; Gibb and O’Sullivan, 2010).
7.4.1 ‘End of life’, obsolete and out-dated housing

The ‘Sixth Report on Empty Homes’ (DTLR, 2002) gives an early indication of the rationalities of demolition,

“Strategies for demolition should be mindful of the opportunity to retain some older houses, where they are in good condition, as part of the development of mixed areas. For example, many of Birmingham’s pre-1919, ‘front of pavement’ terraced houses, have reached the end of their life... structurally, in terms of condition, in terms of the maintenance costs to keep them in that form. Pre-1919 villas, larger three and four-bed homes, do have a future, tend to be built later and to a better standard” (DTLR, 2002, para 109)

We see here then, that demolition is meant to be selective and pre-1919 terraced houses - ‘the street house’ that George Orwell would recognize in the ‘Road to Wigan Pier’, is deemed to have reached the end of its life. Allen (2008:131) comments on the same ‘end of history narrative for the terraced house’ in his study of Kensington, Liverpool. It is interesting to note that larger ‘villas’ have not reached the end of their life.

By the time the Sustainable Communities Plan (ODPM (2003a) is announced, the reference to ‘end of life’ is replaced by terms such as ‘obsolete housing’ and then in a subsequent document ‘out-dated stock’,

“Pathfinder strategic plans will entail radical and sustained action to replace obsolete housing with modern sustainable accommodation, through demolition and new building or refurbishment” (ODPM, 2003:24 emphasis added).

“some of the housing in pathfinder areas has reached the end of its useful life – it no longer meets modern needs or aspirations. In these cases we have no alternative but to demolish out-dated stock, making way for modern replacements which meet people’s needs now and in the foreseeable future” (ODPM, 2005:56 emphasis added)

Similarly, BNG in their Business Plan for 2006-2008 promise
“to provide an improved choice of good quality, well designed homes through new development and investment in sustainable homes whilst replacing obsolete housing” (BNG, 2006:8).

This marks a shift from the more restricted demolition specification of ‘pre 1919 terrace housing’ to the broader ‘obsolete housing’ – which could mean anything. For example, in BNG the range of housing targeted for demolition include the pre 1919 terrace but also, maisonette flats, multi storey flats, council houses, as well as the locally specific Tyneside Flat. However, it is the demolition of the Victorian terrace that has evoked the most vociferous objections in some pathfinder areas. Although terrace houses make up 47 per cent of dwellings in BNG compared to 26.6 percent nationally (Society Guardian, 2007:4) with the exception of the earlier Save Our Scotswood campaign (Section 7.3) and a petition against the demolition of Wardroper House (flats) in Walker Riverside21, the objections were reduced to individual householders making a last stand (see Section 7.5.3 on CPO). More broadly, critical commentaries revolve around social and environmental issues of sustainability such as cultural attachments to the ‘terrace’, the loss of social cohesion caused by clearance, the cost of repairing and reusing old buildings versus demolition, the waste produced by the demolition industry and the way in which VAT ratings encourage new build over refurbishment (English Heritage, 2005; Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors, 2007; Sustainable Development Commission, 2007). Furthermore, to achieve the government target of 60 per cent reduction in the CO2 emissions from all energy use in the whole UK housing stock by the end of 2050, Boardman (2007) in considering ‘heritage’ properties argues,

“one implication is that about three-quarters of pre-1919 stock (3.75 million dwellings) could be demolished if it proves impossible to bring these properties up to an adequate standard of energy efficiency. This would leave the real architectural heritage, as identified by listing, intact”.

The government’s interpretation of obsolescence indicates a shift from seeing obsolescence as decay, ruin and physical deterioration (physical obsolescence) to a more functional obsolescence where houses, industries, landscapes and regions are

21 In Bensham and Saltwell, one of the BNG areas in Gateshead a protest group established against the demolition of Victorian terraces
rendered obsolete under the vagaries of changing cultural preferences, tastes and fashion, technologies and the market (Jakle and Wilson, 1992). Functional obsolescence is dictated by ‘outside’ influences rather than the more tangible internal decline of physical obsolescence and it is difficult for many residents to understand why their ‘solid, family house with a garden’ is been demolished only to be replaced by a ‘newly built family house with a garden’. This extract from a focus group in Walker Riverside illustrates this point quite well,

“But people think that there’s nothing wrong with their house they think they’re good family houses so they don’t understand and they haven’t been told why they’re been demolished” (Focus Group, Walker Riverside, 2007)

The Cole and Nevin (2004) definition of obsolete housing gives no indication of the type of house to be demolished instead dwelling on the outsider choice criteria of taste and aspiration. Obsolescence in housing has not driven national policy for 35 years when ‘slum clearance’ prevailed and certain housing types such as back-to-back housing and tenement flats in Scotland (Kintrea, 2005).

Similarly, Weber et al (2006) based on US studies identifies two main ‘types’ of demolition – ‘abandonment’ (see Bender, 1979) and ‘tear down’. Abandonment demolition occurs when the property is severely dilapidated and virtually uninhabitable, thus the motivation for demolition is not necessarily profit but eliminating a nuisance (Weber et al, 2006). Bender (1979) found that abandonment demolitions took place within neighborhoods with declining or stagnant population, income, and property values, and where large amounts of vacant and underused land were concentrated. In contrast, ‘tear down’ demolitions involve “the practice of demolishing an existing [habitable] house to make way for a dramatically larger new house on the same site” (Fine and Lindberg 2002: 1). Thus Weber et al (2006) consider the relationship between ‘tear down’ demolitions and gentrifying neighbourhoods. If we then consider the justification for demolition in BNG, in terms of habitability, a different circumstance is revealed to the one witnessed by Weber et al (2006) because in BNG the houses are (on the whole) habitable yet many have been abandoned.
7.4.2 ‘Surfacing the invisible’ rationalities of demolition: Obsolete places and people?

The habitability of the housing in BNG, in terms of decay and ruin, is not the only determining factor of abandonment. In national and local policy documents and interviews with practitioners, the emphasis on ‘modernization’, ‘meeting aspirations’ and ‘sustainable homes’ suggest that ‘outside’ social and cultural influences are related to the abandonment of certain urban residential spaces. The criteria for demolition are not necessarily based on the economic obsolescence of the housing but on the social obsolescence. In other words, the economic value of housing is a less important consideration, and less damaging to the broader regeneration aims than the perceived social undesirability of the housing. Following this logic, it suggests that the social obsolescence of housing is an indication of and related to the unsustainability of a community. The housing per se is not necessarily the problem; it is the perception and problem associated with certain people and housing in certain communities. This logic was not lost on some of the residents who in discussions complained that their terraced house or Tyneside flat in Scotswood, Walker Riverside, or Felling was being demolished whereas the same housing in Heaton (a mainly student area in Newcastle with numerous Tyneside flats) was not,

“There are Tyneside flats in other parts of Newcastle – Heaton for example, how come they are not been knocked down?” (Scotswood resident, 2007)

“This area [Scotswood] has so much potential. If you look at Heaton, it still has Tyneside flats and back yards and still nothing for kids, still no play schemes yet they have knocked this [Scotswood] down and here the houses have so much potential and there is space for children to play – though at the moment they think the building site is an adventure playground” (Community worker, Scotswood Natural Community Garden, 2007)

As we have seen, the explicit rationality of demolition is ‘obsolete housing’. However, closer analysis begins to reveal and question the implicit motives behind demolition in BNG. Thus, the challenge is, to adopt Leigh-Star’s term “surface the invisible”\(^{22}\)

\(^{22}\) Susan Leigh-Star (1999) uses the term ‘surface invisible work’ in relation to urban infrastructures whereas I am extending its use to include the less obvious political rationalities of demolition
(1999:385) rationalities of demolition. The fundamental concern here is that the rationality of obsolete housing masks the real problem of ‘obsolete places and people’. In BNG, obsolete housing is mainly social housing although not all properties are rented as some were bought under the ‘Right to Buy’ scheme. The range of social housing includes the ‘Tyneside Flat’ (Figure 7.4), other pre-1914 terraces, high rise flats, apartments and various 20th century council estate houses which include semi-detached houses and bungalows for the elderly. Here then we begin to establish the relationship certain urban spaces and people (inner urban and working class), a spatial concentration of poverty (spaces and people experiencing high levels of deprivation) and the decision to demolish. Yet within these inner urban spaces, there are even more nuanced geographies of demolition (see Appendix 8 for an extract from a list of impending demolitions)

**Figure 7.4: Tyneside flat in Scotswood awaiting demolition** (Andrea Armstrong)
The maps and photos go some way to demonstrate the nuanced geographies of demolition. Of the three case study areas, the maps reveal that Scotswood has the largest contiguous area of demolition (65 hectares) whereas in Walker Riverside and Felling there are distinguishable pockets of demolition and refurbishment. Yet this analysis only reveals the scale and site of demolition, not the rationality behind the decision to pinpoint certain spaces with a ‘multi-coloured boundary marker’ on a map. The example of ‘Scotswood Village’24 gives us some indication of the ‘mentalities’ or the ‘modes of thought’ (see Section 4.2.2) leading to the ‘red mark of demolition’ (Figure 7.5). In other words, drawing from Foucault (2004), the ways of thinking (the mentalities) of those in power is related to the decision (in this instance) to demolish.

Figure 7.5: Regeneration interventions in Benwell and Scotswood
(Benwell and Scotswood Area Action Plan, 2006)

An interview with a young female Scotswood Village resident gives some indication of living in the area,

---

24 Scotswood Village is located in the south west corner of Scotswood and comprised of Victorian terraces and Tyneside flats which were originally built by Lord Armstrong to house his workers (Armstrong Vickers Tank works)
“It’s the people that make it worse, it’s horrible to say but they’re all riff raff. I mean I cannot walk around here and feel safe to be honest. It’s the diversity of the place, I mean you’ve got my sort and then 13 year old chavvas that would like to glass you over the head. And that’s not nice and it’s not fair when you’ve got residents who want the place looking nice and they’re stealing park benches and graffiting as soon as its put up, it’s not what I like. So I just hang around with people in Jesmond all the time and I’m only ever here to sleep, I sleep here and go to work at the Metro Centre and that’s all the time I spend here” (Young Scotswood Village resident, 2007).

The young person makes a clear distinction between herself, the ‘chavvas’ (the Newcastle dialect for ‘chav’), the respectable residents and her friends in Jesmond where she chooses to spend her time. Other interviewees expressed the same sentiments and make the distinction between themselves and the ‘riff raff’ – a term they used repeatedly.

“I was talking to another neighbour down there and these two lads walked by on the path pushing these two boilers from the houses over here and they’re from where I live a right riff raff family and you get riff raff and they’re a right riff raff family from hell” (Felling resident, 2007)

“he’s been in prison he’s had a tag on his leg and the complaints they’ve had from people - the police are never away from the door - braying the door in .......you can’t put that riff raff family in a decent place because you know that whoever they move next to then that family is going to move out” (Walker focus group, 2007)

The judgement of space and the sustainable resident

The discussions with residents reveal the hidden anxieties and resentment towards some people and families living in their communities. The designation of ‘sustainable communities’ by policy makers provides a platform from which to air their concerns to a

---

25 Jesmond is an affluent northern suburb of Newcastle, more recently populated by relatively affluent students. It is a distance from any BNG area – physically, materially and culturally.
wider audience. The law abiding citizen, the ‘sustainable residents’ become entangled in the networks of power and the within the judgement of spaces. The spaces of regeneration are judged according to their sustainability, which means their sustainable residents,

“Between 2000 and 2002 through very intense consultation with residents and councillors the officers were able to define what was a sustainable community. A sustainable community is one that had a strong community spirit and the people wanted to stay there and that was generally private housing with some owner occupation and good private rented with good landlords. So they were able to identify what areas would be retained and areas that had no future and that were unsustainable. The unsustainable areas were dominated by anti social behaviour, poorly looked after properties and mainly looked after by absentee landlords” (West Newcastle Coordinator, BNG, 2007)

**Housing tenure, the unruly tenant and sustainability**

Another factor taken into consideration when deciding on spaces of demolition is the relationship between housing tenure and sustainability. The analysis of tenure contributes to an even closer analysis of spaces of regeneration – at household and street level. The demolition judgement is honing in. The example of Scotswood Village illustrates this quite well,

“In Scotswood Village there are six parallel streets and there is no real difference in terms of condition of the properties it’s just that traditionally or generally the eastern end of Scotswood Village had a higher proportion of private rented whereas the west end of the village there was a higher proportion of owner occupied. So the settled nature of the owner occupier has fed into the behaviour of the private tenants and made that an area which was sustainable and where there weren’t as many problems. Whereas the eastern half was inhabited by

26 Throughout the thesis, reference is made to the ‘sustainable resident’ or ‘sustainable tenant’ and these terms were coined by the author to be a contemporary expression of the ‘desirable/undesirable poor’ distinctions that have survived from the nineteenth century. In this sense they are not strictly a departure from the old distinctions but instead are meant to reflect the New Labour language of responsibilization and citizenship.
private tenants, most of whom were problematic in terms of low level petty crime so when it came to deciding what was sustainable and what wasn’t sustainable - generally putting that boundary in was relatively easy because it was known that the east was unruly tenants and the west was a settled community” (West Newcastle Coordinator, BNG, 2007).

Similarly, in discussions with the Benwell Scotswood Senior Planner and the Benwell Scotswood Area Coordinator they revealed the contradiction of some three-bedroomed family homes being demolished along, and to the south of Armstrong Road in Scotswood despite the intention to encourage families. Again, the reason for this was ‘unruly tenants’ with “antisocial behaviour problems and drug use” or irresponsible lettings policies.

The irresponsible landlord

Although the ‘unruly tenant’ is vilified for their behaviour within the community, it is the ‘irresponsible landlord’ who is blamed by residents and policy makers, planners etc for the pockets of unsustainability,

“In a small area there are pockets of sustainable housing and pockets of market collapse

AA Why do you think that is then?

Well, based on the clearance programme this large rectangle here is mainly council housing and all of the social housing that was designated to be cleared has been cleared so it’s leaving only private......and I suppose one of the answers to the question is that mono-tenure doesn’t work in terms of a sustainable community so that was a major driver for the collapse of the area. The other reason is that there is a very, very high proportion of private rented in those neighbourhoods and it’s a case of poor landlords, plus poorly vetted anti social tenants and decline in demand for an area. Where we’ve seen pockets of sustainability there’s been a mix of tenure and accredited or better landlords” (West Newcastle Area Coordinator, BNG, 2007).
In a study of the ‘failure’ of regeneration in the West End of Newcastle, Robinson (2005) similarly contends that unscrupulous landlords housing anti social tenants have contributed to the pockets of unsustainability,

“Another factor has been the arrival of anti social residents who could, by their actions, make life so unpleasant for everyone else that there would be a mass exodus from the street or neighbourhood. This process is legendary in the West End – and real enough. In the North Benwell terraces, for example, some landlords let to anti social tenants, some of them evicted from social housing. The actions of these tenants led owner occupiers to flee, often having to sell their property at a very low price to these unscrupulous landlords – and so a spiral of decline was given a further twist” (p33).

Campbell (1995) makes a similar point in her article on anti social tenants and the collusion of unscrupulous landlords. The Relocation and Resettlement Officer for Your Homes Newcastle (YHN) has considerable contact with landlords admits that private landlords vary in their level of responsibility with some houses in a terrible state, perhaps deliberately whereas others are concerned for the ‘exchange value’ of their property,

“there’s a feeling that landlords have caused a lot of problems in the estates and they haven’t added to the sustainability but I think [mentions name of a landlord] a quite prominent landlord in the west end with some properties in the east end would quite vigorously deny that and could be appearing at enquiries and things if it goes to CPO. Because quite legitimately he has a commercial interest in his properties and I think his properties tend to be a lot better. Some other properties though are pretty deplorable and me and Pauline have been in properties where there’s no central heating, people have got a fan heater, the fires been condemned and its absolutely freezing – you are warming up when you’re coming outside - just horrendous holes in the roof” (Relocation Officer YHN, 2007)
7.5 Withdrawing the repair option: techniques of demolition

“Each species of subtraction presents different techniques, motives, or results......the least spectacular deletions, which operate in subterfuge, without dynamite or bombs, may even be the most violent” (Easterling, 2005:179).

By examining the rationalities of demolition, the complex interrelations of the ‘politics of unbuilding’ (Graham, 2004) are beginning to emerge as the judgement of spaces leads to the process of social and material disconnections. Amongst the residents, the sense of disconnection starts long before the bulldozers move in - because as Graham and Thrift (2007) would recognize, ‘the possibilities of repair are withdrawn’ from the some people and some houses in BNG. Various techniques of government contribute to the withdrawal of repair, whereby the decision to demolish has removed the repair option from a particular house, street or community.

Withdrawing the repair option involves the ‘hidden and visible politics of unbuilding’ as co-present trajectories that negotiate meshes of social, material and infrastructure networks. By exploring the techniques of demolition, the hidden and visible politics of unbuilding emerge, as do occasional intersections between social, material and infrastructure networks. These intersections provide insights into the ‘stutters’ of repair and maintenance.

7.5.1 The community experts: relocation and resettlement teams

The relocation and resettlement teams (RRT) in Newcastle and Gateshead were established after Going for Growth in 2002 because the housing officers were inundated with complaints from unhappy residents. They are a visible presence in communities experiencing demolition. Their early role in spaces of regeneration was to repair confidence in the process of regeneration to bring about governmental ambitions. The RRT teams aim to “provide practical support and advice before, during and after relocation” (Your Homes Newcastle, YHN, 2007) and claim to be “experts in the field of homeownership advice and appointed to give help to those affected by clearance (Gateshead Council, 2007). In a discussion with the Newcastle RRT, they explained
their role as ‘oiling the cogs’ because they facilitate the regeneration process. As ‘new experts of community’ (Rose, 1999:189) the RRT facilitate relocation at ‘arms length’ by first issuing a questionnaire to each household to assess the resident’s tenure status (owner occupier, private or council tenant) and personal situation. According to Rose (1999), the questionnaire is also a technique to make communities real and visible. The questionnaire is followed by visits to residents informing them of the compensation packages and assisting with relocation. The process of acquiring properties due for demolition is a slow and sensitive process therefore the RRT become the ‘eyes and ears’ in the communities, gathering knowledge at a household level of personal finances and family situations.

The surveillance of community allows the RRT (and BNG) to determine who lives where according to tenure. Then the RRT ranks visits by tenure, with council tenants and owner-occupiers visited early on in the process. In contrast, they wait to visit private tenants, as the private landlord is often “happy to continue gathering rents and hopes that the capital value will rise” (Relocation Officer, 2007). In discussions with the RRT, they stated that private tenants “get the worse end of the deal” in many ways.

“we will go out and visit the residents certainly if they’re council, certainly if they’re owner occupiers, but we don’t always go and visit the private tenants straight away because Newcastle Council prefer it that we don’t. The reason is quite often a private landlord might be in a clearance scheme that there’s no CPO [Compulsory Purchase Order] so perhaps he will just think well I’m not in a hurry I’ve got my rental income coming in and I’m not in a hurry for the capital value. The capital value will probably rise in the time it takes from declaration, to acquisition of the property through to CPO so they’re quite happy to just sit there. What they don’t want is people who they see as representing the city council coming along and knocking on doors saying oh you’re in a clearance area. So we tend not to go and visit the private tenants till the landlord is in negotiation with city property and has agreed a price and then obviously it’s explained to them the council will only buy the property with vacant possession. Therefore, obviously once they’re happy they will invite us in and we will go and see the private tenants and I have to say in our experience the private tenants get the worst end of the deal” (Relocation Officer, 2007)
This serves to reveal, in part at least, how the private tenant is in a vulnerable situation as they are often in private tenancies because,

“they are no longer entitled to council accommodation and this could be because they’ve had a bad history in the past or left a large rent arrears which will stop them gaining access to council accommodation. So private tenants get the worst of it and as private landlords realize they are going to have to sell there is no incentive to invest in the property so they [private tenants] can often end up in quite poor housing with no repairs been done but they have to stick it out or they lose their Home Loss Payment” (Relocation Officer, 2007).

The compensation packages vary according to tenure and in brief, the private tenant receives £4,000 Home Loss Payment if they have been a tenant for over 12 months and a disturbance allowance (packing and removals, disconnection and reconnections of services and equipment, redirecting mail and £200 towards adapting curtains and blinds). They only receive ‘priority re-housing status’ if they

“are eligible to join the scheme i.e. you have a previously good tenancy record and satisfactory references from your previous/current landlord” (YHN, 2007).

A council tenant receives the same as the private tenant however, the disturbance allowance includes ‘other equipment’ such as fitting a shower or burglar alarm if they already have one. Interestingly, the relocation package for council tenants states,

“If you qualify for a priority re-housing status we will back date this to the date the scheme was officially agreed. If you do not qualify for priority re-housing status we will tell you why” (YHN, 2007:5).

Furthermore, any rent arrears or court costs owed to the council will be deducted from the £4,000 Home Loss Payment. In this sense, the technology of demolition has enabled the surveillance of community at household level, gathering personal data regarding finances, family situation and behaviour. The residents being moved because of demolition have to go through a process of character assessment to judge their
worthiness for ‘priority re-housing’ in the council/housing association sector. The sifting process selects the ‘sustainable tenant’ and discards the unsustainable tenants. Tenants’ behaviour is more closely monitored and punished (by eviction) for unruliness, incivility and antisocial behaviour more than owner-occupiers inhabiting the same space. In a discussion on ‘managing the underclass’, Haworth and Manzi (1999:159) similarly argue,

“the discourse of social control in relation to council tenants is most strongly observable in the language of tenancy agreements which proscribe certain forms of behaviour and impose strong normative standards on tenants”.

The unsustainable tenant is excluded from formal, regulated housing and has little option (if house buying is not an option) but to rent privately. As Haworth and Manzi (1999) suggest, the imposition of a moral and judgmental framework is not replicated in other tenures. Being ‘passive recipients of welfare’ (Hirst, 1994) they suggest there is an expectation of becoming ‘passive recipients of authoritarian intervention in their private lives (Haworth and Manzi, 1999). Thus, the power geometries (Massey, 1991) of mobility emerge in spaces of regeneration in distinct relationships. Some control and restrict others (landlords and their tenants), some initiate and control the flow and movement (councils, RRT), some have their movement and flow controlled (tenants and home owners) and some may resist movement (tenants, owner-occupiers, landlords).

In comparison to private and council tenants, owner-occupiers appear to have the most choice. They have five relocation options – but these are conditional. They have to be an owner occupier when clearance is announced; it has to be their sole or principle home and it has to be freehold or leasehold, with at least 5 to 21 years unexpired lease. The first option is to receive the market value of their property (from time of initial demolition notice), a Home Loss Payment of 10 per cent of value of house and the Disturbance Allowance. Second, they can buy a new property elsewhere and receive a Relocation Grant that contributes to the difference between the value of the current property and the new purchase price. Third, Home Swap is a pilot scheme in Scotswood whereby the council purchase and renovates properties that can be purchased with the help of a Relocation Grant to a maximum of £25,000. There is also a shared ownership scheme
with a housing association (buy 50 or 75 per cent of property on a mortgage, then pay rent on remaining 50 or 25 per cent). Fourth, an Equity Loan whereby a percentage of a property is purchased with the remaining percentage bridged by an equity loan which is paid back on sale of the property. The final option for owner-occupiers is rented accommodation from the city council, Housing Association or privately rented.

On the surface, these options seem to cover most situations. However, in discussions with people who has bought their council house cheaply under Right to Buy, even with the relocation packages they could not afford to buy another house.

