

**Statement for Submission: Urban Regeneration Agency (Edge Lane West, Liverpool)  
Compulsory Purchase Order (No. 2) 2007**

**Introduction**

I consider the Urban Regeneration Agency (Edge Lane West, Liverpool) Compulsory Purchase Order (No. 2) 2007 proposals are out of tune with the latest ideas on regeneration and sustainable communities; they also do not fit with today's experience in urban design and planning. I am familiar with the site subject of the Edge Lane CPO, with Pathfinder Policy, with regeneration guidance and with English Partnerships. I have worked with Liverpool City Council, as adviser to the Government, to housing associations in the city, to communities and regeneration bodies and to the city council itself over a very long period of time (1980 onwards)<sup>1</sup>. I attach my CV. I have visited the area and am familiar with the Edge Lane site from my visits.

I gave evidence at the No 1 CPO before it was quashed in whole by the High Court and the then findings of the previous inspector were placed again at large before this No 2 inquiry.

Since that time, the National Audit Office (NAO) has itself completed an investigation into the use of Pathfinder and wholesale demolition as an approach to the restructuring of the local housing market by changing a physical component - the house stock and its type. The NAO findings are unequivocal and clear: there is *no* evidence on analysis of other Pathfinder schemes of *any* causal link between changing the physical stock and a consequential *improvement* in the local housing market as a result of that change in physical stock. The most that a physical change in stock type may achieve is a change in the nature of those who may be attracted to it. That is, a change in the *type* of market, rather than a change in the housing market *per se*.

The current CPO (as before) aspires to the grander proposition of restructuring the local housing *market* such as to cause a market improvement by physical change of stock. Since there is no causal link between the two, CPO No 1, and here CPO No 2 have remained an expensive gamble.

Whilst all future matters require an element of future judgement to be made by a decision taker, regrettably, in this matter, the analytical basis of the current CPO in Edge Lane has been from the very

outset (CPO No 1) and remains (CPO No 2) fundamentally flawed in its confusion of physical house types and the functioning of the housing market itself.

Below are my main objections to CPO No 2:

1. **NEW URBAN TRANSPORT.** It is difficult to be clear whether the acquiring authority proceeds with CPO No 2 on the basis of a highway scheme or a housing scheme. That is, is the tail wagging the dog or the dog wagging the tail. Transport policy no longer favours assisting car use rather car containment. Public transport, walking and cycling are favoured both for environmental and for economic and social reasons. Cities all over the developed world, including the United States, and most recently in central London at Kensington Gore are adopting a 'car-taming' model and any essential road and traffic flow improvements are carried out to minimise disruption to the traditional street layout<sup>2</sup>. The proposals to increase traffic access to the centre of Liverpool via Edge Lane neither fits with the experiences and successes of other cities, nor with the direction of expert thinking. Indeed, they run counter to today's approaches.

Fast urban roads, as proposed for the entrance to Liverpool via Edge Lane are rarely being built in already developed cities now - more are being taken down, for example, Milwaukee and Boston in the USA<sup>3</sup>. Recent changes to the inner ring road in Birmingham, access to the city centre and the demolition of the Bullring are examples of traffic reduction plans in the UK<sup>4</sup>. In many inner London boroughs including Islington, Hackney, Kensington and Chelsea, Westminster, Camden, pedestrians, cyclists and buses are gaining priority space on streets; cars are being slowed and traffic management methods are being revolutionised. There are many other examples. The Government is now actively pursuing a strategy to reduce traffic speeds in residential areas, such as the subject area, to 20m.p.h. Many cities have already begun to do this. Liverpool could learn from and copy some of these examples.

At Edge Lane, there appears no evidence that the acquiring authority or partner City Council or other relevant public authorities have themselves investigated such alternatives, with a clear commitment to traffic reduction with consequent human and environmental benefits. Rather, they seek to demonstrate a compelling public interest in winding back the clock to earlier failed transport methods, thereby condemning a large public to the application of outdated views on

transport planning. This damaging approach by the acquiring authority detracts from the public interest in the acquisition of the land of others for this highway scheme.

