

## **URBAN REGENERATION**

### **PROPERTY-LED REGENERATION (Our case study = Docklands)**

Urban Development Corporations (UDCs) are an example of property-led regeneration. They were set up in the 1980s-1990s to oversee physical, social and economic regeneration of inner city areas. The idea was that they were to spend public money to buy land with the power of compulsory purchase, build infrastructure and marketing to attract private investment. The aim was for the private investment to total 4-5x more than the public investment.

#### **CRITICISMS OF UDCS**

1. They were dependent on property speculation and lost huge sums of money purchasing land which later fell in value.
2. They had greater power than local authorities and thus democratic accountability was removed.
3. Local people often felt excluded by the UDCs as they were not consulted on plans.

### **CITY CHALLENGE PARTNERSHIPS**

#### **CENTRAL MANCHESTER DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (CMDC)**

CMDC is an example of a Development Corporation established after the LDDC, in 1988. A partnership between the local authority and private developers was created. Its aim was to regenerate 200 ha of land and buildings in the southern sector of Manchester city centre. The area contained decaying warehouses, offices, former mills and contaminated land, unsightly railway viaducts and neglected waterways. It had been declared a conservation area in 1979. Some of the buildings were refurbished into a range of uses including housing. The canals in the area were cleaned, and their banks were improved by the addition of lighting, seats and plants to upgrade the aesthetics of the area. This has now become a popular entertainment based area for young people. The CMDC engaged in widespread consultation and formulated a development strategy that complemented the plans of Manchester City Council. The area also developed its tourist potential and now attracts over 2 million visitors a year. Attractions included the world famous tour of Granada Studios (actually closed), the Manchester Museum of Science and Technology, the GMEX Centre and the Bridgewater Concert Hall complex. The CMDC was disbanded in 1996, and planning powers have now reverted to Manchester City Council.

#### **Partnerships between local and national governments and the private sector**

City Challenge Partnerships represented a major switch of funding mechanisms towards competitive bidding. To gain funding a local authority had to come up with an imaginative project and form a partnership in its local inner-city area with the private sector and the local communities. The partnership then submitted a 5-year plan to central government in competition with other inner-city areas. The most successful schemes combined social aims with economic and environmental outcomes. By 1993, over 30 City Challenge Partnerships had been established and another 20 or more bids had been unsuccessful.

#### *How city Challenge worked*

The City Challenge initiative was designed to address some of the weaknesses of the earlier regeneration schemes. The participating organisations - the partners - were better coordinated and more involved. This particularly applied to the residents of the area and the local authority. Separate schemes and initiatives operating in the same area, as had happened before, were not allowed - the various strands of the projects had to work together. Many earlier initiatives had concentrated on improving buildings, whereas City Challenge gave equal importance to buildings, people and values. Cooperation between local authorities and private and public groups, some of which were voluntary, was prioritised. All the City Challenge areas suffered from high long-term and youth unemployment, a low skills base, poor levels of educational

attainment, environmental deterioration, increasing areas of derelict land and growing commercial property vacancy. Public-sector housing was deteriorating in almost all the City Challenge areas due to a combination of poor initial design and inadequate maintenance. The population of these areas usually had a higher than national average incidence of healthcare problems, high levels of personal crime and fear of crime, a high proportion of single-parent families and households dependent on social security.

#### *Was the initiative successful*

Overall, the competition between areas for funding was believed to be successful - improving the quality of proposals and encouraging new and more imaginative ideas. The private sector, in particular, found the competitive principle attractive and argued that competition had encouraged local authorities to suggest solutions as well as identifying problems. However, the competitive nature of the scheme was criticised by others on the grounds that large sums of money should have been allocated according to need, not competitive advantage. In some cases neighbouring authorities competed against each other when they could have worked together. By 1997 the Conservative government was able to publish statistics pointing to the success of City Challenge. Over 40,000 houses had been improved, 53,000 jobs had been created, nearly 2,000 ha of derelict land had been reclaimed and more than 3,000 new businesses had been established.

POSITIVES	NEGATIVES
Competition between areas for funding was believed to be successful as it improved the quality of proposals and encouraged new ideas	Some argued that large sums of money should have been allocated based on need rather than competitive advantage.
Competition encouraged local authorities to suggest solutions as well as identify problems.	Competition forced neighboring authorities to compete rather than work together. This was a major issue as disadvantaged areas rarely coincided with administrative boundaries.
Local councils and residents were more involved with the schemes than under Urban Development Corporations	All successful bidders received the same amount of money, irrespective of need.