“I bought my council house in 2002 and in 2004 it was worth £30-40,000. I know some people say at least you can pay your mortgage off but I can’t afford to move anywhere else and start again

Where would you move?

Well, that's the thing, I wouldn't be able to move anywhere where I would want to because £26,000 isn’t going to give me that option. Even if I got the £26,000 cash and another mortgage for £50,000 you can’t get a one bed flat for £50,000. That’s why I bought the house at the time because it was all I could afford. At the time I couldn’t afford a £50,000 or £70,000 house so I thought I’d start at the bottom in a council house and work my way up. And as I say touch wood it doesn’t come down before I move on and make me money on it. Say today I decide to sell it - by law my solicitor has to tell whoever wants to buy it that my property is going to come down in the next two years” (Felling focus group, 2007)

Another situation in Felling involved a young single mother living in a privately rented Victorian terrace. The house was damp, and in a general state of disrepair. The focus group lasted about two hours and half way through the young woman who had not spoken previously said, “mine needs pulling down” and told of her situation,

“I got a letter from the council that I’d have to move house by August 2007 so that was a couple of months ago and I showed it to my landlord and he said they’re just sending that letter to frighten you. My landlord is a private landlord
and he's refused to sell. He's got a few properties about four. Well, he says if I stick it and stay and say that I'm not moving into any rough street because he doesn't want to sell till he's got another property. The council says they don't have to rehouse us because I'm a private tenant. I've got to find a house on my own. I've got to find me own home through a private tenancy” (Felling resident, 2007)

The others then joined in the conversation and another young single mother told her story,

“I didn’t have a priority card and I was homeless for nine months. For nine month, we squished into my sister’s house with no benefits or anything. It all depends how homeless you are if you’re living with family members you’re less of a priority than in a shelter. If you’re in a shelter you would get somewhere quicker but you don’t want to take anywhere. My sister has two kids and her husband two so there's four kids, two adults then me and my bairn. I think if you're homeless and in a shelter or a bed and breakfast they will fast track you to places that no one else will want. Well, you know the flats round here they'll put me in there with all the druggies around because no other bugger wants them and if you're a lass on your own with a bairn and you refuse that they’ll say you’re obviously not as desperate as you say you are. So you've got the choice of somewhere dangerous and locking yourself in the flat for god knows how long. So they’ve got to understand it from that point of view as well” (Felling resident, 2007)

With owner-occupiers in particular the RTT often build up close relationships with the residents and become aware of the different personal situations that may affect the move.

In discussions with the RTT they revealed that for many owner occupiers who have bought through ‘right to buy’ the move can be quite daunting as they have never had to organize moving house before. Living in the same house for decades and as former ‘passive recipients of authoritarian intervention’ (Haworth and Manzi, 1999) whereby any repair and maintenance issues are fulfilled by the council or housing association, after a phone call to the correct department – actually arranging to move was an unknown. The issues that caused most problems were disconnecting services (gas, electric, telephone
etc) – who to ring? When to disconnect? How to get reconnected in the new house? The legal process of solicitors, land searches, costs and surveys and packing and arranging a removal firm. This is a reminder then when considering Graham and Thrift’s (2007) notion of ‘repair and maintenance’ and Leigh-Star’s (1999) nine key characteristics of infrastructure (embedded, transparent, offers temporal or spatial reach or scope, is learned by users, linked to conventions of practice, embodies standards, is fixed in modular increments, not built all at once and becomes visible on breakdown) that for some negotiating and gaining access to network providers of infrastructure and repair and maintenance is related to knowledge and participation.

7.5.2 Promising plots: the example of the Cambrian Estate, Walker Riverside

Of the three case studies, Walker Riverside has made the most progress regarding demolition and new building. The Walker Riverside partnership is led by Places for People (PFP) who was chosen by BNG as the preferred option. After the Going for Growth ‘lack of consultation’ fiasco, PFP promised to consult and include the communities and developed the ‘Walker Riverside Promise’ (WRP, 2005:2) “for residents, community and voluntary organizations and local businesses within the seven neighbourhoods identified for intervention”. Specifically, the WRP (2005:3) offers residents six ‘promises’ - to remain in Walker Riverside if they wish, discuss individual housing needs before plans are submitted, be informed whether ‘decant’ will be necessary (a temporary move when the old house has to be demolished to make way for the new build), be involved in shaping and planning the neighbourhood, recognize the importance of community networks and try to make sure friends and neighbours stay together if they wish and be able to choose location and site of their new home (plot preference) and priority be given to residents based on housing needs.

The Cambrian Estate (Figure 7.6) in Walker Riverside is one of the seven neighbourhoods (Figure 7.7) identified for intervention and is the most developed site of all three case study areas.
The Cambrian Estate is the most developed because they have attempted to pioneer a regeneration process that ‘promises’ not to disrupt affected residents as much as more drastic clearance programmes (as seen in Scotswood). Rather than relocating residents, demolishing houses then building new the three social and material processes are
progressing simultaneously in the relatively small neighbourhood space. Residents were notified that their houses were due for demolition and then maps of the development plans were distributed to all residents affected. Adhering to the ‘Walker Promise’ all residents that wanted to stay chose their ‘plot preference’ from the development plans and were hopeful of moving with neighbours and friends.

A ‘stutter’ in repair and maintenance: social and material intersections

Perhaps this sounds like an excellent strategy but in reality progress has been delayed and the intersection between social and material relations has revealed, to borrow Graham and Thrift’s term, a ‘stutter in repair and maintenance. In discussions with the site manager, he revealed that various staffing issues (Bellway is the developer) had delayed progress, such as finding tradesmen with the required ‘yellow card’ that proves their qualification standards and allows them to work on site. The promise of training local youngsters to work on the projects was delayed due to the new college not being built on time and the new apprenticeships not fulfilling the ‘fully qualified status’ of electrician, plumber etc. For example, new apprenticeships last two years (in contrast to the old system that took five to six years) so they are not deemed fully qualified by the trades and health and safety to receive a full ‘yellow card’. A more serious material factor was revealed after demolishing the houses when the builders revealed an underground tunnel, associated with Walker’s industrial history. Interestingly the architect in their search of the land’s material history did not discover this so they proceeded with drawing the plans. However, in discussions with the long-standing local residents they said in a matter of fact way – ‘oh yes, we knew about the tunnel but they never asked us’. Here then we see the power geometries in spaces of regeneration whereby the professional – the architect is consulted as the land expert rather than the local residents. Other problems were revealed when the ‘material architectural plans’ for the land, drawn in an office, not in the community met with the people responsible for interpreting and delivering the plans (the builders) and the ‘realities of the material land’. The discrepancies between ‘material plans on paper’ and ‘material reality’ reveal the problems of ‘surfacing the invisible’ (Leigh-Star, 1999). Not all infrastructures have a ‘written record’ for the architect etc to find – some infrastructures are only surfaced via the memories of people associated in some way historically.
Due to the ‘stutter’ in the process of repairing community, the development was delayed by a year. This of course adds even more stress, anxiety and uncertainty for residents waiting hopefully for a new home. In consequence, some residents have become tired of waiting and moved elsewhere. If possible, they moved in Walker if not they moved around the East End of Newcastle. For the tight-knit community of the Cambrian Estate many of whom had lived in the same neighbourhood for 30-40 years the move was emotional,

“When we moved out I didn’t shut the door to ‘woor home’ and I still say ‘woor home’ because I couldn’t and my daughter came over the next day and I had to go over for the gas and electricity readings. I went in the back and they’d taken the shed down and gone all over the lawns and I just cried oh it was horrible. I would have preferred to stay where I was for the rest of our lives but it was taken away from us, we didn’t have a choice” (Walker Riverside resident, 2007)

7.5.3 Resisting movement and enforcing relocation: compulsory purchase orders

The Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) is a technique of government only used if negotiations and offers of compensation do not bring about the acquisition of properties in clearance areas. The “use of compulsory purchase powers to assist the site assembly process” (NCC, 2007:1) comes under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004. The PCPA states that a CPO can be issued by the local authority “if the authority think that the acquisition will facilitate the carrying out of development, re-development or improvement on or in relation to the land” (Office of Public Sector Information, OPSI, 2009). The caveat is that,

“a local authority must not exercise the power under paragraph (a) of subsection (1) unless they think that the development, re-development or improvement is likely to contribute to the achievement of any one or more of the following objects;
(a) the promotion or improvement of the economic well-being of their area;
(b) the promotion or improvement of the social well-being of their area;
(c) the promotion or improvement of the environmental well-being of their area.” (OPSJ, 2009).

According to commentators, the PCPA 2004 is one of a plethora of policies to modernize and speed up the planning system (Doak and Parker, 2005; Cowell and Owens, 2006). As critics have been swift to point out, the ‘speeding up of planning’, highlights tension between the urge to streamline and the claim that planning should promote sustainability (see, for example, Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, 2002; Upton, 2002 cited in Cowell and Owens, 2006:412). The emphasis on a shorter, swifter planning process potentially conflicts with “full and proper scrutiny of environmental and social considerations” (Cowell and Owens, 2006:412). Interestingly, the US made similar legislative changes to what they call ‘eminent domain’ and “these changes provoked national demonstrations, blanket coverage across the media, and even saw protestors camping on the lawn of one of the Supreme Court judges” (Minton, 2009:94). In the UK “the Act received little attention” (Minton, 2004:94). Minton (2009) suggests the reason for such disparate responses lies in the differing property owning cultures, with individual private property being central to US national culture.

Within BNG, CPO is a last resort as it can take many years, for example, in Scotswood the negotiations with residents in the clearance area started during Going for Growth in 1999. In a document considering CPO in Benwell and Scotswood, the Director of Regeneration acknowledges the importance of economic, social and environmental considerations. In the same document, a case is made for regeneration in terms of ‘leaving a legacy’, ‘supporting the economic growth of the city, improving housing choice and affordability and the quality of neighbourhoods’ (NCC, 2007). The ‘case for regeneration’ overrides any concerns regarding the loss of one’s home because in BNG’s view, regeneration will promote and improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the area.

For example, before a CPO is issued the process involves negotiations between the Director of Regeneration, the Executive Member for Regeneration, Planning and
Transportation and the Head of Legal services to draw up the CPO notice. This is the legal document handed to affected parties. In the meantime, the Head of Property Services continues negotiations with affected property owners. As stated above, the CPO is a last resort in BNG because of the long and complex socio-legal negotiations. The short term nature of pathfinder funding (in three year tranches) creates tensions because of the long term regeneration goals. As the National Audit Office (2007:18) argues “obtaining Compulsory Purchase Orders can take up to six years and local authorities have had to make financial commitments to fund these Orders in the event that future funding is not forthcoming from the Department”.

In the case study areas, the CPO is mentioned in particular in the ‘key regeneration sites’ (National Audit Office, 2007) of Walker Riverside and Scotswood,

“there are still 230 properties to be acquired in Scotswood and they are mainly in the private rented sector

AA Is it a problem trying to find out who owns them?

A little bit of that but mainly landlords do not want to sell. They say what they have been offered for the value of their land is not sufficiently high but if you look in an area of market collapse how can you put a value on somewhere that no one wants to live in? So really, what has been happening for the last three or four years rather than negotiating with every known owner in that area we have been working with the property section of the council to say we think this is the value of your house and this is what we’ll give you. Its been a case of back and forth until values have been agreed and their properties has been acquired or there’s been a break in dialogue and what it will lead to is both housing and planning CPOs that will be starting this year to I tie up the remainder of those 230 properties” (West Newcastle Area Coordinator, BNG, 2007)

In Walker Riverside, CPO is mentioned in relation to the Heart of Walker (formerly Community Focus) and the Western Gateway developments whereby “the remaining Tyneside flats will be acquired by the council using its CPO powers” (BNG, 2007:10). The CPO is the most powerful technique because, put simply, it allows the state to take
away a house (a home) that is considered in the way of regeneration. If ‘dialogue breaks down’ between the local authority and the property owner, which means the property owner does not want to sell and move (for whatever reason) - it is then that the CPO is used to forcibly shift the ‘disagreeable’ property owner. During the fieldwork there was never an opportunity to speak to a property owner subject to a CPO but in discussions with friends, neighbours, community workers etc the reasons for not wanting to move were a combination of financial (e.g. a disagreement over the local authority valuation and/or unable to afford a similar property) and attachment to place (see Section 7.7.2).

In some other Housing Market Renewal areas, the contestations and controversies surrounding demolition and relocation have been rendered visible via the socio-legal intersections of the CPO process (see Allen, 2008). As Minton (2009:94) argues, Pathfinder is about human stories of desperate individuals trying to save their homes and the complex legal details of the court battles which have ensued, all at the behest of a highly centralized government programme”. Yet in BNG the contestations against Going for Growth (see earlier in chapter) have not been repeated and CPO is a relatively hidden aspect of demolition. In particular, these extracts from my research diary provide an insight into the hidden aspects of demolition - the CPO victim,

“In walking around an area like Walker Riverside or Scotswood, one is struck by the contrast between the boarded up houses awaiting demolition, the small and large gaps of grassland where houses once stood and the occasional site of an inhabited house amongst this desolate site. It is sad to see the small signs of inhabitation of the person awaiting CPO – the Sky dish, the net curtains flapping through an open window, the tended garden, and the ornaments in the window. Worst of all though is the concerned face peering at me through the net curtain. This made me feel extremely sad and uncomfortable – it felt like the worst kind of voyeurism”.

“In a conversation with a member of the regeneration team about the possibility of filming a demolition they said I had missed a ‘good one’ yesterday. Apparently, a CPO had been administered and yesterday was ‘eviction day’ for this troublesome family. Because the family had caused trouble in the past, security guards were present as well as the bailiffs to form a ‘secure ring’ around the
house. Laughing they recalled their disappointment that the family did not cause any trouble but left the house quietly.”

7.6 The ‘least spectacular demolitions’: The artist’s spectacle or the surgeon’s extraction

> Whether it’s good or bad, it is sometimes very pleasant, too, to smash things
> Fyodor Dostoyevsky, Notes from the Underground

Some aspects of the politics of demolition are more visible than others. One would perhaps expect the demolition act would be quite a spectacle because destruction in motion - be it a natural phenomena or a human induced demolition - can be terrifying, horrifying and thrilling in equal measures. The spectacle and experience of destruction evoke immediate, intense emotional reactions as Smith (1989) commented in an article for the Los Angeles Times “people love to see things come down. It’s real, it’s emotional, it’s passion. It’s adrenaline”. To some, then, demolition is a public spectacle, it is entertainment Demolition stimulates strong emotional reactions, in part manipulated by the demolisher who deliberately creates an artistic spectacle with dynamite that metaphorically ‘kills’ a building by ‘choreographed construction suicide’ (Byles, 2005:86). Alternatively the demolishers use the surgeon metaphor to describe their ‘art’. The surgeon metaphor implies a skilled, precise intervention and is mostly applied to ‘slum clearance’ or the demolition of public houses. Jeff Byles in his aptly titled publication ‘Rubble’ charted the history of demolition and spoke to many demolishers in the US who variously described their occupation by drawing from the surgeon metaphor with such comments as ‘building euthanasia’ (Byles, 2005:86) or the ‘dentist of urban decay’ (p 97) or when talking about public housing demolition they said ‘we create a clean canvas and let someone else be the artist’. And interestingly Baron Haussmann called himself ‘the artist-demolitionist’. Demolition, particularly when applied to public buildings, can be seen in terms of the artistic creation of a spectacle. When applied to more private residential dwellings associated with urban decay and socio-economic problems the artistic metaphor is inappropriate and distasteful. Instead, the surgeon metaphor is applied thereby inferring professionalization and skill to the act of demolition. However,
in both artist and surgeon metaphorical interpretations the inter-relationship and tension between life and death/creation and destruction is palpable.

7.6.1 ‘Domicide’: socio-technical disconnections of houses and homes

Similar to the US, demolitions in the UK of public buildings tend to be public events (but less spectacular!), whereas the more widespread demolition of residential houses is shrouded in secrecy and conducted in private. In Newcastle, the City Council website has links to a time-lapse video of the demolition of Newcastle City Library. There is also a link to another website ‘Losing it’ where images of public building demolition in Newcastle can be seen, such as the City Library, Westgate House and Talk of the Tyne. In contrast, there are no images of the ongoing residential housing demolition in BNG. In a study exploring the connections between houses, homes and violence in Palestine Harker (2009:324) argues,

“When talking and writing about the destruction of Palestinian property, it is usually the case of house demolitions and rarely home demolitions” (original emphasis).

In BNG documents, one has to know the ‘regeneration speak’ and read selectively between the narratives of past history and future vision to establish that the process involves demolishing homes. Terms such as ‘land assembly’ and ‘clearance programme’ are used more frequently in BNG documents than ‘property’ or ‘house’ demolition and homes are never mentioned. For instance, the Scotswood Benwell Strategic Commission document in a section on ‘vision and future roles’ states,

“Land assembly has provided the opportunity for the significant new housing development…….The clearance programme, which was agreed following substantial consultation with residents, will secure a 65ha site within this BNG planning period (2008-11) and will therefore be available for future redevelopment. 800 properties have been demolished to date with another 600 to take place after acquisition” (BNG, 2007a:4)
The term house or property preceding demolition implies a material detached process of destroying the built form. Home demolition, implies the “destruction of a set of material, social and affective relations that constitute home” (Harker, 2009:324). By deliberately avoiding the term home, BNG do not acknowledge the multiple experiences of home whereby,

“Some may speak of the physical structure of their house or dwelling; others may refer to relationships or connections over space and time. You might have positive or negative feelings about home, or a mixture of the two” (Blunt and Dowling, 2006:1).

According to Harker (2009) home demolition is similar to what Porteous and Smith (2001:12) term ‘domicide…defined as the deliberate destruction of home by human agency in pursuit of specific goals, which cause human suffering to the victim’. Domicide has many different forms across the globe, including eviction, exile, expropriation, displacement, dislocation and relocation (Porteous and Smith, 2001). It can involve the destruction of a single property, a neighbourhood or an ethnic homeland (Harker, 2009). In BNG, domicide means the destruction and relocation of long standing neighbourhood and Section 7.7 considers the emotional impact of domicide in more detail.

Finding out when demolitions are going to occur within the BNG area is difficult for residents and researchers alike because the ‘act of demolition’ is preceded by and embedded within a network of negotiations and socio-technical processes. For example, the factors that need to be in place for a house to be deemed habitable - the architectural structure to ensure protection from the elements and the house should be connected to the central network infrastructure that supply water, gas, electricity and telecommunications. Such network infrastructures ensure that the house is part of the “accelerating flows and mobilities that surround globalization” (Graham, 2001:339). The technical infrastructures of water, energy etc not only connects the house to a global network of flows but they also situate the house in place. To demolish the house is to disconnect from the ‘network of flows’.
Within BNG, observation reveals the ‘socio-technical signatures’ on the exterior of the house to indicate the disconnection - large writing on the exterior of the house in green, yellow or blue signifies that ‘electric off’, ‘gas off’ and ‘water off’ (Figure 7.8).

**Figure 7.8: Signs of disconnection before demolition** (Andrea Armstrong)

The house is gradually dislodged from its moorings as the service flows are disconnected. Once the complex network of negotiations between residents, service providers and the local authority results in the acquisition of houses the piecemeal demolition of houses begins. As the West Newcastle Area Coordinator, BNG (2007) noted,

> “if you go down there now you will see ongoing demolition because we’re getting 20 or 30 properties a month being demolished. It’s just a case of whenever you get a block of two or three in a row and then we have a contract arrangement with a demolition expert so as soon as we own a block or a street we inform them and within a couple of days they will go out and clear them”
7.6.2 The demolition expert

Within the BNG area Owen Pugh are the chosen demolition expert. To many people the demolition process is associated with the wrecking ball and explosives (Liss, 2000) and is the spectacular experience as described above. However, within the spaces of regeneration the observed demolitions were very different as this extract from my research diary illustrates (see also Figure 7.9),

“First, the paraphernalia of the demolisher was brought onto the site such as the JCB digger, the portacabins, skips, fencing and the low loading lorries. The demolishers, a group of five or six men wore high visibility jackets and hard hats and were led by a supervisor and his deputy. The demolishing process was organized, methodical and surprisingly slow, for example two – thee days to demolish two properties. Not so spectacular! The whole site was surrounded by high, steel fences before the JCB operator started dismantling the house – no wrecking ball, no explosives, the JCB digger pushes and pulls the walls and roof down”.

Figure 7.9: Photos showing the phases of demolition witnessed in Scotswood in 2007
(Andrea Armstrong)
The process is slow and methodical because the houses are dismantled in order to recycle as much material as possible. In most cases over 85 per cent of demolition material can be reduced, re-used, reclaimed or recycled (RICS, 2007). Over 80 per cent of construction material comes from natural resources (RICS, 2007) so the demolishers Owen Pugh picked out materials such as timber, tiles, slates or top soil that could be re-used in its present state; bricks, concrete, metal or glass that could be crushed and recycled after reprocessing; or materials that could be recycled or reused through conservation such as carved masonry, period doors and windows. Even though the ‘act of demolition’ was less spectacular than anticipated, the benefit of slowing down the whole process was that materials were recycled and reused. Again we return to the issue of demolition and sustainability from the perspective of materiality. As the National Audit Office (2007:18) argue,

“Demolition has both environmental benefits, in terms of the re-use of brownfield land and the replacement of old properties with new ones built to modern standards of sustainable design, and environmental costs, in terms of generating landfill and wasting embedded carbon. Any consideration of the options available for redeveloping a neighbourhood should include both the benefits and costs. However, the pathfinder business cases we examined tended to highlight the environmental benefits rather than the costs”.
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The expert demolisher of residential houses may display the controlled, skill of the surgeon, in this case precisely extracting ‘obsolete’ houses with no spectacle or spectators yet in conversations they appeared well aware of the emotional and controversial aspects of their work. For example, they regaled numerous tales of previous demolitions within the area - of haunted houses where only the deputy supervisor would enter, which added to his reputation as fearless; of demolitions associated with crimes such as the convicted child murderer Mary Bell whose house was in Scotswood or houses associated with the murder by arson of a family with young children. As Harris (1999:117) notes “nothing better reveals the linkages made….between building and human life cycles more than the powerful emotions raised by the expiration of a structure’s time on earth”. The demolishers’ stories or more accurately the experiences they selected to tell are a useful insight into the world of demolition - the daring and danger associated with it, the machismo; the link between life and death, creation and destruction and the way in which the identity of a house and its resident can become entwined with the familiar house transforming into the architectural uncanny (Vidler, 1994) after the murders and deaths by arson, thus, the familiar, taken for granted house turns to horror (King, 2006) and is destroyed. Interestingly, the demolishers told such tales as a positive example of housing demolition in the sense that the community supported the destruction of a house that served only as a symbolic reminder of past horrors. This is in contrast to their current contract which is perceived as negative demolition. As the members of the Scotswood Neighbourhood Residents Association told me of Owen Pugh’s initial entry into the area after Going for Growth “we lined the streets as they came in with their bulldozers and booed”.

7.7 The emotional geographies of demolition and ‘being moved’

Moving house is recognized as one of the most stressful life events, even when the decision to move is a personal one. For most people, the decision to move house is a personal choice based on lifestyle, employment etc and the ability to move depends upon a variety of factors such as, personal initiative, family ties, transferable skills, the amount of information available (and access to information) and the ability to pay travel costs (Pooley and Turnbull, 1998:69). Therefore, the opportunity to move is not available to everyone, even if it would be their choice. Researchers exploring movement to the countryside have found that those with the option to move and the ability to choose the
time and place they might inhabit are the middle classes (Murdoch and Day, 1998; Savage et al, 1992; Lewis, 1998) and families with children (Valentine, 1997; Matthews et al., 2000). In contrast, many working class families in BNG have lived in the same council housing for decades. They may never have moved in their lifetime or they may have moved in earlier ‘slum clearances’ programmes. In consequence, the knowledge that ‘their home’ of all homes in Newcastle and Gateshead is ‘obsolete’ instills a range of emotions – very much like a bereavement – denial, despair, anger and finally acceptance of their fate.