2. **DEMOLITION BLIGHT.** Area demolition, on the scale proposed in Edge Lane, is now being seriously questioned, not only by community groups all over the North, but also by government ministers including Yvette Cooper<sup>5</sup>, and also by the National Audit Commission which has placed a question mark over the financial viability of pursuing such schemes. Local authorities have been advised that demolition should be considered only after consideration of ‘all’ possible other options. Demolition is a tool of last, not first resort. There are simply not the financial or administrative resources to pursue the clearance approach originally advocated through Housing Market Renewal. Unfortunately Edge Lane could fall between the 2003 policy and current thinking unless this Compulsory Purchase Order application is rejected.

There are many reasons for this CPO No 2 falling into this gap, including; higher than predicted costs; much stronger opposition than was foreseen by any individual or organisation beyond the immediate community; the time lag in area demolition plans; the clear advantages and popularity of renovation; the level of compensation on offer to resident owners which does not match the cost of an equivalent home in a nearby area<sup>6</sup>; the blighting effect of compulsory purchase orders on many surrounding streets and homes in concentrated areas of the city.

If demolition proceeded immediately (and it was programmed to have been completed at the start of 2008) , it would *still* be at least five years before this part of Liverpool became fully functioning again, based on all previous experience. In practise, it would take far longer due to an oversupply of such developments already and reductions in public spending.<sup>7</sup> In addition, a central justification for CPO No 1 was that the City sought to improve its image in time for the City of Culture. However, that justification has now gone as it is too late to rely upon that reasoning.

The visual and service impact of the plan is stark and Liverpool has greatly damaged its image through its own continual ‘blighting’ of streets and neighbourhoods with successive demolition plans<sup>8</sup>. The social disruption and continuing population loss from such areas in Liverpool caused by the presence of such plans, is hindering recovery by deflecting inward investment to areas not subject to CPO uncertainty, following decades of already steep decline. It also has

significant negative impacts on schools, buses, shops and other urban services.<sup>9</sup> Northern industrial cities are struggling with a difficult legacy but adopting policies that hark back to the slum clearance mechanisms of the 1960s is simply reinforcing their problems. Both Sheffield and Manchester have recently been forced to back off area demolition plans and adopt renewal policies instead.<sup>10</sup>

I would respectfully request the Secretary of State to adopt a renewal (renovation) approach in Edge Lane since demolition is unjustified and has in this CPO area been a remedy of first and not last resort. Even though the acquiring authority at CPO No1 sought to rely upon renewal (renovation) approaches elsewhere in the City, these approaches are not being applied to the area inside the CPO Order land subject to this inquiry. Indeed, the acquiring authority's response to CPO No 1 underlines the reality that at the remitted CPO No 2, the acquiring authority has in fact adopted demolition as the *only* resort.

Clearly, the approach to demolition *inside* the CPO No 2 Order Land, as the first and only resort detracts from the public interest. If the CPO No 2 was confirmed, the Secretary of State would be endorsing the principle of demolition as a first resort, endorsing the failure of the acquiring authority and its City Council and other public authority partners to consider alternatives openly as part of their demonstration of a compelling case for acquisition in the public interest, and it would endorse a departure from the government's stated policy which requires demolition as a tool of last resort in this Order land.

3. **HERITAGE** At the CPO No 1, the acquiring authority and its City Council partners sought to misdirect my evidence. In doing so, it seemed to me that the acquiring authority sought deliberately to mislead the Secretary of State. I am not a conservation area expert and do not (as I explained before) use "heritage" in the narrow sense. Instead, the acquiring authority failed to respond to my evidence concerning the "community heritage" value of older inner city neighbourhoods.<sup>11</sup> My objection at CPO No. 1 remains unanswered by the acquiring authority. This failure detracts from the public interest in the acquiring authority's case for acquisition. By 'heritage' I do not mean listed buildings or conservation areas but rather the long-established, slowly evolving built fabric which provides the fixed physical framework around and within which people live and work.