### **CASE STUDY: HULME CITY CHALLENGE PARTNERSHIP, MANCHESTER**

<http://www.rudi.net/books/12104> - [GOOD LINK](#)

The Hulme area of Manchester was redeveloped as part of a slum clearance programme in the 1960s and a number of high-rise flats were built. Of the 5,500 dwellings, 98% were council owned. Over half of the dwellings were part of a deck access system, with many of the poor design features of prefabricated construction. The area had a low level of families with children, and a disproportionate number of single-person households. There was also a high number of single parents, and other people with social difficulties. There was some evidence that the local authority had used the area to dump some of its more unfortunate residents.

The Moss Side and Hulme Partnership was established in 1992 with a 5-year remit to complete what, at the time, was regarded as the most ambitious regeneration programme in the United Kingdom. The Partnership managed the delivery of several regeneration programmes in the area, including the Government's Single Regeneration Budget, Capital Challenge and European funding programmes. Over £400million of private and public sector resources was invested into the area by the Moss Side and Hulme Partnership.

## Redevelopment

In 1992, under the Hulme City Challenge Partnership, plans were drawn up to build 3,000 new homes, with new shopping areas, roads and community facilities. A more traditional pattern of housing development was designed, with streets, squares, two-storey houses and low rise flats. By 1995, 50 ha of land had been reclaimed, the majority of the former deck access flats had been demolished, 600 new homes for rent had been built, and more than 300 homes had been improved and refurbished. The main shopping area was totally refurbished, including the addition of an ASDA supermarket. A new community centre, including crèche facilities and other social provision, the Zion Centre, was also constructed. Crime in the area has been greatly reduced, and there is more of a social mix of people living in the area. The appearance of Hulme has altered radically.

## The partners

A number of agencies and organisations were responsible for this transformation, including the Guinness Trust and Bellway Homes. These worked in close collaboration with each other and with Manchester City Council. The company responsible for Manchester airport also invested capital in the project. Hulme is a good example of how the public and private sectors can work together to improve a previously declining and socially challenging area.

## WHAT WAS ACHIEVED?

### ***Economic:***

Brierly Fields, a green area, was partly developed for a series of office blocks, and partly retained as urban parkland. This office development has attracted big companies such as Michelin, Laing O'Rourke and the University of Manchester data centre.

Many jobs had been created and 300 new businesses were established. New road infrastructure was constructed with an emphasis of permeability (no cul-de-sac's) which was hoped to promote efficient transport and reduce crime.

### ***Social:***

Many houses were improved with an additional 2,000 houses built for sale and rent. The main shopping parade was refurbished with many new additions including an ASDA supermarket. The Moss Side Sports Centre was updated in 2002 and is now a modern facility widely used by the community.

### ***Environmental:***

Brierly Fields was partially retained as urban parkland for community use. Variation in the type of building was introduced to make the area appear more interesting. The Hulme Arch was constructed as a symbol of the regeneration.

ANALYSIS OF SUCCESSES AND FAILINGS	
SUCCESSES	FAILINGS
Hulme's population has grown by 3.3% since 1992, compared to a 0.2% increase in the city.	Unemployment rates in 2003 remained 5-6x higher than the national average. The 'ghettoization' of Hulme in the 1960 redevelopment has been linked to the maintained high unemployment rate and worries of a similar occurrence exist. The increasing feminisation and professionalization of work and issues with raising skill levels in deprived neighborhoods are attributed to this.
Of the original goals of regeneration of Hulme, it is estimated that 80% of them have been achieved. However, the remaining 20% will be difficult to achieve as the cohesion of the City Challenge disappears.	
Initial evaluations of Hulme in the late 1990s found that crime had gone down in Hulme, with the police reporting a 40% reduction across the board in key crimes.	In terms of employment, education and child poverty, however, Hulme remains in the worst ten wards in Manchester and well within the worst 2% of wards in the country.
Improvement in the look of the new Hulme from the Archway to the varied types of dwellings and Hulme Park.	

## Schemes and strategies of the twenty-first century

In the early years of the twenty-first century, the Labour government moved in two main directions in its attempts to regenerate and redevelop urban environments in the UK.

- It created prestige project developments (flagship projects) such as the waterfront developments in Cardiff Bay
- It began to develop sustainable communities in a variety of UK towns and cities. In theory, urban economic sustainability should allow people who live in cities to have access to a home, a job and a reliable income. Urban social sustainability should provide a reasonable quality of life and opportunities to maximise personal potential through education and health provision, and through participation in local democracies.