7.7.1 Keeping mementoes

Keeping mementoes is an important coping mechanism for many residents being moved,

“AA I wondered if you keep mementoes or actually watched you house being demolished?

Oh yes, well, we walked around there and watched it go and had a word with the guy who was knocking it down and he said ‘hang on a minute’ and got the bricks for us and now they’re in the yard there. And I’ve got the Robert Street sign, because I’d lived there all me life and somebody decided I should have the sign so before the street came down they brought it round and knocked on me front door and said, here we are and its in my shed. But it was a real trauma moving, relocating and finding……I mean this is a house the other place was where I’d lived all my life, a home and we’d all been brought up together and we’d had happy times and this is bricks and mortar, I could leave this house any time I like and it wouldn’t matter

AA how do you cope with losing such an attachment and your family history and everything?

Well, I said at the time of moving you can pack all your memories into suitcases but there wasn’t enough room in the suitcase for all your memories. I mean you’ve just relocated three streets and you’ve brought things with you……and that’s a photo of my father as a pit man up there and that house on the middle bit
is a family houses that used to be on Armstrong Road and they demolished that in a previous regeneration” (Scotswood resident, 2007).

Here we see that the things that people take with them, the ‘aide memoires’ (Rowlands, 1993) help preserve a certain consistency and continuity. As Marcoux (2001:73) argues, “we could also say that memory may be constituted in motion through the displacement of objects. Bringing things with oneself, then, is to make the choice of remembering”. The role of mobile possessions in securing memory in motion is mostly seen in research on migration, exile and diaspora (e.g. Spitzer, 1993; Parkin, 1999). Here though, we see that mobile possessions such as a couple of bricks and the street name sign secure a memory of a past home. More important than the mobile possessions though, are the memories attached to a certain house that makes it a home. The new house, only three streets away from the original, does not have the attachment to family history and memory and is thus seen merely as ‘bricks and mortar’. This contradicts MacGregor Wise (2000:297) who writes that home “is not the place we ‘come from’; it is the place we are”.

7.7.2 Breaking community networks, losing family and friends

The social and material processes of demolition and relocation transform spaces of regeneration. By dispersing the community geographically, no matter how small or large a distance as DeLanda (2006) argues, unless the community members are more active in the maintenance of links the connections become wider and weaker and the mundane rituals that expressed solidarity may be broken. As Marcuse (1985:931) argues,

“Displacement from home and neighbourhood can be a shattering experience. At worst, it leads to homelessness, at best, it impairs a sense of community. Public policy should, by general agreement, minimize displacement.” (Marcuse, 1985:931)

It is important to consider the variety of ways in which ‘domicide’ affects people and to define exactly what sort of home and community is being destroyed (Harker, 2009). This is exemplified by an elderly woman who had lived in the same house in Pottery Bank in Walker Riverside for 42 years. Her children were all born there and two of her sons and their families continue to live in Walker Riverside, one in Pottery Bank and one just off
Walker Road, so both within one mile. Her house was demolished and she is living in a new house on the Cambrian Estate because these were the only houses available in Walker at the time. I asked how the move has affected contact with her family, she replied,

“Well if I didn’t come up every day I wouldn’t see them at all. They don’t bother coming down, I don’t know whether they don’t want to come down because they’ve other things to do but I go out every morning when I get up by 8 o clock and I’m up here. I’ve never walked so much in all me life because when I was over there I was quite content just to sit and do what I had to do in the house and sit and watch television it didn’t bother us going gallivanting different places and now I’m out every morning and I go back down again at 12:30 to 1 o clock for the rest of the day and then we go to the shop when he comes in from work and get what I need from the shop and then I’ll go and visit me sister

(AA) so you’re not in your new house very much?

Well everybody’s up here I can’t just knock on next door and say eh you I’ve come to visit you like. I mean beforehand I used to lock the door go round the corner and go round to me son’s or along the street and that’s what gets me because they’re pulling down decent homes and they’re shouting and bawling because there’s no where to move to because they’re not building them quick enough to put people in. So it means that people have to move away from their relatives to Byker and places like that if I wouldn’t move to some places they’re hoying people. I would have still been there if that house hadn’t come available because I wouldn’t have moved out of the area. There’s a woman who lives next to me sister on Burwood Road and she’s in her 90s and I don’t want her to die but it could possibly happen and I thought well if her house comes up I’ll put in for that and at least I’m in the same area. But the way things were going it was happening that quick before you knew where you were there were 3 or 4 people moving out in a week and 3 in a day (Walker Riverside resident, 2007)

In this situation, her community is not where her new house is but where her old friends and family still are. Home and community here means identity with “themes of family,
friends, rootedness, memory and nostalgia” (Porteous and Smith, 2001:12). The attachment to place and the bonding with people has been established over the years (Altman and Low, 1992). Place attachment is related to the degree of autonomy over choice of residence (see Bahi-Fleury, 1996). Thus control over ones own residential choices (e.g. free choice, forced relocation, can they leave if they want, do they feel trapped) is related to place attachment (Livingston et al, 2008). The Walker Riverside resident returns every day to her old neighbourhood and has acquired a new daily ritual to maintain ties with family and friends. Here then we have an example of mundane, everyday mobility (Binnie et al, 2007) to maintain connections with familiar people and spaces. As Livingston et al, (2008) reveal, networks of family and friends are an important factor for place attachment in poor neighbourhoods and these strong attachments hinder the formation of bonds in the new areas. Yet one has to be careful not to romanticise notions of home and community because for some these spaces are discriminatory (Valentine, 1998) or violent (Meth, 2003). In the example above the elderly mother is making the effort to see her family and as she says ‘if she did not make the effort she would not see them’. Thus one can assume that family, community and home means something different to the younger members of this family. Whereas the mother is making efforts to maintain and bridge the family connection the younger members do not make reciprocal efforts.

In discussion with another Walker Riverside resident who had been moved from Pottery Bank to the Cambrian Estate she wished she still lived in her old neighbourhood,

“AA What is it like living on the Cambrian?

It’s different its very quiet and you hardly see anybody and the neighbours you hardly see there unless it’s a nice day and they’re in their back garden its not like what it was here” (Walker Riverside resident, 2007)

A relocated Scotswood resident stated similar feelings,

“I do miss being up here I miss the atmosphere but there’s not much of an atmosphere where I am now” (former Scotswood resident, 2007)
In the Walker Riverside example, moving house was out of her control and the choice of new house was restricted because ‘they’re not building them quick enough to put people in’. Once in her new house though, she makes the effort to maintain the network of connections with family and friends by walking to them each day. She is fortunate to live within walking distance of her old neighbourhood as this allows her to take back some control over her mobility choices and reconnect with her family. Others are not so fortunate, because the lack of new properties available and the altered tenure choice (more owner-occupied than rented) means the community networks are stretched too far for some. The elderly and those on a low incomes or unemployed are the most affected because a mortgage is not an option.

**Conclusion**

This chapter begins to develop a relational understanding of regeneration by focusing on the material and social moments of destruction and disconnection. Within a governmentality framework the main argument is made that demolition is a technology of government to erase certain people within certain urban spaces. Drawing on a set of literatures from materiality, infrastructures, repair and maintenance and emotional geographies the relationship between the history of place and the socio-technical power geometries of politics and policy is explored. The main findings are that demolition and relocation are part of a complex network of visible and hidden power relations to meet government agendas. The visible politics of demolition claim houses are obsolete because they no longer meet tastes and aspirations. By ‘surfacing the invisible politics of demolition’ this chapter argues that the judgement of space is related to the surveillance of space for signs of the sustainable and unsustainable resident, the unruly and the irresponsible landlord. These value judgements are the invisible rationalities used to determine demolition. The chapter then considers the techniques of demolition that put into practice the rationalities. Three ‘visible’ techniques are identified – the community expert, promising plots and compulsory purchase orders. The two final sections of the chapter go on to explore the ‘hidden’ aspects of demolition – the act of demolishing the houses and the emotional responses of affected residents.
CHAPTER 8

Transforming community

8.1 Introduction

Chapter 7 explored the ways in which demolition and relocation involve complex interrelationships between social and material processes. This chapter moves onto the next phase of shaping and transforming spaces of regeneration by exploring the rationalities and techniques of transformation. The chapter begins by developing the conceptual avenues introduced in Chapter 4 concerning a relational understanding of the ways in which social and material power geometries negotiate the transformation of spaces of regeneration. The chapter then discusses the rationalities of transformation and considers the ways in which the ‘case for transformation’ has been justified and ‘problematized’ according to general and specific social and material geographies. The main argument here is that the social and material problems of stigma and lack of housing choice contribute to the political rationality of ‘mixing communities’ and ‘urban branding’ is a technique to achieve ‘mixed communities’. The following sections of the chapter draw on empirical evidence from the three case studies to explore the various branding techniques in BNG and consider the implications for the local working class residents. Throughout, the chapter considers the interpretation of such urban transformations as ‘state-led’ gentrification.

8.2 Interpreting transformation

Chapter 4 introduced a spatial understanding of regeneration that focuses on the relationality of space, in order to understand the process of transforming places and people. A relational understanding of the transformation of spaces of regeneration considers “space in the process of becoming ….in the process of being made” (Massey, 1998:37). To understand the process of being made, we need to understand how spaces of regeneration were made in the past to understand why and how they are being remade. Foucault’s concept of governmentality allows us to explore the rationalities of transformation. Understanding space as a rationality of government helps us interpret the “writing of history of spaces and powers (in plural)”……[and thus] the examination of the logics contained in strategies and tactics of power/government that
seek to use space for particular ends" (Huxley, 2007:194). The process of regeneration involves the writings of history of spaces and powers in particular ways to justify the technologies of transformation. To justify intervention means writing the history of spaces of regeneration in terms of social and material disconnection (see Chapter 7) - the narrative of decline and depopulation, of homogenous, inward looking working class communities, lack of housing choice and of stigma. As Harvey (1989:16) argues,

“To begin with, enquiry should focus on the contrast between the surface vigour of many of the projects for regeneration of flagging urban economies and the underlying trends in the urban condition. It should recognize that behind the mask of many successful projects there lie some serious social and economic problems and that in many cities these are taking geographical shape in the form of a dual city of inner city regeneration and a surrounding sea of increasing impoverishment”.

Spaces of regeneration are related to other urban spaces and each space is in the process of being made. The process of being made though is related to the multitude of networks assembling particular spaces. Some spaces are dominant and some are dominated (Murdoch, 2006). Therefore, to understand the technologies of transformation we need to explore ‘connections’ or more accurately ‘re-connections’.

To understand the transformation of spaces of regeneration, the work of Harvey (1989) is an excellent starting point. Spaces of regeneration, in the process of becoming, involves techniques of transformation to [re] connect people and places to the wider city centre and suburban spaces. The sense of disconnection between spaces of regeneration and the ‘successful’ city spaces is most clearly seen in the BNG prospectus that paints a picture of the juxtaposition between spaces of ‘growth’ and spaces of ‘decline’,

“The centre of NewcastleGateshead is vibrant…..Its international reputation for sport, shopping, nightlife, historic architecture, urban parks and the contemporary arts is growing thanks to developments such as the Angel of the North, the Baltic world class cultural centre, Gateshead International Stadium, the Gateshead
Millennium Bridge, the Great North Run, the Grainger Town Project…. (HMR, 2004:5)

“Set against this success are major challenges. Adjacent to the city centre are neighbourhoods blighted by abandoned housing and market failure associated with the decline or disappearance of traditional industries such as ship building and mining……Such areas contrast sharply not only with the successful centre but with other residential areas of NewcastleGateshead” (HMR, 2004:6).

The aim is to “develop and extend the vibrant inner core conurbation of NewcastleGateshead outwards, building attractive communities in which people want to live” (HMR, 2004:6). The language of ‘develop’ ‘extend’ and ‘outwards’ also points toward an understanding of transformation in terms of connections; in effect, spreading the success. A range of strategies have emerged over the years to transform spaces of regeneration, including,

“Gentrification, cultural innovation, and physical up-grading of the urban environment (including the turn to post-modernist styles of architecture and urban design)), consumer attractions (sports stadia, convention and shopping centres, marinas, exotic eating places) and entertainment (the organization of urban spectacles on a temporary or permanent basis” (Harvey, 1989:14).

An increasingly important aspect of transforming spaces of regeneration is the production of an urban image whereby the entrepreneurial city creates social and material imagery for competitive purposes (ibid). Within this context, place marketing has become a significant aspect of urban regeneration (see Anholt, 2005; Kavaratsis, 2004; Rantisi and Leslie, 2006). The rise of place marketing is most often discussed within the context of the shift in urban governance from managerial to entrepreneurial (see Harvey, 1989; Griffiths, 1998). Within the context of entrepreneurial governance, the process of place branding is related to two not always easily compatible objectives – the relation to external audiences, as a means by which to attract investment and people, and in relation to the local audiences to legitimate regeneration, cement local solidarities, foster morale and social cohesion within the increasingly divided and segregated city (Griffiths, 1998:44). As Harvey (1989:14) argues, “the production of an urban image of this sort
also has internal political and social consequences”. Place marketing, as Harvey (1989) recognizes is related to power, whereby the most powerful decide on the marketing strategy to (re)create space.

Other commentators have noticed the shift from ‘city marketing’ to the process of ‘branding’ whereby culture is seen in business terms with prestige cultural assets (buildings, museum, areas) described in real estate language as ‘flagships’, ‘chesspieces’, ‘nodes’, the ‘anchor store’ in shopping malls and the ‘must see’ tourist attraction (see Evans, 2003; Garcia, 2004 cited in Cochrane, 2007:114). Here we see attempts to transform the material aspects of city spaces by using branding as a technique to connect new and old cultural assets. At the same time, Florida (2002:8) constructs an image of a ‘creative class’ of knowledge workers who “create new ideas, new technology and/or new creative content”. According to Florida (2002), cities are competing to lure the creative class to provide specialized labour in new and expanding industries and contribute to urban regeneration. Thus, we begin to consider the transformation of cities in terms of relations between new and existing material cultural assets, the need to attract the creative class and spaces of regeneration. Within the context of urban regeneration policy, it is important to examine the extent to which local cultural and creative influences, affect branding in spaces of regeneration. Branding is set in relations of power that influence the process of creating spaces of regeneration. Put simply the hypothesis being tested in this chapter, is that branding is a technology of government to transform spaces of regeneration. The rationality of transformation involves a narrative of decline combined with a desire to attract the middle classes (the creative class in Florida’ terms) in order to create mixed communities (see Chapter 3). The chapter focuses on the various branding techniques used in the three case studies to illustrate the ways in which mixed communities are achieved and received. Through the process of branding, or ‘image politics’ an imaginative vision is created to transform spaces of regeneration from the old to the new; as in the case of Glasgow (Helms, 2008:89) from ‘working class hard city’ to ‘middle class cultural city’.

Urban branding involves ‘image politics’ whereby a range of branding techniques transmits specially chosen images to alter perceptions and attract investment in material infrastructures and people to repopulate deserted spaces of the city. The politics and geography of urban branding is related to what Katz (2001) refers to as the hidden
geographies of capitalism. The power to create and transmit a new image for city spaces is situated with the dominant networks that can hide the unfavourable places and people. Thus we begin to consider the ways in which mediated images of spaces of regeneration are working in particular ways for the city and local people. As Philo and Kearns (1993:3) argue,

“[…] there is also a more social logic at work in that self promotion of places may be operating as a subtle form for socialization designed to convince people, many of whom will be disadvantaged and potentially disaffected, that they are important cogs in a successful community and that all sorts of ‘good things’ are really being done on their behalf”.

According to Helms (2008:99) in her study of remaking the old industrial spaces of Glasgow, the imagineering of Glasgow “stands for a deliberate strategy to influence, shape, or, even more strongly, engineer images that represent Glasgow” (original emphasis). Urban branding in spaces of regeneration is about the flow of ideas to project an image to attract investors and the middle classes back to the inner city and as Philo and Kearns (1993) argues, orchestrate home support for regeneration. Once investment is secured it is about fixing those ideas in a built infrastructure of newly imagined houses. The issue then is to consider the dominant and hidden meanings of urban branding by examining the rationalities and techniques of transformation.

8.3 Rationalities for transformation

Like many other former industrial regions, Newcastle Gateshead has a story of growth and decline. The picture of fragmented, polarized city spaces persists alongside images of a vibrant city centre. Despite many attempts to transform the spaces associated with past industrial glory, continued out migration and a lack of investment in new house building has exacerbated problems. In interviews and policy documents the rationalities for transformation are presented within ‘regimes of truth’ or as Rose (1999:19) puts it,

“…the emergence of particular ‘regimes of truth’ concerning the conduct of conduct, ways of speaking the truth, persons authorized to speak truths, ways of enacting truths and the costs of doing so. Of the invention and assemblage of
particular apparatus and devices for exercising power and intervening upon certain problems”.

The regimes of truth provide an opportunity to understand the ‘mentalities’ or ‘modes of thought’ (Section 4.4.2) of government that animate governmental aspirations (Huxley, 2007). In the case of BNG, the problematization of stigmatized neighbourhoods and lack of housing choice is set within the context of ‘council estates’ in spaces of regeneration. Such narratives are generated to portray a particular regime of truth. The problematic regime of truth for spaces of regeneration becomes translated into governmentalized assumptions and aspirations of mixing communities. It is to these rationalities of transformation that we turn to next.

8.3.1 Council estates, the working class, stigma, lack of housing choice and ‘state-led’ gentrification

“The West End’s [Newcastle] reputation is legendary: years ago child killer Mary Bell in Scotswood; the 1991 riots; joyriders; drugs and violence; notorious criminal families. One small, telling example of this reputation that I have experienced is of officials going to a meeting in the West End trying to avoid taking their cars” (Robinson, 2005:32)

In the post war period idealistic and Utopian thinking influenced the development of the council estates in Western Europe (Wassenberg, 2004). Since then, the council estate has become a “problematic concentration of low demand, vacancies and high turnover rates” (Wassenberg, 2004:225). Indeed, since the early 1970s the whole North East and particularly BNG have consistently lost population (HMR, 2004). The picture of decline due to depopulation is reinforced by narratives of stigma and lack of housing choice associated with the West and East End of Newcastle and Gateshead;

“Depopulations and the way that depopulation undermines local services and then you get a spiral of decline. Walker for example, lost 40 per cent of its population in a 30 year period and the West End of Newcastle lost a similar proportion. Though after critical events in the west end there was flight in enormous proportions when social difficulties displayed themselves overtly. The
West End of Newcastle was abandoned by 40 per cent of its population and the
East End of Newcastle and Gateshead lost its population not through
abandonment but through lack of housing choice. There is an overrepresentation
of social housing and in the last generation that means an over representation of
depprivation. In terms of housing choice the dominance of Tyneside flats means a
physical lack of choice” (Chair of BNG, 2007)

“I have lived in the Old Fold for 30 years since I met me husband and there was
a lot of nice people in the Old Fold but we all got tarred with the same brush that
we are hooligans, scruffs and scum” (Felling resident, 2007)

“It was an area where people would not buy a house - with zero ‘right to buy’
because people thought what is the point of buying a house in an area like that
where no one wants to live” (Senior planner, Gateshead Council, 2007)

The Chair of BNG makes a clear distinction between the ‘abandoned’ West End of
Newcastle (which includes Benwell and Scotswood) and the ‘lack of housing choice’ in
the East End and Gateshead. The Felling resident highlights the way in which her
neighbourhood has changed over the years. Interestingly she sees the change in terms
of the people and the way in which a few ‘hooligans, scruffs, scum’ dominate and
contribute to the stigmatized reputation. As Wassenberg (2004:223) argues,

“the residualization or marginalization of social housing leads to deprived
neighbourhoods where socio-economically disadvantaged tenants are being
concentrated. These areas take on a problematic reputation. The residents are
socially stigmatized merely for living in a stigmatized area”

The senior planner in Gateshead, discussing the wider area of Felling (but including the
Old Fold) suggests in contrast to the BNG Chair, that housing choice per se is not the
problem, but the stigma associated with the area that prevents people buying. Thus,
over time council estates and the people living in them (working class) becomes
representative of particular negative narratives and meanings that shift perceptions of an
area. As Skeggs (1997:76) argues, “the negativity associated with the working class is
ubiquitous”. Historical studies show the ways in which the British working class is
continually demonized, pathologized and held responsible for its own social problems (Kuhn, 1988; Nead, 1988). At the same time, studies highlight the political normalization of middle class cultures (Hill, 1986). The power to stigmatize and undermine working class cultures lies with the dominant classes (Skeggs, 1997; Reay, 1998). Class then, is closely related to housing; in turn, as Allen (2008:25) argues housing allocation processes are drenched in class. Housing policy and urban regeneration policy are each similarly ‘drenched in class’ but not that explicitly because ‘class’ is never mentioned. The persistence of polarized spaces of middle class owner occupied suburbia and working class inner city council housing concerned John Prescott, then the Deputy Prime Minister,

“The division between areas exclusively owner occupied and exclusively of renting, which was very much a creation of the 20th century, has not been a happy one in our view and it has led to social polarization and social exclusion “ (Select Committee on Environment, Transport and Regional Affairs, 2001:2).

The national government’s concern about social polarization and social exclusion is also related to the discourse of ‘owner occupation’ and the local concern about lack of housing choice,

“Most UK residents want to be owner occupiers. The economic and political changes of the last twenty years have decreased demand for social housing. Newcastle’s housing stock is split between owner occupation and social housing 66 per cent/34 per cent whilst the national average is 80 per cent/ 20 per cent……Lack of choice contributes to growth in commuter traffic, indicating that surrounding areas benefit from workers choosing to live out of and work in the city” (HMR, 2004:10)

Thus we begin to see the ways in which the rationalities of transformation are presented as a regime of truth in the form of a linear narrative setting out the problems associated with the people and places in spaces of regeneration. The problematization of council estates (and of renting in general) and the working class, the stigmatized reputation and the lack of housing choice leading to abandonment; the concerns about polarization of middle and working class people and places and the rising aspiration to become home
owners (see Allen, 2008:138 for a similar linear narrative). These political concerns then feed the justification for mixing communities as a solution to the problems discussed above. For some commentators, the urban transformation of spaces of regeneration discussed in this chapter, can be interpreted as ‘state-led’ gentrification (e.g. Allen, 2008; Cameron, 2003; Hackworth and Smith, 2001; Lees et al, 2008; Smith, 2002; Uitermark et al, 2007). This ‘wave’ of state-led gentrification was initially termed by Hackworth and Smith (2001) as ‘third wave gentrification’ (see Figure 8.1).