The 'heritage' aspects of older industrial cities and towns across the North, are at last being re-valued after decades of neglect and stigma resulting from industrial and environmental damage. The conservation (i.e. renewal and not demolition) approach supports community, but it also helps cities to recover by protecting existing areas, revaluing existing assets, transforming extremely decayed conditions, as witnessed in Anfield, in other parts of Liverpool and in many other cities.<sup>12</sup>

The old (i.e. existing) street patterns and existing buildings of Edge Lane have the potential to contribute to restoring Liverpool's appeal following its successful bid as Capital of Culture 2008. Furthermore, the simple terraced homes, often of generous dimensions and elegant design, compared with other Northern cities and with recent housing schemes, are *outstanding* exemplars of high-density, family-friendly accommodation. Terraced homes have successfully adapted to more than 100 years of dramatically changing living conditions. They can continue to be adapted as many current renovation experiments show.<sup>13</sup> Cities like Edinburgh, Durham, Harrogate, Chester and many other attractive smaller cities are recovering strongly, using a 'heritage' renovation approach. I have worked in housing renewal schemes in areas such as Edge Lane over many years and am certain that this approach could work in this part of Liverpool.

The failure of the acquiring authority *itself* to apply the principles of the renewal of properties for the purpose of improving the local housing market detracts from the public interest in confirming their demolition. The proposed outcome is in my view extremely detrimental to this part of the city.

4. **INFILL SITES AND "SCALPEL" DEMOLITION.** A major target of urban regeneration and environmental sustainability is the re-use of spaces and gaps within existing urban structures in order to reinstate strong street forms and secure urban environments. The capacity of these sites to meet most if not all of the needs for new housing in cities like Liverpool is clearly already demonstrated by existing land use surveys.<sup>14</sup>

For the people living in blighted areas, who want to move to new housing there are already many large and small bare sights within the inner city, awaiting new uses and new buildings. There is no need for further demolition to achieve the addition of new homes where needed

including within or adjacent to the areas being targeted. Preserving and renovating the remaining existing homes alongside infill building for the many people who prefer this style of house is important to retaining Liverpool's population<sup>15</sup>.

In addition, whilst there are a number of seriously damaged properties in the CPO red line area, a "scalpel" approach to demolition as we proposed in 2003 following our work in Manchester and Newcastle, offers significant potential for small gap site infill development.<sup>16</sup> This would remove individual properties or small clusters of derelict property. Were the CPO No 2 not to be confirmed, those individual properties which have suffered extensive damage from fire may be removed to provide additional open space or additional homes, depending on the site. This is how similar terraced areas in North Manchester have been saved and renewed, with selective and strictly limited removal of unsaveable properties coupled with the creation of more open space and more focal points for the community.<sup>17</sup>

The introduction of small pocket parks or private gardens is clearly feasible and practicable in Edge Lane but has not been investigated by the acquiring authority as an alternative to demolition. In this respect the acquiring authority has adopted inside the red line of the CPO a commitment to demolition alone, by failing to investigate and debate such alternatives.

5. **HOUSING MARKET RENEWAL AREAS AND DENSITY.** As I have mentioned above, the acquiring authority's premises for its CPO No 1 and now No 2 are fundamentally flawed in the objective factual and analytical base. I have stressed that the physical framework of an area interacts with but is distinct from the people who occupy and use those physical spaces.

*Population* will continue to filter out of the targeted areas unless the blight of inner areas is lifted and as long as *new* house building continues on the edge of inner areas at a rate that outstrips household growth and population growth in the North West.<sup>18</sup> The overall population decline of Northern regions, accompanied by too much demolition within and *new* house building outside core cities, is extremely costly to cities because it is environmentally harmful, socially unsustainable and a major cause of congestion.<sup>19</sup>

Meanwhile, *depopulation* of city neighbourhoods continues to deplete inner city schools and other social institutions. These areas need to regain *population* (as opposed to *new houses*) as

quickly as possible to recreate viable communities and support essential but currently failing infrastructure such as shops and schools<sup>20</sup>. The urgency of renovating and marketing ‘historic’ terraced streets and Victorian homes should drive their *renovation* as an alternative to demolition and new building. At its simplest, this is a faster way to repopulate the area since currently homes and other infrastructure are still standing and many parts of the existing community and social ties remain extant and these are attractive to the market place and to people seeking to purchase into an area.<sup>21</sup>

At the same time, there is so much bare infill land in inner Liverpool that it would be possible to develop other multiple existing sites with 50-100 homes all over the inner city<sup>22</sup>. This combined approach would help inner Liverpool recover in the way that North Manchester is now doing.<sup>23</sup> Enterprise and employment creation will follow from incoming population recovery, alongside existing population retention.