### **Case Study: Prestige Project Development Cardiff Bay**

#### **Location:**

- Cardiff is located in the south east of Wales approximately 15 miles west of New-port.
- Located in the southern part of the capital city on the shoreline of the Bristol Channel.
- The re – development of Cardiff Docklands creating the internationally acclaimed Cardiff Bay.

#### **Background info:**

- The Cardiff Bay Development Corporation was set up in April 1987 to regenerate the 1,100 hectares of old derelict docklands of Cardiff and Penarth.
- It was part of the British Government's 'Urban Development Programme' to regenerate particularly deprived and run-down areas of British inner cities.
- The old industrial landscape concentrated around the docklands began to decline in importance as the coal, iron and steel industry disappeared. The area became deprived and was experiencing urban decay.

#### **The Main Aims:**

- To promote development and provide a superb environment in which people will want to live, work and play.
- To re-unite the city centre of Cardiff with its waterfront.
- To bring forward a mix of development which would create a wide range of job opportunities and would reflect the hopes and aspirations of the communities of the area.
- To achieve the highest standard of design and quality in all types of development and investment.
- To establish the area as a recognised centre of excellence and innovation in the field of urban regeneration.

#### **Achievements of the Regeneration Project:**

- The regeneration of Cardiff Bay was undertaken to create a complementary mix of Housing, Open Space, Commerce, Leisure and Industrial Development.
- The total estimated cost of the scheme was 2.4 billion pounds, with a public/private leverage ratio of 1:2. That is the government funding was expected to attract double the investment from the private sector.
- Some of the significant achievements of the project included the construction of a Barrage across the mouth of the Bay to create a 200-hectare fresh water lake, the construction of new homes including those at Atlantic Wharf and new offices including Crickhowell House now the home of the National Assembly for Wales.
- The development also created commercial and leisure facilities such as those at Mermaid Quay on the waterfront and the Atlantic Wharf Leisure Village. As many 30,000 jobs were also created by the regeneration project.
- 6,000 new homes have been created.

#### **However there were some criticisms:**

- Local residents on low incomes living in apartment blocks in nearby Butetown cannot access the facilities as they are too expensive. They feel they were not consulted in the redevelopment process.

## SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES IN LONDON

Initiated by Labour Government in early 2000s. DESIGNED TO BE WHERE PEOPLE WILL WANT TO LIVE, NOW AND IN THE FUTURE, WHILST SENSITIVE TO THE ENVIRONMENT

The Labour government set out to ensure to create communities that:

- Are prosperous
- Have decent homes for sale or rent at a price people can afford
- Safeguard green and open space
- Enjoy a well-designed, accessible and pleasant living and working environment
- Are effectively and fairly governed with a strong sense of community

There is an urgent need for more affordable homes all over London to accommodate its growing population and to reduce homelessness. It is also essential that workers who are key to the delivery of the capital's public services are able to afford to live and work within its communities. The Government Office for London (GOL) is working with the Greater London Authority (GLA), local authorities and relevant agencies to achieve these aims.

### **Greenwich Millennium Village**

This is developed on a brownfield site and is part of the larger Greenwich Peninsula development. Over a period of 5 years, 1,377 homes built, including homes for social rent or shared ownership. Sustainability, energy efficiency, waste management and quality in design and construction are key features in this project. English Partnership had overall responsibility and invested £200 million

### **How is it sustainable?**

Modern Housing with 'Green Credentials' such as timber cladding. Homes to use: 80% less energy (generating power locally & combining with a heating system) & 30% less water, cedar wood from sustainable forests, aluminium – lasts and can be recycled. Homes take advantage of sunlight & are protected from cold east winds.

Mixing the land use – integrated primary school and health centre, community centre, shops and businesses mixed in with housing, helps to reduce people's use of energy as places are easy to get to. Primary school also built to maximise daylight to reduce energy consumption.

*Sainsbury's eco-store* – uses 50% less energy (less CO<sub>2</sub>)

The area boasts a lake, strips of open space that connect places in the development. 20 hectares of parkland with two ecology parks

New underground station (Jubilee line) – public transport connection to other parts of London provides better transport along with bus routes and cycleways which means residents don't have to use cars and therefore are more eco-friendly.

Problems: infrequent bus services which is cut off from older dwellings by the flyover. Few families live here "Yuppie village" with high rents.