**Figure 8.1: Schematic history of gentrification (with recessions in grey)**
(Source: Hackworth and Smith, 2001:467)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Sporadic gentrification: Prior to 1973, the process is mainly isolated in small neighbourhoods in the north eastern USA and Western Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Gentrifiers buy property: In New York and other cities, developers and investors used the downturn in property values to consume large portions of deteriorated neighbourhoods, thus setting the stage for 1980s gentrification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>First-wave Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Intense political struggles occur during this period over the displacement of the poorest residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>The anchoring of gentrification: The process becomes implanted in hitherto disinvested central city neighbourhoods. In contrast to the pre-1973 experience of gentrification, the process becomes common in smaller, non-global cities during the 1980s. In New York City, the presence of the arts community was often a key correlate of residential gentrification, serving to smooth the flow of capital into neighbourhoods like SoHo, Tribeca, and the Lower East Side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Gentrification slown: The recession constrains the flow of capital into gentrifying and gentrified neighbourhoods, prompting some to proclaim that a ‘degentrification’ or reversal of the process was afoot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Second-wave Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Post-recession gentrification seems to be more linked to large-scale capital than ever, as large developers rework entire neighbourhoods, often with state support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>begin to experience the process for the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Gentrification returns: Prophesies of degentrification appear to have been overstated as many neighbourhoods continue to gentrify while others, further from the city centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | feed the justification for mixing communities as a solution to the problems discussed above. For some commentators, the urban transformation of spaces of regeneration discussed in this chapter, can be interpreted as ‘state-led’ gentrification (e.g. Allen, 2008; Cameron, 2003; Hackworth and Smith, 2001; Lees et al, 2008; Smith, 2002; Uitermark et al, 2007). This ‘wave’ of state-led gentrification was initially termed by Hackworth and Smith (2001) as ‘third wave gentrification’ (see Figure 8.1).
In this sense, gentrification is a tool of urban regeneration policy (Smith, 2002). As Smith (2002: 446) argues,

“Gentrification as a global urban strategy is a consummate expression of neoliberal urbanism. It mobilizes individual property claims via a market lubricated by state donations and often is buried as regeneration”.

Section 8.4 reveals the range of urban branding techniques orchestrated by BNG that are directly related to the central state desire for ‘mixed communities’. Central to the idea of social mixing is bringing the middle classes back to the inner city so that social capital can be rebuilt. Once the area is ‘socially mixed’ (read gentrified) the image of a ‘liveable city’ (Florida, 2003) can be marketed as inclusive and harmonious (Rose, 2004). Thus, despite social mixing evoking images of a socially balanced and integrated community, the concept is also laden with economic interests and urban growth.

8.3.2 Meeting aspirations, increasing housing choice – mixing communities

A range of studies have been commissioned by BNG to provide the evidence base for transformation. The North East Housing Aspirations Study (Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, 2005) confirmed significant movement away from BNG to North Tyneside, Tynedale, Derwentside and Castle Morpeth. Another study, found that historically one in ten people taking up jobs in Newcastle Gateshead actually made their homes there, with north Tyneside in particular housing many commuters in professional occupations (Experian, 2005, cited in Audit Commission, 2005:18). Overall, the aspirations survey27 revealed a strong demand for houses rather than flats; new developments of private housing in existing suburbs rather than social rented housing; housing close to open space, parks or woodland or in rural areas, and the least popular option was waterfront apartments (Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, 2005). The housing aspirations of all socio-economic groups fits within the ‘traditional housing’ category with,

27 The ACORN classification system has been used to differentiate between the socioeconomic groups. The classification system sub-divides the North East population into 5 main socio-economic groups. The highest socio-economic group are the Wealthy Achievers, followed by the Urban Prosperity, Comfortably Off, Moderate Means and finally the Hard pressed (Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, 2005:40)
“inner urban developments still remaining unpopular, particularly for the higher and intermediate socio-economic groupings. However it would appear that if many of these developments were more affordable more young professionals for example would choose this type of housing as it provides the lifestyle and cultural benefits associated with living within central areas” (Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, 2005:44)

The ‘lifeline’ for spaces of regeneration is their relative affordability and proximity to the cultural assets and creative industries located in the city centre28 (see Minton, 2003; NewcastleGateshead, 2009). Thus, we begin to see the political rationalities emerging within a complex and contradictory landscape – the need to repopulate inner urban spaces, but only young (middle class) professionals would be interested, who aspire to own their house and live and work close to cultural and knowledge industries. So here we see the start of the pathway to mixed communities because as we know the indigenous community mainly rent their homes. The BNG Business Plan clearly indicates whose aspirations they intend to meet,

“We aim to create great places to live….there will be a better choice of affordable homes that meet the aspirations of existing and future residents. The area will be attractive to families and professionals working in the expanding cultural and knowledge industries, and graduates and first time buyers will choose to move to the area” (BNG, 2006:7)

Indeed, the HMR prospectus expresses the same intentions,

“The pathfinder offers a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to reverse the decline and provide attractive places to live for existing and new residents – especially people who have been leaving the area. These well educated and ambitious people are vital for creative industries and the knowledge economy; and they bring the wealth necessary to support quality local services and create opportunities for all” (HMR, 2004:20)

28 In 2003, the same year that the Sustainable Communities Plan was announced, ‘NewcastleGateshead’ entered a bid to become the European Capital of Culture in 2008 (Liverpool won) (Minton, 2003; Beckett, 2003).
Here we get an indication the diverse range of ‘new residents’ BNG are hoping to attract – families, professionals working in the creative and knowledge industries, graduates and first time buyers as well as retaining some existing residents. To satisfy this particular social mix involves catering for a range of lifestyles and housing requirements. The evidence for the creation of mixed tenure neighbourhoods is supported by a commissioned report (by BNG) that collates a range of research including JRF (2005a, 2005b) to supports the notion of mixing communities to ensure sustainability, for example,

“the mixed tenure neighbourhoods had produced ‘ordinary’ and ‘civilized’ communities where residents identified with each other as well as identifying difference. These developments were more successful in avoiding concentrations of deprivation, which have manifested in predominantly social housing estates. The research shows that the mixed developments can make a contribution to the creation of successful mixed communities” (JRF, 2005a cited in Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, 2006:14).

Similarly, citing a report examining the ability of four new inner city mixed income communities to attract and retain families they argue,

“On the whole the communities in low income areas consisted primarily of ‘local’ families with ties to the areas. There were also ‘newcomers’ with similar backgrounds and another group of ‘newcomers’ who had higher incomes, who tended to have children after they moved to the area” (JRF, 2005b cited in Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, 2006:14).

The influence of Richard Florida’s ‘creative class’ stemmed from the NewcastleGateshead bid in 2003 to become the 2008 European Capital of Culture (Beckett, 2003; Minton, 2003). They lost to Liverpool but in the bidding process Bill McNaught, the Head of Culture and Development in Gateshead, was invited to present a seminar at a Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors conference in London. As Beckett (2003:2) explains,
“In the context of the conference, with its themed mineral water bottles and perky, cafe-style house music playing in the intermissions between seminars, MacNaught’s positive thinking seemed quite at home. Bullish books about "urban innovators" and "harnessing the triggers of creativity" sold briskly in the lobby. The author of one of them, an American academic with television-size gestures and a perfect aspirational name, Richard Florida, gave an energetic address about how "bohemian" cities would inevitably prosper. Afterwards men in rectangular glasses exchanged business cards. It all seemed much more appealing than the usual local government gatherings to discuss problem estates and spending cuts”.

It is here that we see an example of ‘mobilizing policy’ (Peck and Theodore, 2010; McCann and Ward, 2010) whereby urban regeneration discourses from Europe and the US are selected, mobilized, translated and mutated (Allen and Cochrane, 2007) via personal exchanges (discussions and business cards) and as literature (expert books). It is within this conference context that Bill McNaught met Richard Florida so it is not that surprising to find within BNG policy documents and commissioned reports the ‘creative class’ influence (see quotes above). Such is the range of BNG documents and commissioned reports that suggest successful transformation is related to the retention and attraction of ‘the creative class’ it is difficult not to assume that BNG policy has been influenced by Florida’s argument that diverse, tolerant, cool cities do better (Florida, 2002).

The gist of Florida’s argument is that advanced economies are driven by creativity and this sector is dominated by a ‘creative class’\textsuperscript{29}. In 2003, he worked with Demos to produce a UK Creativity Index of 40 cities (see Demos, 2003) and Manchester came top with Newcastle in 22\textsuperscript{nd} place. Indeed, a recent report celebrating the NewcastleGateshead ‘decade of culture’ mentions proudly in a section entitled ‘setting an example’ how the recognition of Richard Florida helped situate NewcastleGateshead in an international setting,

\textsuperscript{29} Florida splits the creative class into two groups. The ‘super creative core’ including scientists, engineers, actors, poets, novelists and the ‘creative professional’ group including high tech service professionals and legal and health care professionals. He devised a set of indicators to measure 50 US cities – a Bohemian Index, a Talent Index, a Melting Pot index and a Gay Index.
“When it comes to cultural regeneration, NewcastleGateshead is being favourably compared to larger, often better known European cities. For example, in 2004, NewcastleGateshead came to the attention of the acclaimed American economics professor Richard Florida when he named the area as a classic example of a city - along with the likes of Berlin, Barcelona, Madrid and London - which was creating the right environment to encourage the rise of the ‘creative class’ which in turn was having a positive effect on the city environment as a whole” (NewcastleGateshead, 2009:25)

Thus we begin to see that the argument “be creative – or die” whereby “cities must attract a new creative class with hip neighbourhoods, an arts scene and a gay friendly atmosphere – or they’ll go the way of Detroit” (Dreher, 2002:1 cited in Peck, 2005:74) is compelling, especially for post industrial cities (worldwide) who have experienced a ‘brain drain’.

Nevertheless, one has to consider the compatibility between the diversity of lifestyles BNG is attempting to attract, for instance, Peck (2005:745) argues that creatives “contemptuously reject suburbia, the generica of chain stores and malls and places that are orientated to children” yet BNG want to keep and attract families with children. Other commentators argue that it is wrong to assume that all creatives share the same lifestyles and outlook because engineers, accountants, designers and social workers may all be professionals, but may not all share the same values, politics, preferences and behaviour as artists, musicians and dancers – or choose to spend time with them (Nathan, 2005). The same can be said of the ‘non-creatives’. Other studies of the middles classes in UK cities find that professionals and managers have diverse attitudes to cities, live in different neighbourhoods – and use them very differently (Jarvis et al, 2001). Furthermore, during the 1990s, professionals, managers and technical staff were more likely to leave big conurbations than any other economic group (Champion and Fisher, 2004). A study of Manchester’s financial and business sector reveals most professional lived in the suburbs or wanted to move to the countryside (Halfpenny et al, 2004). The people who enjoyed city centre living were students and young professionals who stay for a few years and then move to the suburbs as Nathan (2005: 4) argues, “this is not Florida’s creative class”. Interestingly, early commentators on gentrification
questioned whether the middle and working classes would mix and live side by side as this quote from Clay, 1979:70) asks,

“whether policy can promote population mixes of different socioeconomic and racial groups while simultaneously enhancing the civil class domination of the neighbourhood. In the past new people and incumbents have often not mixed well when they were of different races or socioeconomic statuses. The normative integration that is a prerequisite for upgrading does not develop…..This probably becomes more serious when racial mix is combined with socioeconomic mix”

Thus, the rationality of mixed communities to create sustainable communities is debateable.

8.3.3 Can it work and should it work?

In Chapter 7 of the thesis the emphasis was placed on critiques of HMR that stress how unjust it is to displace to the existing working class residents i.e. the theory of state-led gentrification. In contrast, this chapter mainly explores the reason why the HMR approach to creating sustainable communities (which means mixing communities) will not work because different class cultures and aspirations do not mix. These two key criticisms of HMR were identified by the Audit Commission (2005:20) in the context of BNG whereby they asked, “how many of the local populations who aspire to move to bigger homes will have the means to do so” (in other words posing questions of exclusion) and “will the incomers who may have the resources to buy more aspirational housing be attracted by the locations within pathfinder areas” (in other words asking questions related to the sustainability and desirability of mixing communities). Similarly, Cameron (2006:13) suggests,

“It is often argued that housing market renewal will provide greater housing choice and meet rising aspirations. The choice will not in reality be available to many in the mainly low income existing residents of these areas. Housing market renewal will, rather, increase the range of choices for the more affluent who already have significant choice......at the cost of reducing choice for those who need low cost housing, whose aspirations will not be met by the market”
Although the potential problems are surfacing amongst commentators, the process of transformation continues and the emphasis is on meeting aspirations, improving housing choice, and ‘mixing communities’ (see Chapter 3). In the UK the theme of balanced or mixed communities has become increasingly popular and in fact, the notion of mixed tenures and mixing communities stems back to the Urban Task Force (URF) report that argues,

“Without a commitment to social integration, our towns and cities will fail. We can, however, establish certain principles to ensure that wealth and opportunity are spread more evenly among urban neighbourhoods. In responding to social problems we must avoid repeating the mistakes of the past. Developing large amounts of social housing in one location does not work. Many existing social housing estates have a strong sense of community – often more so than wealthier neighbourhoods – but there is not the economic capacity to make these neighbourhoods work over the long term. As a result, jobs and investment go elsewhere, exacerbating the physical isolation of many of these estates. In future, we must develop on the basis of a mix of tenures and income groups” (DETR, 1999:45)

The rationality of transformation is to ‘mix communities’ in terms of housing tenure to provide homes to buy and rent to accommodate a range of income groups. To achieve this version of ‘community’ or more accurately ‘sustainable community’ requires a radical and dramatic transformation technique. As the Audit Commission (2005:20) argue,

“This is by no means assured as development on the scale required is likely to be focused on areas which have suffered years of decline and stigma and would ultimately be competing, at least until 2010 with the new and existing homes in attractive, often rural settings a short journey away from the city”

Yet one has to consider that the change in tenure, with fewer homes for rent, may lead (as suggested above and in Chapter 7) to some existing residents being displaced. The displacement of working class and minority groups when gentrification occurs has been of considerable debate for many years (for example, Laska and Spain, 1980; Marcuse,
Displacement has been a major theme in gentrification literature but it is “extremely difficult to quantify (Lees et al, 2008: 218) and is like ‘measuring the invisible’ (Atkinson, 2000). In a review of gentrification literature, Atkinson (2004) found that it was viewed overwhelmingly as a negative neighbourhood process. Yet, policy makers appear not to have read this critical gentrification literature and actively promote gentrification as a public policy tool as the following quote illustrates;

“At the neighbourhood level itself poor and vulnerable residents often experience gentrification as a process of colonization by the more privileged classes. Stories of personal housing dislocation and loss, distended social networks, ‘improved’ local services out of sync with local needs and displacement have always been the underbelly of the process, which, for city boosters, has represented something of a saviour for post-industrial cities” (Atkinson and Bridge, 2005:2)

State-led gentrification is not only seen in the UK. In the Netherlands a policy of ‘housing redifferentiation’ (see for example, van Kempen, 1999; Uitermark, 2003) has been underway since 1996. Housing redifferentiation (could read Housing Market Renewal) involves the demolition of inexpensive dwellings, refurbishment of others and the building of new expensive dwellings in low income areas. The idea is, like HMR, to create a more socially diverse population in neighbourhoods via gentrification. In Rotterdam, ideas about social mixing have gained intensity after the rise of the Pym Fortuyn Party and its ‘Liveable Rotterdam’ (‘Leefbaar Rotterdam’) as this quote illustrates,

“The city now actively markets itself as a good place for affluent residents and especially targets the so-called creative class (see Florida, 2004). The city has boosted both the construction of owner-occupied dwellings and the demolition of social rented housing…..In language that hardly requires textual deconstruction, the government of Rotterdam declares that it aims to attract ‘desired households’ to ‘problem areas’ ….therefore reinforcing and politicizing the connection between owner occupied housing and liveability” (Uitermark et al 2007:129).
As in BNG, the hope is that these interventions alongside place branding and marketing will attract the middle classes back to the inner city. This process is called an ‘extreme makeover’ by Oudenaampsen (2006:1) who describes the process of regeneration in Amsterdam as “urban rebirth through place branding and social cleansing”. As in the BNG case study, Oudenaampsen (2006) argues that the alleged social mobility benefits of social mixing have yet to be proved. In similar arguments, Freeman (2006:2) suggests that social mixing is no guarantee of upward mobility and Blomley (2004) comments that we should think about ‘who has to move on to make room for social mix’;

“The problem with ‘social mix’ however is that it promises equality in the face of hierarchy. First, as often noted, it is socially one-sided. If social mixing is good, argue local activists, then why not make it possible for the poor to live in rich neighbourhoods? Second, the empirical evidence suggests that it often fails to improve the social and economic conditions for renters. Interaction between owner-occupiers and renters in ‘mixed’ neighbourhoods seems to be limited. More importantly, it can lead to social segregation and isolation” (Blomley, 2004:99)

Thus we begin to see the relationship between policy goals of ‘mixed communities’, the role of urban branding to achieve this vision and interpretations of ‘state-led’ gentrification. The next section explores the range of branding techniques mobilized in the three BNG case studies.

### 8.4 Branding as a technology of transformation

BNG recognize the deep rooted stigma associated with the spaces of regeneration. To alter negative perceptions associated with such spaces, urban branding is used as a technology of transformation to ‘engineer images’ and attract investors/developers and the creative middle classes. Urban branding strategies broadly work in two directions – inward and outward. Inward branding is concerned with identity building and strengthening the pride of the existing residents that will in the longer term attract new residents (Jansson and Power, 2006). Outward branding is concerned with external communication and attracting investment, visitors and tourists (Jansson and Power, 2006). This section draws from the three case studies to explore the relationship
between the dominant outward and inward urban branding techniques and the implications for existing residents – the hidden consequences of engineering images.

8.4.1 ‘Scotswood Expo’: the spectacular event

“The scale of regeneration, investment and development in the West End of Newcastle is enormous. The West End of the city and Scotswood have in recent history, represented the extremes of the city and the North East, as an area of stigmatization, low demand and low value. The ambitions for the Expo are to counter these issues, to create a step-change in development quality and sustainability, in a manner that begins to shape the overall image and identity of the Scotswood area into the future” (RyderHKS, 2004)

In Scotswood, most of the urban branding efforts and ‘hope’ (see Anderson and Holden, 2008) for the future are tied up with the ‘Scotswood Expo’ (Figure 8.2). The Scotswood Expo will be the UK’s first Neighbourhood Exposition. It involves the construction of the first phase of a new neighbourhood that will form the centrepiece of a series of cultural programmes and festivals culminating in a major event in 2011. As the project development manager of Scotswood Expo said,

“We want to create debate on issues concerning the neighbourhood and how it functions. With Scotswood we want to do away with homogeneous estates and dispel the images and perceptions of the area. Ideally we want to see if the Expo can be a model in housing market renewal” (Dosanjh, 2006)
Policy tourism has become an increasingly important aspect when searching for ‘mobile policies’ to translate at the national and local level (see McCann and Ward, 2010; Peck and Theodore, 2010). Thus, the various stakeholders involved in regenerating Scotswood looked to ‘policy tourism’ for a successful example of the Expo model and were drawn like many others to the city of Malmo in Sweden who held a Housing Expo in 2001. Indeed, an article in an architecture website noted the attention that the Malmo project was receiving,

“Malmö airport has witnessed a steady traffic of English officials over the past few months. Everyone from Cabe, the Housing Corporation, English
Partnerships, Yorkshire Forward and the ODPM have been flocking to the city in search of the Holy Grail of successful regeneration” (Blackler, 2006).

The comparison between Malmo and Newcastle is not that surprising because Malmo is an old industrial city, mainly shipbuilding like Newcastle and the regeneration is taking place in the harbour district. The first phase of the project BoO1 was a 350 new housing project that formed the basis of Malmo’s Housing Expo in 2001. When Malmo won the funding from the Swedish government to host the Expo, the city authorities set out to create a model of sustainability that would give Bo01 world prominence. Although the Expo did attract a lot of attention (and various stakeholders including residents from NewcastleGateshead and Benwell and Scotswood were amongst the visitors) the project has had shortcomings. For example, the energy performance fell short of expectations and in future phases they decided upon “a greater attempt to produce a better social mix. With property values in Bo01 well above average, later phases will include more student apartments, starter units and better accessibility for full-life occupancy” (Blackler, 2006). So the warnings about social mixing are evident from the Malmo example with affordability being a key feature to ensure a balanced, mixed community.

As in Malmo, in BNG the Expo example, intends to create a ‘spectacular space’ that gives not only Scotswood but NewcastleGateshead an image of modernity, innovation, design excellence, uniqueness and sustainability and moves away from industrial images and stigmatized perceptions. The BNG Area Coordinator explained to me the reasons for choosing the Expo approach saying that they worked with Newcastle Council to,

“produce a revised approach to regeneration which was based on acknowledging the strength of the city centre and spread the market confidence out from the city centre into the west end and benefit from what was the regional capital, a player now on the European and international stage as an economic powerhouse for want of a better phrase so the people of the west end could benefit from that. And start the redevelopment of the west end with a smaller scale but very high quality development based on Expo models that have been used in Europe but mainly Scandinavia. So that it would be of sufficient quality and scale as a
marketing and event strategy that would be a catalyst to overcoming the stigma and poor perception of the area” (Area Programme Coordinator, BNG, 2006).

Altering poor perceptions and the ‘spectacular event’ are seen as key to increasing the chance of securing development interest in Scotswood which is why such a large contiguous area (65 hectares) of houses have been cleared (see Chapter 7) in contrast to Walker Riverside and Felling where smaller areas have been cleared. As the BNG Chair explained (see quote earlier in this chapter) this is because Scotswood experienced abandonment due to its poor reputation whereas other areas lost people because of a lack of housing choice. The next stage involves securing interest and investment. In June 2008, the Scotswood Expo Architectural Competition was launched as a “new design contest open to architects with exceptional design skills and fresh thinking in the design of new housing for the UK’s first Neighbourhood Expo” (Scotswood Expo website, 2008). The competition is organized by the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Competitions Office in association with Newcastle City Council. The competition coincided with the launch of a new website www.scotswoodexpo.com dedicated to the Scotswood Expo. On the Scotswood Expo website (2008), they ambitiously and confidently assert that

“the Expo will be more than an exhibition...[it will be] nothing less than a statement of Newcastle’s intent30 to demonstrate to the world a new benchmark for making and regenerating communities”

However, the scale of the task must not be underestimated, as the RyderHKS (2004) report warned,

“In practice, the Newcastle Expo will need to be a ‘Regeneration Expo’ rather than just a ‘Housing Expo’. We are not aware of any City having tried this approach to date. The precedents for Housing Expos have all been based in a part of the City that is relatively separated from the rest of the City, or at least, where adjacent areas are relatively stable and prosperous. This presents a huge challenge for the City, but also an important opportunity. For Newcastle could

30 Note it is Newcastle now and not NewcastleGateshead
become a pioneer in this field; rather than simply emulating the Northern European model, Newcastle could develop a new format” (RyderHKS, 2004).

In addition, as Cochrane (2007:115) argues the ‘city as spectacle’ might be expected to provide a means of unifying different aspects of urban policy in the context of attempts to manage the disorderly city. However, “the mobilization of spectacle has its unifying effects, but it is a fragile and uncertain tool for unification” (Harvey, 1989:273). The ‘city as spectacle’ can renew some areas of the city, while others “the peripheral estates and other areas of social housing – become sinks for the poor and delinquent, places to be managed and to be presented as terrible warnings to the middle classes and the respectable (disciplined and ordered) poor” (Cochrane, 2007:115). Indeed, this is a major concern for residents continuing to live in Scotswood whose houses were due for refurbishment. They expressed concern that;

“when this new housing Expo comes our houses are going to look like the poor cousins in comparison because our houses will look really old. And will there be any money to improve our property? BNG said there was going to be money but again it is very vague about what is going to happen” (Scotswood resident, 2007).