The economic potential of well connected and potentially attractive Northern cities is demonstrated by Manchester’s strong recent recovery.<sup>24</sup> A more holistic and sensitive approach considering retention of the population and not its forceful removal will, in my view, taking into account the examples cited above, work in favour of attracting inward investment by alternative and considerably less destructive means than demolition and rebuilding.

6. **REGENERATION AND DISPLACEMENT.** Lastly, I seriously question the purpose for which the acquiring authority and its City Council partners usurp “regeneration” powers. On no view does the forceful exclusion from the CPO No 2 red line area of an existing population in fact constitute “regeneration” by the acquiring authority because the community will not have been “regenerated” but in fact obliterated. This is because, clearly, whilst the buildings may be replaced or “regenerated”, the permanent dispersal of the existing community population to other geographic locations outside of the CPO red line area without the acquiring authority itself planning for the retention or return of the same community of individuals within either new build or renovated homes in the area afterwards. That does not constitute regeneration but social exclusion.<sup>25</sup>

I remain deeply disappointed that the acquiring authority, to date, following the last expensive and damaging public inquiry, has failed to take on board the basic logic of community retention rather than removal in the exercise of its powers.

7. **LONDON'S MAGNETIC TERRACES VS. NORTHERN POTENTIAL.** I have referred above to the acquiring authority's and City Council's overriding determination to demolish terraced homes, having failed to consider alternatives inside the physical area of the CPO red line. If my evidence is rejected by the Secretary of State and does not persuade her that here demolition should not be countenanced, let me explain in simple clear terms the precedent consequences. London has the biggest concentration of terraced housing, often similar in form and size and typology to Liverpool's terraces, particularly in inner Eastern parts of the city of London.<sup>26</sup> However, they are also present in areas such as Clapham, Kensington and Chelsea, and in much of Hammersmith and Fulham. Now affluent but formerly run down areas of Oxford such as Jericho district also have terraced housing that has – thus far - been saved from demolition, restored and revalued in these old inner areas.

Presently, there are no proposals to demolish such property in spite of it previously being targeted for slum clearance, because of high demand for housing per se and the inherent attractions of such older 'heritage' terraces. Much of this terraced stock may now be in designated conservation areas, even though only a few years ago, in the East End and in South London inner neighbourhoods were declining steeply and much neglected. All these arguments increasingly apply to Liverpool.

London and the South East are attracting the lion's share of inward investment, economic growth and therefore housing and regeneration investment alongside population. The North has to work harder just to *maintain* (rather than improve) its position. The recovery of Northern cities depends on many factors but the reputation of the cities for pro-city, pro-restoration, pro-public transport policies and quality services helps. These activities generate inward investment as our research in Sheffield, Glasgow, Belfast, Liverpool, Manchester and other European cities shows.<sup>27</sup> Not only do these cities need to present a positive image by publicly reversing contentious demolition plans as many did in the 1970s, they also need to promote their heritage value and to magnify the community attractions of Northern inner areas. Companies like Urban Splash and Igloo have won an *international* reputation for promoting the 'heritage' aspects of



Northern cities, by converting decayed buildings and infrastructure into attractive, remodelled homes, offices and services. This includes worker-style terraced Victorian housing alongside more glamorous remodelling of warehouses.<sup>28</sup>

There is no evidence of the acquiring authority or its partner City Council having seriously pursued the opportunity to renew the Edge Lane properties as an alternative to wholesale demolition with Urban Splash, Igloo or similar regeneration and renewal companies. This failing, of itself, by precluding the discussion of reasonable alternatives to demolition of the properties, detracts from the public interest because it demonstrates a narrow approach focussed upon the removal of the properties consistent with the acquiring authority having considered only demolition inside the CPO red line area: demolition in this defined physical area, is the only resort.

8. **LIVERPOOL'S ORGANIC CHANGE AND THE SURVIVAL OF LOW INCOME COMMUNITIES.** Large areas of inner and outer Liverpool have been repeatedly smashed by damaging clearance plans and poor quality estate building since the 1930s right up to the 1980s and 90s.<sup>29</sup> On each round, the loss of population and jobs has been dramatic. This has left the city weaker while current plans for Edge Lane continue the damaging pattern of change. This policy has given a negative signal to the people of the city itself; but national government and the wider community of the North West also often question the viability and manageability of the city.