This is a potential problem in Scotswood because such a large site has been cleared for the housing Expo, once the site is developed the juxtaposition of old and new housing and communities may strengthen the differences rather than fostering social mix. As Davidson and Lees (2005) study of new-build gentrification and social mixing found, there was no social mixing between new-build residents along the River Thames and adjacent poor neighbourhoods. Similarly, a BBC programme filmed over three years ‘The Tower’, charted the transformation of a social rented tower block into a privately owned, riverside development for affluent Canary Wharf workers. The residents of the neighbouring Pepys Estate watched the transformation with trepidation and interest, yet the hoped for lifeline to help struggling businesses did not materialize because the communities did not mix.
When a long standing Scotswood resident as a member of the Scotswood Benwell Regeneration Board31 visited the BoO1 project in Malmo, Sweden, she doubted whether a successful community had been created. As she said,

“I’ve been to Malmo twice and I’ve met one or two who have been relocated …and I’ve got to say that in the 3 years I saw very little change in the amounts of people, a lot of them were occupied, but a lot of them were rented with astronomical rents. I would think they would have to have two householders working in that kind of house because you walk around and there’s very few people, they are all shut down for the day and then maybe teatime they return and the children are at school so when I’ve been there you see very little evidence of any community spirit and that was my concern. I met some of my age group [60s] and they seemed quite happy said they loved it and there are little cul-de-sacs, places where they have communal barbeques and meetings but in the 3 years that barbeque looked unused so they talk about it but I don’t know if they actually do it” (Scotswood Resident, 2007)

So although the properties in Malmo were occupied, the rent has risen and it is interesting how the Scotswood resident assumed, probably correctly, that two adults would have to be working full time to afford living there as a tenants. So it may be that low earners, the young, elderly or part time workers might not be able to afford living there. Like many other new developments occupied by full time workers and /or commuters the places are deserted by day and by night most people stay in their own home. As empirical research into the social interactions of actual gentrifiers in London reveals, there is little social mixing between middle class gentrifiers and low income groups (Butler and Robson, 2001, 2003). Where low-income groups had been displaced, social interaction was greatest but where displacement had not happened, gentrification tended to result in ‘tectonic’ juxtapositions of polarized socioeconomic groups rather than in socially cohesive communities (Butler and Robson, 2003).

31 The Scotswood Benwell Regeneration Board was set up to establish the Benwell Scotswood Area Action Plan and involved a partnership between BNG, One North East, the North East Chamber of Commerce, the Housing Corporation and the West End Community Development Consortium, a small representation of local residents and a consortia of consultants led by EDAW. The Area Action Plan is a Development Plan document, due to be adopted in late 2009, when it will become part of the wider Local Development Framework for Newcastle.
8.4.2 Renaming spaces of regeneration: ‘erasing memory and spreading success’

The place names of Walker, Benwell, Scotswood and Felling are associated with a selection of memories and histories. Most local residents eagerly relate tales of better times when jobs were plentiful in the local industries. Community workers and local councillors speak of struggles and troubles. Policy makers acknowledge the history then focus on the decline and the need for transformation because the place and name is associated with stigma. In all three case studies, there is evidence of renaming spaces of regeneration but as Rose-Redwood (2008) warns, the process of place naming is related to unequal power relations. In Benwell and Scotswood, the Area Action Plan outlines the intention to create by 2021, “a series of distinctive and attractive neighbourhoods with different residential offers and identities, able to meet the needs and aspirations of communities in a sustainable manner” (BSAAP, 2006a:7). To re-imagine Benwell and Scotswood, five neighbourhoods are to renamed - South Benwell/Delavel will be Greener Benwell; Benwell Village will be Historic Deneside; North Scotswood will be Family Land; New Scotswood will be 21st Century Scotswood; West Road and North Benwell will be Cosmopolitan Core and Grainger Park will be Urban Grandeur. The new names build on the ‘positive aspects’ identified by BNG and partners in each existing neighbourhood such as history, culture and nature. The parks and open spaces of Greener Benwell, the oldest neighbourhood of Historic Deneside, the semi detached houses with gardens in Family Land, the ‘Expo’ site of contemporary (futuristic) urban housing design in 21st Century Scotswood, the BME communities of Cosmopolitan Core and the Victorian villas and park of Urban Grandeur. The descriptive nature of the new names is an urban branding strategy that tells a selective story (Jansson and Power, 2006). The renaming process has not involved local residents, yet the space of regeneration is still a place of memory. In spaces of regeneration the powerful can rename, the powerless can remember. The practice of symbolic erasure is most evident in the act of street renaming, where one name is officially replaced by another (Azaryahu 1996; Rose-Redwood, 2008). Thus, spaces of regeneration are simultaneously sites of memory and erasure.

In Felling, developments on a brownfield site in the neighbourhood of ‘Old Fold’ have been renamed ‘St James Village’.
The St James Village development includes a mix of uses such as over 55s apartments (Figure 8.3), play facilities, a Netto supermarket and Boklok housing (see Section 8.4.4). There is also a new nursing home – Marigold Court and bungalows for seniors built behind it. The address for the new developments is St James Village, Gateshead – the association with Felling is severed. The St James Village has a highly visible profile because it is located on the Felling bypass but the re-naming has effectively distanced it from Felling and its nearest neighbourhood, the Old Fold Estate. Here we see an example whereby the “place of memory is constructed in relation to other places” (Rose-Redwood, 2008:434) and in spaces of regeneration, the old place struggles for cultural recognition when compared to the new place.

**Spreading success**

Walker has been renamed ‘Walker Riverside’ in an attempt to promote more clearly its river side location. This coincides with other riverside regeneration projects in Newcastle Gateshead such as iconic buildings - ‘The Sage’, a music venue and the ‘Baltic’ an arts venue in Gateshead and the ‘Quayside’ development of modern, upmarket apartments in Newcastle. As BNG (2004:19 argue,
“Major investment in the City Centre and Riverside areas has delivered new jobs and a new image. Such landmark projects have inspired those who live here, re-injected regional pride, enhanced the region’s image and perceptions to new investors”.

Indeed, BNG aim to *spread* the image, success and wealth with intentions,

“to extend the revisioning of the waterfront - the Sage, Baltic and Quayside - eastwards to Walker Riverside. Yet even though Walker Riverside lies in close proximity to the Quayside etc, the industrial perception of the river persists” (East Newcastle Area Coordinator, BNG, 2006).

Commenting on the Dockland development in London, Minton (2009:8) warns of the consequences of ‘spread’ for local inhabitants,

“But rather than wealth trickling down, it had spread from Canary Wharf to South Quay to Crossharbour. But rather than helping those who need it the most, it has rubbed up right against them yet entirely ignored them, creating a segregated and disconnected patchwork. At the same time the spreading effect has continued to displace the original community, as property prices ensured new homes remained unaffordable for locals, forced to move out further east to boroughs like Barking and Dagenham”.

The concerns raised here bring to the surface the ways in which dominant political strategies to alter perceptions and attract investors and the keenly sought “educated and ambitious people vital for the creative industries and knowledge economy” (HMR, 2004:20) displaces local inhabitants rather than mixing them. The emphasis on ‘mixing communities’ in policy documents suggest mixing *in communities*. It creates a utopian vision of a community with local residents staying in their new or refurbished homes surrounded by new people, attracted to the area by the riverside lifestyles and the creative and cultural opportunities. By concentrating on ‘mix’ in policy documents, the alternative objective of ‘spread’ is less obvious. Spread means the flow of image, people, ideas and wealth of successful spaces in the city into less successful spaces. In effect,
an updated version of Thatcher’s ‘trickle down’ but ‘spread’ suggests a less dominant method of ‘trickle out’ or from the local residents’ perspective ‘seeping into’ – it is growth with a friendly hat.

Branding spaces of regeneration is a vital aspect of this and is presented as a “once in a lifetime opportunity to reverse decline and provide attractive places to live for existing and new residents” (HMR, 2004:20). Minton (2009:9) suggests those in favour of the growth model fall back on the “well-known and much-loved Thatcherite mantra….There is no alternative (TINA)” to justify their strategies. In Walker Riverside a branding expert is brought in to transform unfavourable perceptions.

8.4.3 The branding expert

Karol Marketing was appointed in March 2006 to develop a three year communication and marketing strategy. As one of a growing number of ‘experts of community’ (Rose, 1999:189) the branding expert is on hand to offer advice on and about the transformation of spaces of regeneration. The branding expert ‘communicates’ using inward branding techniques to ‘legitimate regeneration’ and ‘foster compliance’ amongst local residents and outward branding to ‘market’ the new community to external audiences of investors or the creative classes (Griffiths, 1998; Jansson and Power, 2006). Such outward branding techniques can be traced back to early ‘boosterists’ in St Petersburg, Florida, who were the first city in the US to employ a press agent to boost growth in 1918. As Logan and Molotch (1987:59) argue, “now virtually all major urban areas employ an expert to attract investment”. At a presentation to the Walker Riverside Project Board Annual General Meeting (AGM), held in the Belmont Methodist Church, the director of Karol Marketing explained the branding strategy. The AGM was open to the public, hence my attendance. The main points discussed in the AGM were recorded in my research diary. It was interesting to note the imbalance between the twenty or so project board members (which included two Walker Riverside residents) and the ten members of the public in the audience, which included me and about seven local residents.

The branding expert from Karol Marketing explained the process of developing a branding strategy. First, the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) are assessed in relation to the political, environmental, social and technical (PEST)
context. From this assessment the ‘Marketing and Communication Strategy’ emerges. The communication plan involves the development of ‘key messages’. As the branding expert explained ‘the key messages aim to bring all messages together to reduce confusion in the market place – a holistic approach’. Finally, a ‘tactical list of objectives’ is devised – this is the ‘activity plan’ or ‘plan of delivery’. The branding expert explained the key areas of activity that Karol Marketing had identified – signage, public relations, community inclusion and new resident appeals.

A consistent brand signage with the strapline ‘Proud of our Past, Passionate about our Potential’ (Figure 8.4) was chosen because as the branding expert explained during the AGM, ‘it uses alliteration; acknowledges the past but recognizes the need to move forward; recognizes future opportunities and also that there is room for improvement and the word ‘passionate’ fits with the One North East regional image’. He also suggested public relations exercises such as going to the newspapers with positive stories.

Figure 8.4: Walker Riverside sign showing ‘Pride, Passion, Potential’ strapline
(Andrea Armstrong)
Heart of Walker (HOW)

In addition to the main place branding technique of Walker Riverside a sub logo entitled the Heart of Walker (HOW) (formerly Community Focus) has been introduced. This logo has been developed to raise the profile of the project that aims to “create a strong, new community focus” (BNG, 2007c:4) for existing and new residents. Due to the historic development of Walker Riverside “complex technical and spatial contraints” (NCC, 2009:18) have been created resulting in no cohesive centre. The industrial history of Walker Riverside has left a legacy influencing the current social and material landscape of disconnection and fragmentation (Table 8.1) whereas the ODPM (2003a) defines community as connected, accessible and diverse.

Table 8.1: The industrial history and development of Walker Riverside
(adapted from NCC, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside industry develops. 1858 -brick field and St Anthony’s pottery 1898 – Walker Road (east – west) and railway built. More houses, two churches, pub and school built. Walker Park created. Brickwork pits enlarged</td>
<td>1916-Brickworks significantly expanded Walker Road flanked by terraces. Areas set aside for leisure and allotments in adjacent open fields Scrogg Road built - new north link from Walker Road</td>
<td>1938- brickfields surrounded by new housing estates replacing the pottery. New school, cinema and health clinic built Local routes to river lose importance and area south of Walker Road empties</td>
<td>1951- brickwork pits largely filled. Area to south of Walker Road partially developed with post-war housing Plan abandoned to build new road over Tyne to Heworth</td>
<td>1967- brickfields developed with new housing and area set aside for Lightfoot sports ground. Development based on historical brickfield pathways Church Walk – 1960s precinct design shopping centre built</td>
<td>Oldest housing along Walker Road begins to decline as does population</td>
<td>2007- much of housing south of Walker Road demolished and estate on former brickfields</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From Table 8.1, the significant industrial and morphological changes can be traced and their impact on today’s landscape assessed. The industry that originally created opportunities in Walker over time has constrained and influenced development in less positive ways. The brickfields industry continues to leave ‘traces’ in the material landscape and thus defines the social landscape. In effect, the ‘brickfields’ were historically the ‘heart of Walker’ in the material and social sense because of their location in the landscape and the employment they provided. After the First World War, the new housing estate “massively redefines Walker physically and socially” and the “active brickworks create a ‘hole’ at the heart of the new neighbourhood and the area between Walker Road and the railway becomes a “left over” following the closure of the dominant pottery works” (NCC, 2009:67). The pattern of fragmentation and disconnection between neighbourhoods within Walker begins to appear - a legacy that persists,

“Walker Riverside is not all one place, rather a collection of neighbourhoods” (BNG, 2007c:3).

In discussion with residents and community workers they revealed what a ‘collection of neighbourhoods’ actually means for those living and working in Walker Riverside,

“Walker is a very active place but there are sections where you do not cross over. It is very territorial.

AA What is the division based on?

Where you live and the Walker Road is a big barrier. Because you see there is Low Walker where the ship yards were, then you come along Walker Road and you have Pottery Bank and you cross over Walker Road and you have Lancefield and they do not like crossing over to Pottery Bank. Then you go into the Lightfoot and they do not venture out much there. Then you have our bit of Walker where the library is, but people come there because it’s a library. Then you’ve got Hexham Avenue and Church Walk shopping centre and not many people go there who don’t actually live there. Then the other bit of Walker is St Anthony’s that backs on to Byker and that is on its own a bit there – it was the old
Monkchester ward and that went. It’s not a huge area but the people who live there like to stay there” (Workers with East End Community Alliance, 2007)

It is difficult to say conclusively why territorial behaviour develops. Instead of considering the present material situation as a problem of a fixed landscape creating a barrier, for instance, the east-west Walker Road physical splitting the neighbourhood (Figure 8.5).

Figure 8.5: Aerial photo of Walker Riverside clearly showing the roads (www.walker-riverside.co.uk accessed 24/05/07)

If one considers instead, the historical development of the landscape, a picture of flexibility to fixed constraints emerges. Over time the landscape shifts and alters with new developments either replacing or appearing alongside old ones. With the loss of employment, the population begins to decline and, with it, services. The networks to other parts of the city are severed (the railway) or abandoned (the road bridge over the River Tyne to Heworth in Gateshead). Seen in relation to one another, the contrast between the highly connected, valuable spaces of the city and the falling fortunes of
former industrial heartlands is reminiscent of Graham and Marvin’s theory of ‘splintering urbanism’ whereby,

“Virtually all cities across the world are starting to display spaces and zones that are powerfully connected to other ‘valued’ spaces areas across the urban landscape as well as across national, international and even global distances. At the same time, though, there is often a palpable and increasing sense of local disconnection in such places from physically-close, but socially and economically distant, places and people” (Graham and Marvin, 2001: 25)

The HOW Supplementary Planning Document, identifies the way in which the historical pattern of change is related to the current regeneration plans,

“The continuing implications of how the former brickfields created an obstruction in the heart of the inter-war layout need to be fully resolved. The post-war development failed to do this successfully, both north and south of Walker Road. Priority must be given to establishing a successful network of routes and spaces that link together the surrounding areas. These will need to cut fully across the brickworks to form meaningful and attractive routes as part of the wider street pattern” (NCC, 2009: 67)

The intention is to ‘connect’ and ‘link’ Walker Riverside,

“As the final terraced housing on Walker Road disappears, this street needs positively reestablishing as the primary movement and commerce corridor for the southern half of Walker. This includes reinstatement of transport links to the city centre and other key employment areas, and replacement of building forms that prioritize the quality of the street.........

The retreat from this stretch of the riverside edge, the historical hub of the area, needs to be reversed. Loss of industries and the railway line have created a void which presents a number of challenges. For the “Heart of Walker” to be successful, the area towards the river must be embraced once again by the residential neighbourhood, and new links formed to allow easy & safe access to
the riverside park. The potential of the former railway route as a strategic and sustainable non-vehicular route needs to be fully realized” (NCC, 2009:67).

The plans to develop HOW (Figure 8.6) aim to address the problems of dislocation and territoriality and create a ‘community heart’ – a public space with character and use (NCC, 2009:12). The HOW intends to be a new, mixed-use neighbourhood centre that will improve the quality of shopping and facilities and bring them to the heart of the area, closer to the housing (WRAAP, 2006). To encourage families, the Lightfoot Sports Centre will be developed and a new primary school will be built in HOW. Public transport (currently very poor) and walking and cycling facilities will be improved to ensure car use is kept low as the population increases. The changes are intended to develop a joined up financially sustainable network of new services. Environmental measures have been included in the WRAAP (2006) such as the plan to create ‘green corridors’ that will link HOW to ‘its strongest but rarely visible asset, the River Tyne’ (WRAAP, 2006:10). This approach intends to challenge the perception of the river as an industrial area and the ‘green corridors’ aim to ‘support a rich range of plants and animals’ (WRAAP, 2006:11). By acknowledging the existence and importance of non-human communities, the WRAAP is trying to create a more holistic ‘deeper green’ version of a sustainable community that includes human, animal and plant communities.

In Walker Riverside, there is a concerted effort to rebrand the inward and outward perception of the community, to make it an attractive option for existing residents and to attract new ones. By using urban design techniques to create a community core (HOW) the aim is to slow the pace of mobility that currently the transgressing roads demand. By creating a pedestrian public space, a tree-lined boulevard, in the centre of the community with shops etc, the hope is to transform the perception of Walker, to make people pause and not just travel through on the way to the Silverlink shopping centre. The ‘green corridors’ add to the rebranding package by erasing the industrial image of the river and promoting the river and green spaces as a place of leisure and health.
Community inclusion

The branding expert commissioned by BNG identified community inclusion as a key aspect of regeneration. BNG have used a range of inward branding techniques to foster morale and community cohesion and ‘engineer’ (Helms, 2008) support for the regeneration efforts. Early on a dedicated magazine ‘The Walker Eye’ and a website www.walker-riverside.co.uk were established. The Walker Eye is delivered to every household, is available online and selects positive stories and information concerning the transformation.

Focusing on selected positive images of community a ‘Generation Game’ competition advertised in the local newspaper aimed to find the oldest, youngest and the broadest range of generations in one family. The ‘winners’ were used to represent community in
subsequent advertising with photos and ‘memories of life in Walker’. Using the Walker Riverside signage strapline, the first ‘Pride, Passion, Potential Awards were held in 2007. The awards were also given the name ‘Oscars’ by the organizers, perhaps to raise the profile and prestige amongst the community and wider city. The award for ‘potential’ is open to the young people who have shown effort and the potential for success beyond the expected. The award for ‘pride’ is open to anyone who has been a great ambassador for the community and the award for ‘passion’ is open to those who have shown great strength of character to achieve success.

As the Walker Eye reported,

“Pride, Passion Potential Awards (‘the Oscars) first one held in 2007. We are talking about the first-ever Walker ‘Oscars’ with a glittering ceremony held aboard a River Tyne cruise at the end of last year. It was a unique opportunity to recognise the many people who have gone that extra mile to make Walker such a great place to live” (Walker Eye, 2008:3)

There is something very ‘New Labour’ about these awards. Very much like the ‘Pride of Britain Awards’ for ‘unsung heroes’32. Yet as Griffiths (1998:53) argues branding/place marketing, “is predicated on the manipulation of meanings and perceptions…[and]..bringing certain readings of a city to the forefront and allowing others to fade away into the background”. The Walker ‘Oscars’ highlight pride, passion and potential to erase stigmatized perceptions and promote a cohesive image as opposed to one of fragmented, territorial neighbourhoods. The awards select the successful, who contribute to the notion of social capital (Chapter 6) of local loyalties, civic pride, active citizenship and of building networks within and beyond the community. As Griffiths (1998:53) suggests, such readings of community may be highlighted “but not the traditions of trade union militancy or revolutionary politics……[and] Great play may be made of the city’s cultural diversity but not of the systemic racial discrimination that in all probability accompanied it”.

32 www.prideofbritain.com
8.4.4 Boklok: ‘first in the UK’

In Gateshead, the BOKLOK (pronounced boo clook, which means smart living in Swedish) development was announced in December 2006 and aroused interest locally, nationally and internationally. BOKLOK, the senior planner with Gateshead Council explained “is a big coup because it is the first in the UK and who would have thought the first development would be here”. Policy tourism was part of the process when looking for urban regeneration policy ideas (see McCann and Ward, 2010; Peck and Theodore, 2010 for more on ‘mobile policies’) and like the Scotswood Expo example, BNG looked to Malmo, Sweden as the BOKLOK head office is in Malmo. Gateshead Council were instrumental in securing the BOKLOK development for Gateshead as Alan Prole, the Managing Director of Live Smart@Home explained,

“We are pleased to be working with a progressive authority such as Gateshead in delivering our first BoKlok scheme in the UK.”

The Managing Director describes Gateshead Council as a ‘progressive authority’ because they are the first in the UK to provide land and award planning consent to an affordable housing development built according to Ikea principles. However, although the development is in Felling, the address for new occupants is St James Village. Over time the spaces of Felling that attract investment are being renamed and erased. New communities replace the old ones and the BOKLOK development is of a Swedish design. For instance, the Felling development involves 90 Scandinavian style timber framed apartments and houses St James Village (Figure 8.7) and is marketed on their website as ‘new, modern and affordable’. The BOKLOK brand has four brand values to market the brand positively to external audiences and they are: ‘the customer’s friend, pleasant homes, good housing and low price with a meaning’. Standard features of the BOKLOK house include extra high ceilings and large windows for a light and airy feeling, laminated wood flooring, IKEA kitchens and balconies to upper floor flats.

33 Live Smart @Home are the UK partners of BOKLOK and are part of the Home Group, one of the UK’s largest affordable home providers
35 http://www.boklok.com/UK/About-BoKlok/The-BoKlok-Brand-Values/ accessed 08/04/10
BOKLOK is produced by Ikea and rather disparagingly referred to as ‘flat pack houses’. LiveSmart@Home, the commercial development arm of the Home Group, one of Britain’s largest affordable home provider builds BOKLOK. They are quick to build, energy efficient and affordable (Rose, 2007). As the senior planner of Gateshead Council (2007) explained in an interview, Felling will be,

“branded as an up and coming area, branded as BOKLOK because if they are willing to invest here then it must be on the up and I think it will attract a lot of new investment. I think it will improve the social side and provide a better mix and raise aspirations of communities and people will strive for employment more and anti social behaviour tends to increase”

The BOKLOK development does not build on any existing features of Felling – it is a new community, but it does build on the distinctive brand image of Ikea, as Alan Prole, managing director of Live Smart@Home explains,
“It's not just a retail outlet, it is more of a lifestyle or a culture - which is why people go there. Because there is that strong association [with Ikea], people can see the lifestyle they'll be buying into. But they also see Scandinavian style as being greener and more liberal, more community-based. Certainly, those are elements we are encouraging” (Rose, 2007)

The strategic alliance with a well known brand (Jansson and Power, 2006) effectively speeds up an otherwise slow process (of establishing a brand) and legitimizes the credibility of the regeneration efforts. Thus, the BOKLOK development has a strong outward brand image to attract interest yet the principles of Ikea reign in the growth potential and the distinctive image and lifestyle is used to attract local residents on relatively low incomes. The development offers a range of tenure options from outright ownership, shared ownership at fifty per cent and rental. To encourage local residents to stay for example, those people currently priced out of the housing market, the BOKLOK houses are only available to those living locally with a total household income of £15,000 to £30,000 and not already a homeowner. The important fact here is that the total household income has to be a minimum of £15,000 which effectively excludes the unemployed. The flats cost £99,000 for one bedroomed and £124,950 for two bedroomed. A two bedroomed townhouse costs £132,500 and a three bedroomed townhouse costs £149,500. Buy-to-Let speculators are forbidden from purchasing the properties and when the owners want to move the developers will sell the homes for them at market value to a buyer in the intended customer group. The BOKLOKs are not likely to be situated on inner city sites because of high land values and the preference for high density building; so the situation in Felling is ideal. They are erected by building contractors (they are not self-build) in clusters around small parks. The first apartments were ready to move into in January 2008 and a designated office was set up at the Ikea store in Gateshead for applications. BOKLOK ensure that no one borrows excessively and selection is made on five qualifying criteria:

1. Priority is given to households with an income below £35,000 at the time of application
2. Applicants must have adequate savings to pay for a minimum five per cent deposit and other house purchasing costs
3. Mortgage and rental costs, if applicable, should be no greater than forty per cent of net income
4. Generally, applicants should not be already a home owner although consideration is made in certain cases e.g. seeking a home after divorce
5. The home should be the sole residence (BOKLOK, 2007)

However, given the experience in Scandinavia, if demand exceeds supply a lottery is used to determine who gets the homes amongst those that fit the criteria. Those who are successful receive a £250 Ikea voucher for furniture and furnishings. By using this method of application it means that those who are literate and can mobilize and motivate themselves quickly stand a better chance of picking up the form at the correct time, then handing it in by the deadline. In the aftermath of a period of irresponsible lending and the ‘credit crunch’, the BOKLOK application and assessment procedure on the surface seems a reasonably fair and responsible approach. Indeed, the selection criterion fits with New Labour belief in only getting rights after showing responsibility. In this case, by being employed (even if it is low paid) and having savings fits the ‘responsible citizen’ criteria and the reward is a new apartment or house. The BOKLOK development may be tenure blind but it is not income blind – there is no place for the unemployed or those working but unable to save the deposit.

8.4.5 The ‘entangled’ geographies of branding places

Contrary to the notion of homogenous urban branding (e.g. Friedman, 2005) the three case studies of Scotswood Expo, Walker Riverside and BOKLOK suggest a heterogeneous network of branding processes from within and without the place and/or city limits (see Doel and Hubbard, 2002) that contribute to an understanding of the geographies of branding places (see Pike, 2009). Returning to the conceptual theme of fixity and flow discussed in Chapter 4, the work of Andy Pike is particularly illuminating in developing the fixity/flow idea because he considers the ‘entangled geographies of brands and branding’. As Pike (2009:621) argues, “a consideration of entangled geographies of brands and branding illustrates tensions that can be relational and territorial, bounded and unbounded, fluid and fixed, territorializing and deterritorializing”. Take for example, Scotswood Expo, Walker Riverside and BOKLOK, the processes of
branding each place are entangled in spatial relations *within* the communities, the city, the city-region and *without* to position themselves internationally. Much more explicitly than Walker Riverside, the Scotswood Expo and BOKLOK look beyond regional and national boundaries to Europe and especially Malmo in Sweden for branding ideas. What could be called the ‘Swedification’ of UK urban regeneration approaches is evident in the BNG case studies, in that the building style, materials and distinctive lifestyle option (in the case of Ikea and BOKLOK) is borrowed from Swedish examples. Thus, Scotswood Expo and BOKLOK involve both material and social branding processes, in that there is a fixed built infrastructure alongside the ‘manufacture of meaning’ (Jackson et al, 2006) to re-brand and alter poor perceptions of the communities. In effect, all three are new ‘brands in the making’ (Pike, 2009:623) although BOKLOK’s strategic alliance with a well known brand like Ikea immediately conjures up the distinctive social and environmental brand image associated with it, and is meant to speed up the process of establishing a new brand. The Scotswood Expo borrows the well established and tried idea of an ‘Expo’\(^3\) to launch the new community of ‘Scotswood’ at a spectacular event that will (hopefully) transform perceptions within the community, city and city-region as well as attracting national and international interest and recognition. The Scotswood Expo has looked to the Malmo example because of their similar industrial histories but rather than copying the Swedish model they intend to become pioneers and have a more ambitious ‘regeneration’ expo meaning more than just housing (although it is housing-led regeneration).

Alternatively, Walker Riverside employed a branding expert and favoured a process of branding that does attempt to re-shape poor perceptions like the Scotswood and Felling examples, but rather than ignoring or erasing the historical and cultural associations with the area they use this to build a new, *selective* identity. The emphasis is on creating a ‘community’ brand with the new ‘Heart of Walker’ providing the social focus of shops, public open space and green corridors linking the community heart to the new and old housing developments and the riverside. The distinctive brand image for Walker Riverside is family, community, cohesion and connections and most branding efforts are

---

\(^3\) There is a long history of international expositions and world fairs and indeed Newcastle had its own exhibition in 1929 the remaining legacy of which is Exhibition Park. In recent years, the exposition idea has been developed in Sweden as a ‘Housing Expo’, one of the first being held in Staffanstorp in 1997, which had 45 housing units and 123,000 visitors. Other ‘Housing Expos’ include the ‘Homes for the Future Housing Expo in Glasgow, 1999 and the Malmo, Housing Expo in 2001
geared towards fostering inward support (i.e. in relation to three networks - the existing community, the East End of Newcastle and wider City of Newcastle) for the regeneration. The new community brand is based on selected positive images of community as identified in the ‘Pride, Passion, Potential Awards’, otherwise known as the Walker Riverside Oscars.

These various branding processes intend to attract incomers to the communities by altering negative perceptions. For those already living in the communities they are already imagining the impact of attracting and living in a mixed community.

8.5 Imagining a mixed community

For people living and working in communities during transformation the reasons for the various branding techniques did not go unnoticed. The residents were not involved in the branding techniques except as participants in efforts to promote support for the regeneration within the community. The image of community is not theirs, but one imposed by urban elites and branding experts. A community worker in Walker Riverside expressed concerns that branding ignored the existing community and rushed to imagine a new one,

“There was one bit missing in their analysis (BNG) and that was how the community sees themselves – the personality and character of Walker – that should underpin the vision for Walker Riverside. If you look on the website you will see a vision for Walker Riverside that does not build on the local community. I felt that BNG moved too quickly, they ignored the community character and moved straight to the role of Walker – and they divided up the areas and one was called suburbs. But I felt uncomfortable with the word suburb because it conjures up a particular image and is top down and loaded. Because I think you have to be careful as that becomes the lens through which you view Walker” (Community Worker, Walker Riverside, 2007).

In their study of postindustrial Manchester and Sheffield, Taylor et al (1996:279, 313) argue that there are many different ‘local structures of feeling’ and ‘mental maps’ of cities
held by different publics. Thus, branding spaces of regeneration involves a limited and dominant perspective of community whereas for many residents

“. . .cities remain, for the majority of their users, places of work or schooling, encountered repetitively through the working week: people’s encounter with those cities—certainly within the north of England—is essentially either a mundane, routinized activity, most often referred to in metaphors like ‘the daily grind’, or, alternatively, it is actually ‘a struggle’.” (Taylor et al., 1996: 95–96)

Nevertheless, as Jansson and Power, (2006:35) argue “no branding process can ever manage to incorporate all possible actors, and there will always be a wide range of reactions, opinions and discrepancies about a wide-reaching urban brand”.

Having said that, the ultimate aim of the branding techniques adopted in the three case studies were not lost on local residents i.e. to attract raise the profile and attract investment and new people, and they knew this meant ‘mixing communities’. However, it would be wrong to assume that the local residents uncritically absorb the meanings encoded by urban elites into the spaces of regeneration (Griffiths, 1998). As Hubbard (1995) argues, the readings which local publics make of landscape transformations can include elements of resistance, as well as those of acceptance and compromise. Furthermore, as Helms (2008:89-90) suggests about Glasgow,

“the making of a successfully regenerated Glasgow is in substantial measure all about creating a visual and discursive dominance of images to support such a state of affairs [hiding the out of favour people and places]. Putting such images ‘out on a plate’ simultaneously hides, at least for the outsider, all the problems the city is facing”

In discussion with residents and people who had worked in the communities for many years throughout the transformations they revealed a variety of concerns and criticisms about the ‘mixed community’ objective. Some were cynical and critical,

“They aim to create 21st century housing and attract people in. The land is probably worth more with the people off it but that is a cynical view. They want
fast bus routes with the road near the river taking the middle classes to the
culture and arts and then back again. They want them to move back in from
Hexham to get more community tax. There is also a Discovery Quarter with an
‘evening economy’ – in other words getting pissed. And Science City. But the
jobs are in the service sector and not engineering. They will create a new suburb
with DINKYs (double income no kids yet). They want to attract families but they
have thrown all the families out. What they want are well to do families”
(Community Worker, Scotswood Area Strategy, 2007).

Other residents were concerned. The branding images instigated reflection on the type
of person who might move into the community and they were already imagining
‘difference’ between themselves and potential incomers. These are some comments
from a focus group in Walker Riverside,

“I think young up and coming business people will move in because that’s what
they show on the adverts. But will those people use the local schools or will they
send their children to private schools. So the money they make does not go into
the local economy but is spent outside.

I’m sure the people who move to Walker Riverside will be very special people,
you know managers. But the local people will not support that kind of difference
and the area will change and it will be expensive so they will move, they will
move from here

Yeah because if it is that sort of person the shops and the facilities will cater for
them and not the local people

And the very large difference between you and your neighbour will make you
upset and they will go and find another place where the people are at the same
level to be happy” (Walker Riverside focus group, 2007)

This extract from a focus group in Walker Riverside reveals that some of the local
residents are worried that the middle class incomers will create a community for
themselves, which suits their aspirations and choices. Indeed, Tim Butler’s (1997)
research on gentrifiers in Hackney, London, revealed that middle class gentrifiers sought out similar people who had the same cultural and political tastes and aspirations. So despite the middle class desire for diversity and difference they tend to self-segregate (Lees et al, 2008) with an “increasing tendency towards spatial segmentation within the middle class both occupationally and residentially” (Butler, 1997:161). So rather than as the government expects, building social capital amongst the working class, the incomers (if they come at all) may undermine the working class way of life and force them out – or at least that’s what the working class residents are anticipating. The difference in income and aspirations between middle and working class residents may only add to separation and segregation. The ‘difference’ is measured by the working class residents in terms of income, aspiration, lifestyle and life choices not by whether both middle and working class live in the same place. The concept of social mixing then does not recognize the working class way of life and the attachment to people and the feelings of security and safety that this evokes. But paradoxically, it can be these strong attachments that stop new attachments, a ‘them and us’ mentality, acts as a defence against some of the problems.

A study looking at US and UK experiences of mobilizing mixed communities as a means to create sustainable communities by Gullino (2008) drew from the example of Cabrini-Green in Chicago and found, like in BNG, that local people were worried. First, residents were worried about leaving the neighbourhood and not finding another house, or not being accepted in the new community. Second, residents were worried about breaking the networks and connections consolidated through the years (see Chapter 7); and third, although there was the option to move back to Cabrini-Green the residents realized that the new houses been built were not for them (Gullino, 2008:131-132). As Gullino (2008) concludes in her study, the relocation, disruption of existing networks and the reduction in social housing units ultimately undermines social sustainability. It is impossible to assess the long term impact of ‘state-led’ gentrification in the BNG area at this stage but given the evidence from the US and Europe one does doubt the extent to which social mixing leads to social sustainability for all classes.
Conclusion

This chapter has considered the ways in which the case for transformation is justified by problematizing certain social and material geographies (stigma and lack of housing choice) to justify the political rationality of mixing communities. Further, the chapter has reflected and critically explored urban branding as a technique of transformation of spaces of regeneration by drawing on examples from the three case studies in BNG. The chapter finds that urban branding is related to the notion of mixed communities in four ways. First, the techniques of urban branding aims to transform perceptions and connect spaces of regeneration with the wider city-region. Second, urban branding involves the relationship between the material spaces of houses and infrastructures and the social networks of websites, magazines and images to transform perceptions of spaces of regeneration. Third, by shaping perceptions socially and materially, urban branding is a technique to transform spaces of regeneration and attract the middle classes thus achieving the vision of mixed communities. Fourth, urban branding involves a dominant mental map and image of transformation yet local residents may be compliant, accepting and critical and concerned about the future. Throughout, the chapter considers these urban transformations in light of understandings that interpret them as ‘state-led’ gentrification.
CHAPTER 9

Creating sustainable communities?

9.1 Introduction

The thesis has explored the process of creating sustainable communities through a critical analysis of urban regeneration policy. Empirically the thesis has involved an ethnographic, qualitative study of three former industrial communities in the ‘NewcastleGateshead’ Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder, BNG. By drawing on the BNG case study, the thesis offers an understanding of the process of urban regeneration and the challenges and opportunities of achieving sustainable communities. The thesis provides new insights concerning how the notion of ‘sustainable community’ translates into local urban regeneration practice. Furthermore, it presents critical insights into how the process of material and social regeneration is both delivered and received in relation to social, political, economic and environmental spheres. It provides a unique understanding of the challenges and opportunities faced by communities, government (local and national) and other regeneration stakeholders within the changing political, social, economic and material dynamics of regeneration.

The thesis began by asking the following research questions:

1. How and to what extent have the themes of ‘community’ and ‘sustainability’ been incorporated into national and local urban regeneration policies in recent decades?

2. How significant is the ‘local context’ and ‘place’ in shaping, enabling and constraining the capacity to achieve policies for sustainable communities in this particular urban region?

3. How are the themes of ‘community’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable community’ being interpreted by the different stakeholders involved in the BNG area?
This concluding chapter will consider these questions in light of the theoretical development and empirical engagement made in the thesis. The chapter is in four parts. The first section critically reflects upon the thesis findings in reference to each research question. The second section evaluates the strengths and shortcomings of the conceptual framework. The third section discusses the policy implications and the final section suggests new avenues for research.

9.2 Revisiting the research questions

This section addresses each research question in turn. The first subsection discusses how and to what extent the themes of community and sustainability have been incorporated into local and national urban regeneration policies in recent decades. The second subsection considers how significant the local context and place are in shaping, enabling and constraining the capacity to achieve policies for sustainable communities. The third subsection discusses how the themes of community, sustainability and sustainable community are being interpreted by the different stakeholders in BNG.

9.2.1 Incorporating community and sustainability into urban regeneration policies

The first research question asked - how and to what extent have the themes of ‘community’ and ‘sustainability’ been incorporated into local and national urban regeneration policies within in recent decades? Findings from the thesis suggest that two key processes have been critical in shaping the ways in which these themes have been incorporated in the regeneration policy. First, the ‘mobilization’ of ideas through the policy process. Second, the emergence and use of ‘community’ as a tool for governing urban regeneration.

‘Mobilizing policy’: selecting and fixing discourses of ‘community’ and ‘sustainability’

The first means through which ‘community’ and ‘sustainability’ have been incorporated into national and local policy in recent decades is through the mobilization of policy. Since the Second World War, policy exchanges between the US and UK have been common (Cochrane, 2007; Jonas and Ward, 2002; Peck and Theodore, 2001; Wacquant, 2001). Rather than regarding this as a process of ‘policy transfer’ an
understanding of ‘mobile policies’ (see Peck and Theodore, 2010; McCann and Ward, 2010) seeks to explore the politics of policy learning, whereby local interactions are intertwined with negotiations to that draw wider circuits of policy knowledge into the city (Allen and Cochrane, 2007).

This thesis contributes to the set of literatures on ‘mobile policies’ because it reveals the ways in which discourses of community and sustainability have been selected from the ‘palate of policies’ in the UK, US and Europe. For instance, Section 3.2 demonstrates how the architect Richard Rogers influenced the ‘urban renaissance’ discourse in the UK. Rogers was invited by John Prescott (then Deputy Prime Minister) to chair the Urban Task Force. This body subsequently recommended a commitment to urban sustainability based on liveability (a concept that originated in the US in the 1970s), alongside mixed developments and compact cities. Based on the 1999 Urban Task Force report, the first Urban White Paper on urban issues since 1977 was published (see DETR, 2000; Lees, 2003). The Urban White Paper linked community and sustainability in terms of the liveability of the environment. In other words, actively looking after the physical environment (this became the ‘clean, safe, green’ blueprint) alongside the wider agenda of reinforcing the rights and responsibilities model for citizens and communities (see Chapter 3, Tables 3.2 and 3.3). The principles of urban renaissance, neighbourhood renewal and housing market renewal came together in the Sustainable Communities Plan (see Chapter 3, Table 3.4). In essence, the themes of community and sustainability are brought together by the understanding that the ‘environment creates community’ and thus creates a sustainable community. This idea borrows from New Urbanism in the US whereby there is the belief that the built environment can create a sense of community. In other words, if the environment is safe, green, clean and well connected to public services and other places, citizens will fulfill their obligations and be responsible for the maintenance and creation of a sense of community.

As revealed in the thesis, the flow of ideas influencing the Sustainable Communities Plan continued apace, with New Urbanism from the US (see Chapter 3); Richard Florida’s ‘creative class’ (see Section 8.3.2, Chapter 8); and what I have termed the ‘Swedification’ of urban regeneration/urban design approaches that looked to Malmo in Sweden and the well-known brand of Ikea and the BOKLOK development (Chapter 8).
Though it is important here to differentiate the national and local geographies of mobile policies, in other words, how the flow of ideas are operationalized when they are territorialized (as the framework that focuses on flow/fixed in Section 4.4.1, argues), as Table 1.1 demonstrates, there are similarities between the key themes and concepts of New Urbanism and Sustainable Communities, yet one can clearly distinguish the differences in UK interpretation. As argued above and in Chapter 3, this is because of the ‘palate of policy’ discourses incorporated into the UK Sustainable Communities urban regeneration policy. At the local policy level, Chapter 8 of the thesis argues that Richard Florida’s notion of a ‘creative class’ has influenced BNG policy documents (see for example, the BNG Prospectus published in 2004; the ‘Creative and Cultural Study’ and the ‘Student and Graduate Study’ commissioned by BNG in 2007). The community referred to here is the ‘future community’ rather than the existing one. It is the community of the middle classes, those graduates working in the creative or knowledge industries that BNG aspire to attract because their ‘civilizing’ and ‘responsible’ influence will be an example to the existing working class residents. According to government thinking, middle class communities police their own and each other’s behaviour by actively demonstrating civility and courtesy. Allegiance to community defines responsible behaviour whereas non-allegiance to community defines irresponsible behaviour and such allegiances are then used as a technology for governing them (Dean, 1999; Rose, 1996; Flint, 2002).

Community as a tool of urban regeneration

The second way that the themes of community and sustainability have been incorporated into national urban regeneration policy under New Labour is through community being mobilized as a tool of urban regeneration (see Chapter 6). Using evidence such as ‘The State of the English Cities’ report (Robson et al, 2000) the government reinforced the opinion that “proper communities deliver solutions, while dysfunctional communities work to reinforce and reproduce failure” (Cochrane, 2007:53; see Section 3.1). Chapter 6 identifies how community is mobilized as a policy tool in regeneration areas by creating active citizens (see Section 6.3.1) and active communities (see Section 6.3.2) and building social capital (see Section 6.3.3). Chapter 6 revealed that to build social capital and empower citizens, neighbourhood management is seen as the means by which the ‘qualities and potential’ within working
class communities can be developed (see Section 6.4.1). Using the example of
neighbourhood management in Benwell and Scotswood the thesis explored how these
political rationalities help underpin the moral and ethical principles of responsibilization.
Chapter 6 identifies how the government deems communities such as Benwell and
Scotswood unsustainable because they have not demonstrated the capacity to self-
govern or to control themselves effectively. In consequence, various levels of anti-social
behaviour have manifested such as fly-tipping, graffiti, as well as drug use, theft and
burglary. The thesis argues that to construct a sustainable community involves
techniques to govern at arms length. Section 6.4 revealed four examples of community
being mobilized as a technology of government; neighbourhood management,
neighbourhood wardens, active children, and residents associations. The neighbourhood
manager orders communities in three ways to achieve sustainable communities. First,
community is ordered by encouraging allegiances to others in community, for example,
residents associations (see Section 6.4.1). Second, community is ordered as part of the
clean and green agenda (see Section 6.4.2). Third, community is ordered via
surveillance techniques such as neighbourhood wardens, active children and CCTV
acting as the ‘eyes and ears’ of the community to promote good behaviour (see Section
6.4.2). Below, the ways in which at the local level these interpretations of community and
sustainability are mobilized to justify the reshaping of local populations along particular
lines, is considered (see Section 9.2.2).

**Community and sustainability in the mainstream?**

As demonstrated above, there is clear evidence in this thesis concerning ‘how’ the
themes of sustainability and community have been incorporated into local and national
policies. The thesis has revealed that community has re-entered mainstream policy
discourse and practice under New Labour after thirty years of marginalization,
influencing the direction and nature of urban regeneration to a significant extent. At the
same time, concerns for sustainability have also become mainstream, culminating in its
central place alongside community in the Sustainable Communities Plan (see Table 2.1),
though the ways in which this term has been interpreted have shifted significantly over
time. However, and importantly, the thesis argues that it is difficult to separate the
themes of sustainability and community because they have become so entwined.
Community has driven the urban regeneration agenda but sustainability has become
entrained in this process in a particular fashion around ‘order’, whereby, an ordered community creates a sustainable community (see Section 9.2.3).

9.2.2 Place and sustainable communities

The second research question asked - How significant is the ‘local context’ and ‘place’ in shaping, enabling and constraining the capacity to achieve policies for sustainable communities in this particular urban region? This section addresses this question by considering the significance of the local context and place in shaping, enabling and constraining the creation of sustainable communities in NewcastleGateshead. The thesis revealed that the local context and place are especially significant in shaping and constraining the creation of sustainable communities. The local context and place are less significant in enabling the creation of sustainable communities because national and transnational policy learning has a greater influence. In exploring the significance of the ‘local context’ and ‘place’ to achieve policies for sustainable communities in NewcastleGateshead tensions have been identified between processes that simultaneously attempt to shape, enable and constrain the creation of sustainable communities.

Shaping sustainable communities

The significance of the ‘local’ in shaping the creation of sustainable communities in NewcastleGateshead is seen in efforts to build on the strengths of community. The thesis has highlighted the ways in which the ‘local’ is mobilized to construct particular conceptions of place to engineer a new image of community (see Chapter 8). For instance, Section 8.4 reveals a range of branding techniques that build upon strong local characteristics (material and social) to promote the transforming community to old and new audiences and ultimately achieve a mixed, sustainable community. In Scotswood and Benwell for example, the renaming of neighbourhoods build upon (selective) positive local aspects such as historical buildings and parks (see Section 8.4.2). In Walker, the new name of Walker Riverside aims to stress locally the positive aspects of a waterside location (rather than associating with older industrial perceptions) whilst simultaneously emphasizing the not too distant geographic connection to the successfully revised city centre waterfront with the Sage and Baltic developments.
The strengths of local people are also built upon to conjure positive images of community. This is most clearly expressed in Walker Riverside where a range of branding techniques have been used such as, the ‘Generation Game’ and the ‘Pride, Passion, Potential Oscars’ to foster support within the community for the regeneration whilst simultaneously portraying a positive image to elsewhere in the city, region and beyond (see Section 8.4.3) to attract people to live, work and invest in the communities.