From a more general perspective, a more organic, step by step approach focussing on population retention would enable Liverpool to restore at a faster and more certain rate its 'historic' (in the sense used above) street pattern, but also its numerous listed buildings, many currently at risk, and the vast majority of its remaining (unlisted and outside conservation area) terraced homes<sup>30</sup>. In this way successful cities have managed to add new developments that fit within the existing frame, new and remodelled facilities, and the preservation of the urban form that gives these places their special character.

Liverpool and other Northern cities have recently experienced a healthy growth in house prices, even in areas threatened by possible demolition. This is driven by overall *demand*, rather than by *speculation* as is often claimed. In fact, speculative building is the approach supported by the

acquiring authority and its City Council partner, involving demolishing to make way for speculative new development. There is obviously some speculation in any property market with special subsidies attached. But there is a general wider trend towards the recovery of formerly declining cities which reaches far wider than the UK, which can benefit Liverpool.<sup>31</sup> However, the main driver in Liverpool's recovery is its intrinsic value, its connections and the continued presence of its existing population - its people, however depleted by the damaging blight of demolition plans. Liverpool could capitalise on its intrinsic "people and place" assets, as it is already doing in the city centre and in selected upgraded neighbourhoods.<sup>32</sup>

## Summary

We know the ingredients of city success:

- Reclaiming and reusing brown-field land does *not* involve demolishing sound existing homes, hence *creating* new brown fields. Government policy endorses a reuse of land on existing sites, not the creation of *new* brownfield sites by demolition<sup>33</sup>.
- Building on bare sites within existing communities is more environmentally sustainable than displacing people, destroying buildings, infrastructure and services.<sup>34</sup>
- Neighbourhood facilities, services and public spaces, coupled with renovation of homes, help retain families with children to assist the creation of mixed, vibrant communities, whereas demolition encourages their flight while destroying the fabric of existing communities.<sup>35</sup>
- Many bare, neglected sites not needed for housing can be turned into selling points in currently harsh, unattractive urban neighbourhoods by using them to create local small parks and open spaces as community assets.
- Family and elderly friendly traffic calming can turn currently rundown streets into attractive renewal areas, even where decay has occurred on the scale of Edge Lane and even where traffic pressures are intense.<sup>36</sup>
- Highly selective "scalpel" demolition of un-saveable buildings can be considered after full expert analysis that shows a structure is *unable* to undergo refurbishment. The small sites created can be readily in-filled with 'blended in' re-use.<sup>37</sup> Helping members of the existing communities who want to stay is not only fair; it is the surest way to bring about the necessary first step in sustainable community regeneration.

## **Conclusion**

Liverpool is a majestic historic city, shaped by a combination of its location on the deep Mersey estuary, its strong trading tradition and its powerful international role. Its older inner neighbourhoods, though *visibly* poor and rundown, have *intrinsic* charm and value, as the residents of those areas and concerned outsiders articulate and demonstrate in the expressed desire of many to remain within, return to and protect existing communities. The community population assets of inner Liverpool should not be destroyed because they take many, many years to rebuild as does the physical infrastructure of a place. Demolition and rebuilding in successive waves over the city's recent history has denuded it of valuable community resources of population (and therefore of market demand). The demolition obsession has often with hindsight been unnecessary and unhelpful to Liverpool.

The contribution of road widening involving housing demolition within cities has not in the recent past been positive but in fact significantly detrimental. It has invariably generated more traffic, noise, pollution and congestion. The contribution of this type of traffic plan to modern urban thinking is on the whole negative. It is possible to manage traffic through car-taming methods, as cities such as Manchester, York, Edinburgh and many international examples are showing.

Liverpool can continue to build on its recent recovery, but time is of the essence and further blight cannot be afforded. The reductions in the proposed demolition schemes in the city will require special incentives for renovation, even though much of the cost can be recouped through sales, following upgrading, as Urban Splash and other regeneration agencies are showing. English Partnerships can redeploy its considerable central Government resources to adapt the Edge Lane proposals to the new pro-renovation environment and indeed already is doing so in places. It is therefore all the more surprising that it persists in the pursuit of a demolition only approach inside the walls of the Edge Lane CPO No 2 red line boundary.