**Enabling sustainable communities**

The section above highlights the ways in which the local ‘place’ shapes the creation of sustainable communities. This section moves on to a discussion of ‘enabling sustainable communities’ and identifies two ways in which the ‘local’ has less significance in the early stages of regeneration processes. First, the ‘local’ in terms of policy makers and politicians has less significance in enabling the creation of sustainable communities because of their dependence upon central state funding and the competitive bidding process to fulfill their local regeneration visions and ambitions. The first indication of this is in Section 3.6 and then developed in Section 7.3. For instance, The Going for Growth ‘local’ initiative despite local authority instigation and support (though not local resident support, see Section 7.3.7) failed to materialize until the shift to a central state agenda i.e. the Sustainable Communities Plan (see Section 7.3.8). The local policy makers and politicians were unable to ‘enable’ the creation of sustainable communities without first justifying their case for change to attract central state funds (see Section 7.3.8).

The second way in which the thesis highlights how the local had less significance in enabling the creation of sustainable communities is in distinguishing the ways in which transnational policy learning becomes territorialized. This means that selective representations of the local place simultaneously ‘shapes’ the creation of sustainable communities (as seen above) whilst policy learning from the US and Scandinavia ‘enables’ the creation of sustainable communities which in turn ‘reshapes’ the local place. For instance, in Scotswood representatives from BNG, the local authority planners and regeneration practitioners and selected and invited local residents looked to ‘policy tourism’ for ideas and visited Malmo in Sweden. Malmo was chosen as a policy tourism destination because like NewcastleGateshead it is a port, and has a similar industrial shipping history. Furthermore, Malmo’s Housing Expo in 2001 is widely cited
as a successful event. BNG selected Malmo as a demonstration example of best practice and from this they developed and translated their own interpretation - the Scotswood Expo (see Section 8.4.1). In Felling, Gateshead they looked to the Swedish affordable design development of ‘BOKLOK’. In doing so, Gateshead has strategically aligned the development with a well known brand – Ikea and become the first BOKLOK development in the UK (see Section 8.4.4).

The process of regeneration involves a shifting role for the ‘local’. In the early stages of regeneration the local policy makers, regeneration practitioners etc are dependent upon the central state for funds and transnational policy learning for fresh policy ideas to enable the creation of sustainable communities. Thus the local is marginalized in relation to these early stage processes which enable the creation of sustainable communities. The thesis reveals that transnational policy learning and the ways in which mobile policies are territorialized enables the creation of sustainable communities. Once chosen and incorporated into local policies, these policy strategies help situate the ’local’ (i.e. Scotswood Expo and BOKLOK) on the mental map of ‘best practice’ urban policy approaches that inform future approaches (McCann and Ward, 2010). In these terms, the territorialization of sustainable communities discourse and the success of the policy approach are intertwined with local, national and international recognition. It is important to translate mobile policies in an innovative and creative way to local, national and international audiences in order to appear on the mental map for future developments and become part of the policy tourism trail. Becoming part of the policy tourism trail helps situate ‘places’ and cities in relation to other successful places/cities and this also relates to wider debates concerning the role of cities in driving national economic growth (McCann and Ward, 2010). Yet in doing so, the ‘old place’ in terms of history and people has very little significance in enabling the creation of sustainable communities.

**Constraining sustainable communities**

The thesis has also developed arguments to demonstrate the ways in which the ‘local’ constrains the creation of sustainable communities. The local constrains the creation of sustainable communities in hidden, less tangible ways but always in response to the strategic destruction of place. The thesis has revealed the tensions between
regeneration strategies that seek to shape the local (discussed above and elaborated upon in this section) and strategies that seek to destroy the local place.

The first way in which the local constrains the creation of sustainable communities is in discourses of ‘obsolescence’. For example, Section 7.4 in Chapter 7 detailed the visible and invisible rationalities of demolition and in doing so revealed the way in which the functional obsolescence of some houses in certain inner urban areas constrains the capacity to achieve the creation of sustainable communities (see Section 7.4.1). To overcome this, discourses of obsolescence have been developed by local policy makers and regeneration practitioners to justify demolition. Yet as Section 7.4.2 revealed, the various property types earmarked for demolition because they constrain the capacity to achieve sustainable communities in Bridging NewcastleGateshead are in other areas of the city-region deemed sustainable. This leads you to question the policy maker’s selection (hidden) criterion that contributes to the unequal geographies of demolition in NewcastleGateshead.

Furthermore, the thesis reveals the ways in which discourses of obsolescence differ according to whether the interpretation was from policy documents which highlighted the ‘functional obsolescence’ of the material landscape or from discussions with regeneration practitioners, community workers and residents that highlight the ‘social obsolescence’ of some people (see Section 7.4.2). This means that places and people in BNG constrain the capacity to achieve sustainable communities. This led to the one of the main findings of the thesis – to overcome the local constraints in achieving the creation of sustainable communities, in some areas within BNG, there was a correlation between the ‘unsustainable residents’ and demolition. This was most evident in Scotswood where one half of a street was demolished and the other half kept (see Section 7.2.2). As the BNG coordinator for the area explained (see Section 7.4.2), in consultations with residents and local councillors they determined the sustainable community and the unsustainable community based on the good or bad behaviour of residents and landlords.

Sustainability in these terms has nothing to do with the built environment and the obsolete housing but is interpreted in terms of the behaviour (good or bad) of the local population (see also Section 9.2.3). Sustainability is determined along the lines of social
obsolescence whereby the unsustainable resident is one who is ‘unruly’ whereas the sustainable resident is ‘settled’ – behaviour is a determining factor in shaping and constraining the creation of sustainable communities (see Section 7.4.2). Yet housing tenure is also deemed a signifier of behaviour in that owner occupiers and ‘responsible’ council tenants are sustainable residents and desirable in the newly created communities. Whereas, the irresponsible private landlord with equally irresponsible tenants is deemed unsustainable and forcibly evicted from the community once the decision to demolish has been made. Thus, as the section above and Section 7.4.2 illustrate there are tensions between strategies to shape the local that not only build upon community strengths, but strategies that intend to overcome constraints (material and social obsolescence) which in doing so contribute to the destruction of place.

The second way in which the local constrains the creation of sustainable communities is in the local resident’s response to demolition (see Chapter 7). For instance, local residents, community workers and the local media understood the demolition of communities as ‘social cleansing’ (see Section 7.3.7) and the ‘breaking of communities’ (see Section 7.7.2) rather than the creation of sustainable communities. Section 7.6.1 in Chapter 7 also argues that ‘regeneration-speak’ such as ‘land assembly’ and ‘clearance’ evades the most contentious interpretation of demolition in BNG – ‘domicide’ (Harker, 2009). As revealed in Chapter 7, finding out the location and time of demolitions in the case study areas was difficult because the process of ‘land assembly’ involves social, technical and legal negotiations and contestations. The fragmented nature of the processes (which are both spatial and temporal) preceding demolition mean that the complex politics of unbuilding masks the annihilation of communities. The thesis also revealed one of the most significant, and underestimated (by policy makers) constraints to achieving sustainable communities in BNG are the emotional geographies of demolition and being moved (see Section 7.7). For working class communities who have lived in the same house and neighbourhood for generations being moved is a traumatic experience. To cope, some residents kept mementoes to act as ‘aide –memoires’ of their community (see Section 7.7.1). Yet as the thesis reveals, it is the close proximity to ones friends and family that provides a sense of community for some residents. Displacement breaks the attachment to place and bonding, as the elderly Walker resident recognized, so she walked everyday back to her old neighbourhood to see her
family and friends. To her and many of the other residents who had already moved, the new house was just that, a house not a home (see Section 7.7.2).

9.2.3 Interpreting sustainable communities

The third research question asked - how are the themes of ‘community’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable community’ being interpreted by the different stakeholders involved in the BNG area? Chapters 6, 7 and 8 have explored the ways in which the notions of ‘community’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable communities’ are interpreted by different stakeholders involved in BNG by focusing on the themes of ‘governance’, ‘demolition’ and ‘transformation’. These three chapters reveal that ‘community’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable communities’ are interpreted in debates and controversies concerning disconnections and connections; behaviour as a determinant of sustainability and the selection and eviction of communities deemed beyond repair.

Disconnections and connections

The thesis has revealed the ways in which the themes of community, sustainability and sustainable community are interpreted by stakeholders in BNG in terms of social and material disconnections and connections. We first turn to ‘social’ disconnections and connections. Local policy documents and regeneration practitioners emphasized the disconnection of people and place by painting a picture of fragmented, polarized communities in decline juxtaposed to vibrant, glamorous growth areas in the city centres and along the regenerated Quayside (see Section 3.6.1, Figures 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4). The thesis has revealed a set of arguments from national and local policy documents and discussions with regeneration practitioners to justify interventions to regenerate communities. These include arguments that relate irresponsibility, inactivity and the lack of social capital to unsustainability and reponsibilization (Rose, 1999); active citizenship (Kearns, 1995; Raco, 2007) and building social capital (Kearns, 2004) to the creation of sustainable communities (see Chapter 6). Thus, the ability to network and manage oneself is considered a key aspect of a sustainable community. In this sense, the inability to network and manage oneself in communities is problematized in terms of disconnection, with unsustainable communities viewed as inward looking and parochial (see Section 6.3). However, as the thesis revealed the residents see
community very differently – as their home (see Section 7.3.5, 7.4.1, 7.5.2, 7.6.1, 7.7). As Richard Rogers commented when distancing himself from the demolition plans of Going for Growth, ‘it is unsustainable to pull down houses that have a future and even less sustainable to move people who are happy where they are’ (Newcastle Journal, 2000; see Section 7.3.7).

We now turn to ‘material’ disconnections and connections. Community, sustainability and sustainable communities are viewed in national and local policy documents and by regeneration practitioners in terms of housing tenure. According to these stakeholders, disconnection is exacerbated by stigmatized communities and lack of housing choice set within the backdrop of ‘council estates’ (see Section 8.3.1). The solution is to connect these communities to the housing market by increasing the housing choice (albeit with fewer social rented and more owner occupation) thus meeting aspirations and fostering ‘mixed communities’ which means materially in terms of tenure options and socially in terms of ‘class’ (see Section 8.3.2) hence these debates are often understood as ‘state-led gentrification (see Allen, 2008; Cameron, 2003; Hackworth and Smith, 2001; Lees et al, 2008; Smith, 2002; Uitermark et al, 2007). However, as the thesis revealed, for residents affected by demolition and relocation, the plans to ‘connect’ unsustainable communities thereby making them sustainable communities is understood in their terms as ‘disconnection’ (see Section 7.7 and 8.4.5). Disconnection from community networks and hence family and friends (see Section 7.7.2) and disconnection socially and culturally from the incoming middle class communities (see Section 8.4.5). Furthermore, Chapter 6 reveals similar findings to Herbert (2005) who argues that community is being burdened and overloaded with obligations that citizens find excessive (‘the trapdoor of community’) and also Amin’s 2006 idea of ‘community on trial’. For example, in Scotswood and Benwell, existing residents associations comprising mainly of elderly women described their sense of duty and obligation and concern that no-one else was willing to take over from them when they became ill, frail or even died (see Section 6.4.4).

Behaviour as a determinant of sustainable communities

The thesis has revealed the ways in which community, sustainability and sustainable communities are interpreted by the various stakeholders involved in BNG in terms of
behaviour’. As mentioned earlier, Chapter 6 reveals that those involved in delivering the policy locally in BNG (meaning those directly employed and those working in partnership) interpret an unsustainable community as problematic with inactive citizens, anti-social behaviour, and those that lack responsibility. Discussions with local residents appear keen to draw a clear distinction between those they perceive to be involved in anti-social behaviour and themselves (see Section 6.4.2). They also highlight the relationship between irresponsible landlords and some tenants and the loss of community (see Section 7.4.2; see also Allen’s [2008] work on Liverpool). For them, community is taking an interest, knowing your neighbours and caring for your neighbourhood. It is interesting to note that at the local level, mainly amongst residents and community workers, terms such as active citizenship, active communities and social capital are replaced by a discourse of ‘behaviour’ and it is behaviour that becomes a determinant of sustainability (see also section 9.2.2 above). To them behaviour is the key to determining whether a community is unsustainable or sustainable in spaces of regeneration (see Section 6.4.2 and Section 7.4.2). In other parts of the city, good and bad behaviour is exhibited but it is only spaces of regeneration that are observed, criticized and manipulated to such an intensive extent (Cochrane, 2007; Johnstone, 2004). The techniques of urban governance in spaces of regeneration such as neighbourhood management target the active citizens in residents associations and punish those deemed anti social (see Section 6.4). A range of surveillance techniques renders the good and bad behaviour of communities in BNG visible, for example, CCTV, surveys, neighbourhood and junior wardens (see Section 6.4). Thus from an urban governance perspective, sustainability means ‘social’ sustainability and is related to notions of active citizenship, active communities and social capital (cf. Kearns, 1995, 2004).

The thesis also reveals how social order is managed via ‘arms length policing’ through the technologies (neighbourhood wardens assisted by CCTV) that instill a ‘police-like’ presence within the community (see Section 6.4). Thus, as mentioned in Section 9.2.1, sustainability is been interpreted as ‘ordering’. Within this social ordered community, good behaviour (active and responsible citizens) is rewarded by the neighbourhood management team by being awarded the control and management of CCTV, for example in Scotswood (see Section 6.4.2). Thus, some residents can participate in the management of surveillance technologies to govern their own communities whilst those
deemed inactive and irresponsible are marginalized. The thesis also revealed that adults are not the only ones involved in community observation and surveillance technologies because through the junior warden scheme, responsible, active i.e. well behaved children can participate (see Section 6.4.3). Thus, in school they learn citizenship and in the community they ‘do citizenship’. Active, responsible children and adults are viewed as vital to ensure the long-term ‘social’ sustainability of regeneration.

*Communities beyond repair*

The thesis has further revealed the ways in which community, sustainability and sustainable community are interpreted by stakeholders in BNG in terms of ‘repair’. Chapter 7 draws on Graham and Thrift (2007) to highlight the inequalities and injustices of demolition and understand the how *some* communities are deemed beyond repair whereby the repair option is withdrawn and the only option is demolition. Chapter 7 developed the argument that various techniques contribute to the withdrawal of repair option, such as the community experts of the relocation and resettlement teams (see Section 7.5.1), plot preferences (see Section 7.5.2) and compulsory purchase orders (see Section 7.5.3). Section 7.5.1 revealed how the relocation and resettlement teams use questionnaires as a governmentalizing surveillance technique to determine housing tenure of each household in the community. Here we return once again to the theme of housing tenure (see section above on ‘disconnections and connections’) and in this case housing tenure determines the compensation package – with owner-occupiers receiving more than social and private rented. Section 7.5.1 details the ways in which the themes of ‘ordering’ and ‘behaviour’ contribute to interpretations of sustainable communities. For instance, the relocation and resettlement team ‘rank’ or ‘order’ community according to housing tenure and owner-occupiers are visited first by the team. Section 7.5.1 also reveals that for social and private tenants to be designated ‘priority rehousing’ they have to prove their good behaviour which means no rent arrears and being able to provide good references. This surveillance process sifts and selects the sustainable tenant from the unsustainable tenant and rewards responsibility with a socially rented house. Thus a moral and judgmental framework determines who can live in the sustainable community: ‘orderly’ neoliberal citizens. The unsustainable tenant is excluded from the social housing sector and has little option but to rent privately. Plot preferences, used on the Cambrian Estate in Walker appear to promise a fairer, more inclusive way of relocating
residents but as the thesis reveals, the material aspects of demolition and rebuilding can impede progress and contribute to the emotional status of residents involved (see Section 7.5.2). Here then we are reminded of the intersections between social and material aspects of community and the importance of considering the material in answering the research question. Compulsory purchase is another intersection between social resistance and state powers to demolish and the socio-legal negotiations required to issue a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) (see Section 7.5.3). The thesis revealed that the CPO is the most powerful technique as it quashes resistance and evicts the ‘troublesome ones’, those beyond repair, from the community.

9.2.4 Summarizing the implications of the thesis

In answering the research questions, significant implications are revealed for understanding urban regeneration policy. Interpretations of ‘community’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable communities’ have a considerable impact upon the national and local policy formation, on local policy delivery and the perception and reception of policy decisions amongst local people and place. For instance, Section 9.2.3 demonstrated three ways in which the themes of ‘community’, ‘sustainability’ and ‘sustainable communities’ have been interpreted by the different stakeholders involved in BNG - social and material connections and disconnections, behaviour as a determinant of sustainability and repair. Policy makers and regeneration practitioners interpreted unsustainable communities as socially and materially disconnected with inactive, irresponsible citizens living in homogenous estates and sustainable communities as active, responsible home owners. In contrast, local residents viewed the same communities as home and were happy to live there. They feared geographical disconnection from family and friends if relocated and social and cultural disconnection from middle class incoming communities. The second interpretation is related to behaviour, with all stakeholders relating antisocial behaviour with unsustainability and good behaviour with sustainability. This is no different perhaps to any community but the difference lies is the way in which behaviour in spaces of regeneration is observed, monitored and manipulated by ‘police-like’ technologies such as CCTV and neighbourhood wardens. Community, sustainability and sustainable communities in this context are viewed in terms of ensuring conformity and order. The third interpretation views community, sustainability and sustainable communities through the lens of ‘repair’,
whereby some communities are deemed ‘beyond repair’ and homes are demolished and people relocated. Yet again, a process of ‘ordering’ is involved to interpret sustainability and negotiate inclusion or eviction from community.

In exploring how the themes of ‘community’ and ‘sustainability’ have been incorporated into local and national urban policies over recent decades (see Section 9.2.1) it can be seen that the dominant interpretations of policy makers override local residents conceptions of home and place. Powerful policy influences from the UK, Europe and the US capture the attention of policy makers, both nationally and locally. For example, Richard Rogers (urban renaissance), Richard Florida (creative class), Amiat Etzioni (communitarianism), alternative approaches such as New Urbanism and BOKLOK and successful events, such as Bo01Housing Expo in Malmo, Sweden, each offer a way forward towards achieving transformation because they provide a ‘palate of policy’ approaches that re-conceptualize ‘community’ and ‘sustainability’ in their terms.

The imperative to transform places successfully through outward branding strategies and selective inward branding means that sustainable communities are created by the most powerful local elites and the local residents’ interpretations of home and community are marginalized. Section 9.2.2 in particular draws together the set of arguments that reveal tensions between strategies to shape the ‘local’ whilst others effectively seek to destroy it. In shaping communities, local policy makers and practitioners select positive social and material images of the local [sustainable] community through branding techniques. Paradoxically, the ‘local’ is then turned on itself when interpretations of unsustainable communities inform discourses of social obsolescence, hence the correlation between ‘unsustainable residents and demolition.

9.3 Reconsidering the conceptual framework

The thesis develops a relational conceptualization of urban governance in spaces of regeneration. Starting with an understanding of ‘spaces of regeneration’ as spaces in the process of becoming this perspective moves beyond normative, prescriptive understandings of spaces as static and contained and subject to the process of spatial regulation from above i.e. “power over”. Rather than a straightforward process of spatial regulation to transform people and places, the process of regeneration involves
uncertainties, negotiations, contestations and emotions between the multiple social, material, economic and environmental networks. The thesis has drawn together urban theories and empirical evidence (including historical and contemporary policy analysis as well as a range of qualitative methods) to illustrate the relational transformation of people and places.

A governmental reading of power and a relational account of space has provided the main conceptual framework. This has led to an in-depth exploration of the rationalities and technologies of urban regeneration from three perspectives – governing communities, demolishing communities and transforming communities. Each empirical chapter considers the way in which the multiple social, material and economic networks of activity make connections and/or disconnections. A relational understanding of urban regeneration reveals the ways in which rationalities and technologies are set in relations of power, which, in turn, are generative in ‘making’ spaces of regeneration. Thus, the mentalities of urban regeneration, the techniques that shape social and material landscapes and the impact of such techniques of the least powerful are explored. In consequence, spaces of regeneration are understood in relation to other city spaces. This reveals the ways in which certain people and places are in the process of becoming, but the process is one featuring negotiation, coercion, domination and contestation.

In contrast to Urban Regime Theory and the concept of the Urban Growth Machine – perspectives that retain considerable purchase in debates interpreting urban power, governance and politics, particularly in the US (Wood, 2004) - a relational framework has opened us the possibilities for understanding community, materiality and sustainability. Spaces of regeneration are not closed spaces; they are dynamic spaces of fixity and flow. Material permanences’ – the built infrastructures in spaces of regeneration are contingent as Harvey (1989) argues on processes that create, sustain and dissolve them. The thesis argues that the deliberate withdrawal of repair and maintenance (Graham and Thrift, 2007) means that demolition can be seen as a technology of government to erase certain people and places in spaces of regeneration. The politics of repair within the context of demolition reveals the techniques of government to limit options whereby people who stay are forcibly evicted by the socio-
legal technique of Compulsory Purchase Order, whereas compliance involves financial compensation.

The identity of people and places in spaces of regeneration are relational and bound up with narratives of the past industrial history: the material and social legacies of that history that are inherited as physical ‘things’ and abstract memories. As Massey (2005) argues, the past has a distinct geography and the process of identity construction is ongoing. Here we understand place as a space to which meaning has been ascribed – place based rather than place bound to recognize the relations of space beyond place. The thesis also reveals the emotional geographies of spaces of regeneration in relation to certain places and people: the geography of loyalty (Massey, 2005); of home, family and friends; of imaginations of past and present places; and the feeling of loss and disconnection from the future and uncertainty. A relational understanding reveals the ways in which spaces of regeneration are simultaneously victims and made by successful, dominant spaces. The vulnerability of spaces of regeneration in relation to successful spaces with flows of capital, people, creativity and diversity has been revealed. Spaces of regeneration are simultaneously shaped by imaginative maps of loyalty - of community, home and family; and maps of backwardness and decline – homogenous, working class, reactionary, racist and tribalistic and compared to and shaped by the successful spaces of flows, diversity, creativity, sustainability and tolerance.

On reflection, the various shortcomings and alternative theoretical approaches for understanding this particular example of urban regeneration can be found in this approach. For instance, there is scope for a more thorough analysis of gentrification beyond that discussed in Chapter 8. Indeed, an earlier version of the thesis involved a critical discussion of gentrification; but for reasons of balance, in this final version, gentrification features much less. This is because the thesis explores the complexity and multiplicity of processes involved in spaces of regeneration in the process of becoming. That the plan to create sustainable communities as ‘state–led gentrification’ is one with which the thesis has sympathy; but its main concern is with the ways in which the processes of social, material, economic and environmental relations shape and make spaces of regeneration. The thesis explores a short moment in the process of regeneration in three communities in NewcastleGateshead. It is too early to assess the
impact (for an early impact assessment of HMR, see Cole and Flint, 2007). Of course a retrospective assessment of BNG at the end of the process (2018) may involve a greater critical engagement with theories of gentrification. The long-term, wider impact of demolition and relocation combined with the policy of increasing home ownership leading to fewer social houses needs to be assessed. For instance, the moral judgements leading to punitive assessments leading to displacement from ‘sustainable communities’ leading to the private rented sector or homelessness needs to be traced and critically explored.

There is also scope for a greater engagement with surveillance, social order and anti-social behaviour literature beyond that discussed in Chapter 6. My concern with anti-social behaviour is that it has become an all encompassing term to mean anything from dog dirt to serious incidents of crime and public disorder. In relation to creating sustainable communities, anti social behaviour in all forms is used as a way of distinguishing and sorting ‘community’ and is related to relocation and therefore, displacement. On the other hand ‘pro-social behaviour’ i.e. responsible and moral is fostered and rewarded. Though, of course, it is not that simple and a greater interrogation of these issues would lead to a deeper appreciation of the surveillance and control of behaviour, the reasons for the proliferation of certain ‘lifestyles’ and what this means for fostering and governing sustainable communities. In particular, a greater understanding of ‘working class’ (for want of a better term) culture today, lifestyle choices and chances and feelings of marginalization is especially relevant; not least in terms of what appears to be a growing disaffection with ‘mainstream; culture and relatedly the turn by some to the British National Party (BNP), the English Defence League, and Muslim extremism as reported in the media.

As stated above, on reflection I have realized that an alternative theoretical approach would have been one that considered the process of urban governance and politics through a state-regulation perspective (see Aglietta, 1979; Amin, 1994; Boyer, 1990; Cochrane, 1993; Goodwin et al, 1993; Harvey, 1989; Jessop, 1990, 1992, 1993; MacLeod, 2001; Painter, 1991, 1995; Peck and Tickell, 1992). A relational understanding of urban regeneration has revealed the unequal power geometries during the process of regeneration. Mostly this involves an exploration of state intervention working at a distance in communities via various techniques. So the thesis focuses on
'implicit' vertical state regulation as it manifests in local horizontal networks of power. Thus, a relational approach and Foucauldian conception of power may only offer a thin political economy and not get to the structural effects of power (see MacLeod, 2000, 2001; Brenner, 1999; Jones and MacLeod, 1999; MacLeod, 2000; MacLeod and Goodwin, 1999). Future work could explore how that political economy might be reworked to take sustainability and community into account. Furthermore, developing my conceptual framework, future work could try to engage both these approaches to power within the context of urban materialities. In engaging with this theoretical development, the work of John Allen (2003, 2004) in particular would be crucial.

9.4 Policy implications

This section considers the policy implications that have arisen from the thesis. The first part discusses the ‘housing’ focus of the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP). The second assesses the claim made by the government that the SCP represented a ‘step change’ in urban regeneration policy. The third discusses the implications of long term policy plans and short term funding and electoral cycles.

9.4.1 Housing as a driver of urban regeneration policy

With so much emphasis on ‘sustainable communities’ it is possible to overlook the fact that perhaps the primary focus of SCP is housing whether it is issues of affordable housing in the growth areas of London and the South East or the issues of low demand and abandonment in the North and Midlands of England. Housing has returned as a driver of urban regeneration policy. Yet as this thesis argues, whereas housing policy was located within a social democracy context in the post war period (see Section 2.2), contemporary housing policy is located in a neoliberal context where housing is viewed through a market framework: Peter Saunders (1990) ‘Nation of Homeowners’ has been extended, perhaps beyond his own and Mrs Thatcher’s dreams (see Section 3.4). Although housing in the post war period was not incorporated into the welfare state like health and education and was instead left to local government the principles of social democracy ensured that housing was viewed as a basic human need and not a commodity (Mullins and Murie, 2006). Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of the thesis discuss how the neoliberal market framework eroded the social policy side of housing and replaced it with
the drive to privatize and increase home ownership. This section considers the ways in which housing policy is located within a market renewal framework before discussing housing market renewal in a recession.

Creating new housing markets

This thesis has revealed the consequences of locating housing policy within a market renewal framework. Section 3.4.1 details the origins of the sub-regional housing market renewal approach and the emphasis upon public-private partnerships and mixed developments. The housing market renewal approach also ushered in ‘demolition’ as a purported ‘necessity’ to achieve sustainable regeneration (see Section 3.4 and Chapter 7). Section 7.3 noted that within a historical context local authorities were unwilling to demolish housing because of a political commitment to social housing. Section 7.3.1 pointed out that the legacy of demolition and relocation lived on in the memories of many families who throughout the decades had their housing choices dictated and controlled by the state. Yet spurred on by a growth first agenda, Newcastle City Council embarked on a radical demolition plan (see Section 7.3) which although curtailed continued as part of housing market renewal. The thesis revealed the tension between material demolition and social impacts (see Chapter 7; Cole and Flint, 2007). For instance, demolition involves ‘clearance’ and in clearing houses and communities land is assembled and this signals a market opportunity to housing developers (see Section 7.3.6). At the same time, assembling land and encouraging investment has social and emotional impacts for the communities involved (see Section 7.7). A similar tension was identified by Weber and Pagano (2002) between the use and exchange value of development land in Chicago.

In considering these tensions, several questions are raised, for instance, is market renewal what housing policy needs? As the thesis reveals the alternatives to demolition are refurbishment and retrofit (see Section 7.4.1) and these approaches satisfy critical commentaries that highlight the social and environmental consequences of demolition (English Heritage, 2005; Sustainable Development Commission, 2007). Furthermore, if communities are made with the market in mind, what does that mean for already existing meaningful communities? For communities to be marketable, as the thesis argues, this means social and material transformations (relocation and demolition) as well as altering
social and material perceptions of community through branding strategies (see Chapter 8). This means that communities are reshaped but in particular ways that evict some and attract others (see Chapters 7 and 8). This raises an important additional question, for the thesis to address - what happens to communities when the market stops due to recession? This issue is considered below.

**Coupling housing markets and housing policy: a cautionary tale of boom and bust**

As the thesis has demonstrated, under New Labour, the provision of housing as a basic need circa the 1960s has not returned. Indeed, owner occupation is viewed a positive aspect of sustainable communities so has increased as a tenure choice in housing market renewal areas. Under New Labour housing policy has been coupled with housing markets as a driver of regeneration. This is because in the period from 1997 the notion of buying a home to live in for a long time has been replaced by the commoditization of houses and property. The neoliberalization of the global financial sector has encouraged and fostered the growth in mortgages with a range of repayment options to suit low and high income earners alike. This combined with low interest rates saw the housing market become a major driver of economic growth in the US and UK and elsewhere. The rush to purchase properties grew apace and the ‘buy-to-let’ option saw many one time single home owners become speculators in the ‘property boom’ owning a ‘portfolio of properties’ to rent. Such was the desire and demand to buy, house prices dramatically increased and BNG saw houses that would not sell for 50 pence in 1991 advertised for sale in the mid-2000’s for £135,000. Yet this did not last.

As of the late 2000’s, the ‘bubble’ burst, instigated by borrowers defaulting on sub-prime loans in the US and so started the global recession and the ‘credit crunch’ which effectively means lending (at worst) ceased and at best was severely restricted. Poor and rich have been affected but it is the most vulnerable in the poorest areas that face the consequences most harshly (Day, 2009; JRF, 2009). In our local communities, most people can offer examples of incomplete housing developments, quickly abandoned once the market stopped working. Housing market renewal pathfinders such as Bridging NewcastleGateshead face a restricted and uncertain housing market and are developing their future response (see Audit Commission, 2009a, 2009b; JRF, 2009; Northern Way, 2009a, 2009b). Again this poses crucial questions when considering future housing
policy approaches. For instance, to what extent is the market an appropriate allocator especially given the transformations in the economic climate? Should community rather than markets be more central when developing housing policies? It is beyond the scope of the thesis to discuss this in any more detail but it is enough to warn of the consequences of coupling housing markets with housing policy.

9.4.2 A ‘step change’ in urban regeneration policy?

With each change in government, administration there has been an apparent change in urban policies (see Chapters 2 and 3). Nevertheless, as this thesis argues, although there has been a change in language and rhetoric this sometimes masks a continuity or ‘borrowing’ of previous policies. The Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) involves an ‘evolution’ of policies (Raco, 2003, 2007) and the incorporation of policy ideas from Europe and the US (see Section 9.2.1). Policy makers use new language to give an impression of progress and invention and to distinguish difference from other parties. Early in the New Labour administration, the Social Exclusion Unit (1998) asserted that past policies had not only failed to deliver but also were part of the problem. Yet as the thesis has demonstrated the Blair government has drawn from previous urban initiatives (see Chapters 2 and 3). It appears then that it is easier to write policy documents than deliver policy given the limited ‘regeneration toolkit’ hence the evolution of previous approaches. It is not surprising then, that policy makers are persuaded by new urban regeneration ideas, the ‘mobile policies’ (Peck and Theodore, 2010; McCann and Ward, 2010). For instance, Chapter 3 demonstrated that the sub-regional housing market renewal approach is heavily influenced by Brendan Nevin (see Section 3.4.2), and the SCP is influenced by this and also ‘communitarianism’ (Putnam, 1996; Etzioni, 1993, 1995) and New Urbanism (see Section 1.3.4) from the US. At the local policy level in BNG they have looked to Scandinavia in particular for ‘best practice’ inspiration (see Section 8.4) and more broadly Richard Florida’s ‘creative class’ and ‘creativity index’ for cities has influenced central and local policy and helped situate NewcastleGateshead on the international scene (see Section 8.3.2).

There is no easy way to combat the stark inequalities between the rich and poor so government fall back on old policy approaches and clutch at new ideas, mainly from the US. Ideological solutions such as mixing communities are problematic to deliver given the limited regeneration toolkit primarily led by top down master planning and
sociologically suspect given the lack of understanding of working class cultures and the diversity of lifestyles choices in UK cities. Of course, a diverse range of shops, walkable, green public spaces, coffee bars, transport links and such like are as attractive and desirable to most people. However, the working class residents revealed in discussions that they desired an improvement to their communities for themselves, their families and friends. They did not want the situation where it was easier to ‘buy a bhaji than a banana’ at their local shops, in other words they wanted fewer takeaways and more opportunities to purchase fresh fruit and vegetables, bank in their communities and have a regular public transport service (see Speak and Graham, 2000 for a discussion of marginalized neighbourhoods, private service disinvestment and social exclusion). Furthermore, they did not want master plans and the new people imposing their ideas and lifestyles on them. They wanted regeneration on their terms – a vibrancy and renaissance that they understood and actively desired. Of course, one can appreciate the complexities for policy makers in addressing the social, economic and environmental consequences of long-term decline following Thatcherite deindustrialization policies yet it is still very sad that some people are still suffering thirty years on.

So is the SCP a step change in urban regeneration policy as was claimed at its inception? This thesis has developed a set of arguments that suggest the SCP is a step change in some respects and similar in others to previous urban regeneration policies. Overall, the thesis has revealed that the SCP can be viewed as a step change in two ways. First, the SCP is a more holistic version of regeneration than previous policies because it combines social, economic, and environmental factors (Chapter 3 and Table 3.5). Second, housing is approached very differently (see Section 9.3.1). Yet given the current (2010) economic climate, questions can be raised as to whether it was advisable to tether housing and urban regeneration policies to the vagaries of the market. What in a boom appeared to be a step change (upwards) may now become a fast escalator downwards towards economic decline.

The potential for sustained ‘step change’ has been constrained by ‘place’ (see Section 9.2.2) and also by the means of delivery. For example, although public funds contribute to the SCP in nine northern towns and cities, a major aspect, and a legacy from the Thatcher era, is the necessity to attract private funding in partnership (see Section 2.4, 2.5). To market the heavily stigmatized areas involves ‘land assembly’ which means as
we have discussed in this thesis, demolition and relocation (see Chapter 7). The judgement of spaces and impact of displacement is another concern for urban regeneration policies because one cannot underestimate the emotional impact of ‘being moved’ (see Section 7.7). Furthermore, although promises were given that they could move back if they wished, in reality the change in tenure (more owner occupation and fewer rentals) meant that displacement was permanent for many people because they could not afford the new prices or could not get a mortgage (unemployed or elderly). As mentioned above, especially in light of the ‘credit crunch’ of 2009 onwards, one has to question whether the consequences of this had been thought through. This thesis suggests that investigating the development and practice of housing and regeneration policy in a recession would be a future research area.

9.4.3 Long term policy plans, short term funds

One final aspect has been raised many times in critiques of urban regeneration yet the lessons have been ignored – the issue of short term funding for long-term regeneration goals within a context of four-five year electoral cycles. The SCP was announced in 2003 as a fifteen year programme, so is meant to continue until 2018. Despite the announcements of millions of public funds for the scheme, the continual stream of funds is dependent on local progress and determined by three yearly Comprehensive Spending Reviews (CSRs). In consequence, a year after receiving funding, BNG has to start producing the evidence of progress and future directions to bid for the next three years. This starts in the second year of a three-year funding tranche and is submitted in the third year. The impact of repeated bidding for funds means that in the third year especially, any plans have to be restrained until the next three years funding is agreed and so the cycle continues. This is not only frustrating for BNG but for the residents who are largely kept in the dark about this and are left waiting to see when their house will be demolished. Uncertainty is one of the main concerns expressed by residents experiencing the regeneration process. The imperative to show progress within electoral cycles leads to this thesis suggesting that housing is of such importance that future policy should transcend party political cycles. Furthermore, my thesis suggests that a market approach to future housing and urban regeneration policy should be avoided.
9.5 Research avenues

Finally, this section suggests further research avenues that have emerged from the thesis in addition to the ones mentioned earlier such as housing and regeneration policies in a recession and the development of my theoretical framework. The first research avenue concerning housing and urban regeneration policy identifies two themes for development – mixing communities and sustainability and low carbon infrastructures. The second research avenue of ‘tolerance’ identifies themes that contribute to understanding the potential emergence of a politics of exclusion in housing and regeneration.

Housing and urban regeneration policy

The thesis has shown the importance of investigating the historical context of housing and urban regeneration policies as this reveals continuity and change. Continuing to chart the nature of housing and urban regeneration policy using the conceptual framework developed in this thesis will provide a rich seam for future research. Two themes have emerged strongly from the thesis and in contemporary urban policies. The first relates to how the discourses of mixed communities and sustainability may develop in light of institutional shifts and economic changes (discussed above Section 9.3). In particular, it would be pertinent to investigate the themes of mixed communities and sustainability in light of announcements to allow local councils to build ‘council houses’ once more (see Homes and Communities Agency, 2010). Segregation or what could be termed ‘housing apartheid’ in terms of access to and exclusion from housing options has increased due to a range of related factors such as the mixed community approach, the demolition of rental options and the ‘credit crunch’. In consequence, the issue of ‘affordability’ has gained prominence. Thus it is timely to ask questions whether mixed communities are a successful and sustainable option and look back to the history to explore the rationalities for segregation and mix, including the potential for dedicated areas of social housing, some of which have been regarded as desirable places to live.

The second theme to emerge has developed from the study of infrastructures and sustainability in the thesis which have subsequently come together in contemporary debates around ‘low carbon infrastructures’ (see Homes and Communities Agency, 2009; While et al, 2009). There are several areas of interest that have emerged from the
thesis that would contribute to the low carbon infrastructures debate, including, for instance, the relationship between policies promoting affordable housing and low carbon housing; the debate concerning demolition versus retrofit of existing housing and conservation of ‘listed’ properties and for those who have already converted their houses there is the issue of ‘living with’ low carbon technologies. There is also the future impact concerning housing energy assessments required to sell a house, the affordability of installing low carbon technologies and the potential polarization of housing and inhabitants between those who can afford ‘low carbon’ lifestyles and those who cannot. These issues also link to energy security, fuel poverty and financial exclusion.

**Tolerance**

The second research avenue to emerge from the thesis is ‘tolerance’. This theme emerged from the debates in the thesis around behaviour, responsibilization and the surveillance, selection and displacement of ‘unsustainable citizens’ and the retention of ‘sustainable ones. Such interpretations of sustainable communities are divisive and contribute to debates concerning the politics of exclusion rather than inclusion. The theme of tolerance could be developed in two ways. First, a study of tolerance in relation to an increasingly ‘revanchist’ (Smith, 1996, 2001) attitude to ‘behaviour’ encouraged by the state and conducted within communities themselves that leads to stereotyping and a ‘politics of exclusion’. Are we witnessing the erosion of a welfare ethos in the social housing sector? And how do we move towards sustainable, inclusive communities? The second study of tolerance would explore issues of race and immigration within the context of sustainable communities. Though not discussed in the thesis it was observed, especially in Benwell that neighbourhoods, and in some cases streets were segregated along racial lines. Furthermore, discussions with residents and community workers revealed the extent to which racist expressions of intolerance were surfacing in areas were access to housing and employment were restricted. Therefore, it is pertinent to explore tolerance and intolerance between communities in order to move towards sustainable communities (see Harrison et al, 2005).
The relational understanding of urban regeneration developed in this thesis has enabled the emergence of new and exciting avenues for research. Given the current economic situation, policy climate, the change of government (Conservative-Liberal coalition as of May 2010) and the experience for individuals the exploration of these avenues can not come a moment too soon.
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Appendix 1

Bridging Newcastle Gateshead (BNG) External Governance Framework (BNG, 2006:29)
Appendix 2

BNG Local Governance Framework (BNG, 2006:26)
Appendix 3

BNG Board Membership and Board Sub-Groups Membership (BNG, 2006:27)
### Appendix 4

**BNG Core Team and Work Streams and Lead Officers (BNG, 2006:28)**

#### Core Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Mulley</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Anderson</td>
<td>Head of Research and Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Programme Management</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Mackintosh</td>
<td>Head of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Campbell</td>
<td>Head of Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Whitehead</td>
<td>Avast Programme Coordinator – East &amp; North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Sloan</td>
<td>Avast Programme Coordinator – West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill Lawson</td>
<td>Avast Programme Coordinator – Gateshead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Playford</td>
<td>Communications Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Brennan</td>
<td>Programme Management and Monitoring Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Davy</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie McAweeney</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Moore</td>
<td>Admin Assistant (p/t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Assistant (p/t)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Work Streams and Lead Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Karen Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Programme Management</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality, Indices and Housing Market Intelligence</td>
<td>Karen Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Management</td>
<td>TRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets &amp; Trajectories</td>
<td>Karen Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Renewal</td>
<td>Gill Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSL &amp; Council Housing</td>
<td>Karen Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement &amp; Efficiency</td>
<td>Ian Mackintosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Options</td>
<td>Karen Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Good Design</td>
<td>Helen Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Panels</td>
<td>Helen Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>Michelle Playford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Links to Newcastle and Gateshead Councils**

- Newcastle Officer Working Group / Gateshead Strategy and Implementation Group
- Area Board & Programme Structures
- Local planning, housing, regeneration and economic policies
- Arms Length Management Organisations’ Programmes
- Feedback from workstreams, Sub Groups, Board etc, as appropriate
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Appendix 5

List of ‘elite’ interviews

Rob Armstrong (Bellway)
Councillor Sir Jeremy Beecham (Newcastle City Council)
Simon Bishop (Newcastle City Council)
Jo Boaden (North East Assembly)
Dawn Brown (Newcastle City Council)
Jim Coulter (Bridging NewcastleGateshead)
Heather Davidson (Newcastle City Council)
Peter Davidson (Bellway)
Geraldine Morris-Dowling (Scotswood Community Garden)
Nicholas Doyle (Places for People)
Craig Ellis (Gateshead Council)
Alison Embleton (Interface Project, Gateshead)
Michael Farr (ISOS Housing)
Dave Gaston (West End Community Development Consortium)
Martin Gollan (Newcastle Council for Voluntary Service)
Judith Green (Northumbria University and the Search Project, Benwell)
Gill Hancox (Your Homes Newcastle)
Councillor Rob Higgins (Newcastle City Council)
Carol Hunter (East End Community Development Alliance)
Jimmy and Steve (Owen Pugh)
Rev Chris Knights (St Margaret’s Church, Scotswood)
Debra McKenna (Gateshead Council)
Anne Mulroy (Bridging NewcastleGateshead)
Councillor David Napier (Gateshead Council)
Soibhan O’Neil (Newcastle City Council)
Mary Parsons (Places for People)
Prof Fred Robinson (Durham University)
Rev Peter Robinson (St Martin’s and St Michael’s Church, Newcastle)
Moira Slattery (Scotswood Community Garden)
Andrew Sloan (Bridging NewcastleGateshead)
Louise Stobbar (Newcastle City Council)
Paul Ward (Newcastle City Council)
Graham Whitehead (Bridging Newcastle Gateshead)
Neil Wilkinson (Newcastle City Council)
Linda Williams (East End Community Development Alliance)
Appendix 6

Example of focus group themes

Regenerating Walker Riverside: Creating sustainable communities?

Focus Group on the 29 June 2007 at the Thomas Gaughan Community Centre

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION:

CONSULTATION

[Your experiences of the consultation process, good and bad points, what has worked? What could be improved? Is consultation necessary? Have you been listened to?]

DEMOLITION/REFURBISHMENT

[How has the loss of your home affected or is affecting you? What emotions do you feel? What do you miss about your home? Did you keep any mementoes? What did you do to cope with the situation? How has it affected you and your family? How has refurbishment improved the area? Demolition vs refurbishment debate?]

MOBILITY

Any comments about moving and being moved? How does this affect you, your family and the wider community? Was it necessary? What about new people moving into the area, will this alter the community, in what ways? Any comments about moving around the community for shopping, healthcare etc

NEW BUILD/NEW VISION

What aspects of the history, heritage and memories are been brought forward into the new vision? Place names, people? Comments on the new build/vision for Walker

WILL A SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY BE CREATED?
**Appendix 7**

**Example letter to community groups**

**Benwell and Scotswood Research Project 2007**

‘Creating Sustainable Communities’

Dear Resident,

My name is Andrea Armstrong and I am a researcher at Durham University in the Department of Geography. My research project is looking at the most recent regeneration plans that have been happening in your area – the plan to ‘create sustainable communities’, as detailed in the ‘Area Action Plan’.

As part of the research I would like to hear your side of the story, to see what it has been like for you, because you live in Benwell and Scotswood and experience the changes every day. So if you would like to be involved in the research project and would like to talk about for example, the consultation process, demolitions, being moved or people moving away and your views on the new plans then please do get in touch with me. Anything you say will be anonymous and treated with confidence. I am associated with Durham University and no where else.

I would like to talk to small groups of people (6 to 10) sometime in May or June 2007 at a time and venue convenient to you. So if you would like to be involved please contact me or Simon Bishop, the Ward Coordinator as outlined below.

I would really appreciate your involvement and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely,

Andrea Armstrong
Benwell and Scotswood Research Project 2007

‘Creating Sustainable Communities’

If you would like to be involved, please fill in the following details and forward it to me at the addresses below or give to Simon Bishop the Ward Coordinator by the 27th April 2007

NAME:............................................................................................................................................
CONTACT ADDRESS, TELEPHONE NUMBER OR EMAIL:.............................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................

Have you a time preference (for example morning, afternoon or evening)? PLEASE
STATE:............................................................................................................................................

PLEASE SEND TO: Andrea Armstrong, Research Postgraduate, Room 301A, West
Building, Department of Geography, Durham University, Durham, DH1 3RE

OR email to: andrea.armstrong@dur.ac.uk

OR please let Simon Bishop know you would like to be involved.
### Appendix 8

One page extract from ten page list of demolitions in Walker Riverside (NCC, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS1</th>
<th>ADDRESS2</th>
<th>ADDRESS3</th>
<th>LOCALITY</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>POSTCODE</th>
<th>BUS_RES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Shepherds Inn Public House Yard</td>
<td>Former Chandlors</td>
<td>Former The Deli Iced Tea</td>
<td>Former Hadley's Talbot</td>
<td>Former &amp; Present</td>
<td>Former &amp; Present</td>
<td>Former &amp; Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>784 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>788 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>792 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>796 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>800 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>804 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>808 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>812 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>816 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>820 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>824 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>828 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>832 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>834 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>836 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>840 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>844 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>848 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>852 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>856 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>858 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>860 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>864 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>868 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>872 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>876 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>878 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>880 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>882 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>884 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>886 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>888 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>892 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>896 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>900 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>904 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>908 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>912 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>916 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>920 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>924 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>928 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>932 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>936 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>938 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>940 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>942 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>944 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>946 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>948 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>952 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>956 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>958 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>960 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>964 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>966 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>968 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>972 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>976 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>980 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>982 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>984 Walker Road</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>M6 2DH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foot & Present

130 Walker Road
Newcastle upon Tyne
M6 2DH

---

392