In addition to the failure to consider alternatives by the acquiring authority, demolition blight is intrinsically out of step with Liverpool's role as City of Culture in 2008. I strongly advocate that the proposals for the Edge Lane area be carefully reconsidered, allowing facelifts, wide-scale renovation, neighbourhood management, traffic calming and reduction, the abandonment of major road widening plans so close to the city centre and community retention.

Above all, Liverpool needs imaginative plans for the restoration of the main access streets into the city centre, rescuing them from their current seriously blighted condition.

Anne Power

12<sup>th</sup> December 2007

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Power, A. (1989) *Priority Estates Project: A guide to housing management*, London: Department of the Environment; Power, A. and Tunstall, R. (1995) *Swimming against the tide: Polarisation or progress on 20 unpopular council estates, 1980-1995*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation; Tunstall, R. and Coulter, A. (2006) *Turning the tide? 25 years on 20 unpopular estates*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation; DETR (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions) (1999) *Towards an urban renaissance*, Urban Task Force Report, London
- <sup>2</sup> DETR (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions) (2000a) Urban White Paper, *Our towns and cities: the future – Delivering an urban renaissance*. London: DETR; Rogers, R. and Power, A. (2000) *Cities for a Small Country*. London: Faber and Faber
- <sup>3</sup> ODPM Urban Summit, Birmingham 2002
- <sup>4</sup> Independent Commission of Inquiry into the Future of Council Housing in Birmingham (2003) *One size doesn't fit all: Community housing and flourishing neighbourhoods*, Birmingham. Independent Commission of Inquiry into the Future of Council Housing in Birmingham (2006) *One size still doesn't fit all: Final report of the Independent Commission of Inquiry into the Future of Council Housing in Birmingham*, London.
- <sup>5</sup> Beck, H. (2005) Demolition and Renewal Community Workshop, London: LSE Housing; Power, A. (2007) *Communities and demolition – findings from a Workshop at Trafford Hall, the National Communities Resource Centre*. London: LSE Housing; Foresight Project on Sustainable Energy Management and the Built Environment – Meeting of the High Level Stakeholder Group, 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2007 (forthcoming).
- <sup>6</sup> Audit Commission (2005) Housing Market Renewal report; evidence from South Yorkshire HMR site visit by author, September 2006.
- <sup>7</sup> HM Treasury, 2007. 2007 Pre-Budget Report and Comprehensive Spending Review Announcement.
- <sup>8</sup> Edwards, M. “*The claimant's view: how to resist a CPO*”, Communities Against Demolition workshop at Trafford Hall, June 2007; Power, A. (1987) *Property Before People: The Management of Twentieth-Century Council Housing*. Allen and Unwin
- <sup>9</sup> Power, A & Mumford, K (1999) *The slow death of great cities? Urban abandonment or urban renaissance*, York.
- <sup>10</sup> Gould, M. *Escape from a housing trap*. The Guardian, November 14<sup>th</sup> 2007; CABE HMR Summit, October 18<sup>th</sup> 2007.
- <sup>11</sup> English Heritage (2007) Current work on characterization and the renewal potential of terraced streets; English Heritage (2003) *Heritage Counts*.
- <sup>12</sup> The Affordable Housing Development Company <http://www.ahdc.co.uk/>; Yates, T. (2006) Sustainable refurbishment of Victorian housing - guidance, assessment method and case studies. BRE.
- <sup>13</sup> Bevan, S. (2005) *Restored to Glory*. BBC; Nottingham Eco-Home <http://www.msarch.co.uk/ecohome/>
- <sup>14</sup> Rogers, R. and Power, A. (2000) *Cities for a Small Country*. London: Faber and Faber; Power, A and Houghton, J (2007) *Jigsaw Cities: Big Places, Small Spaces*, Bristol: Policy Press
- <sup>15</sup> Lupton, R. and Power, A. (2004) The Growth and Decline of Cities and Regions. CASE / Brookings Census Brief 1. London
- <sup>16</sup> Mumford, K. and Power, A. (2002) *Boom or Abandonment: resolving housing conflicts in cities*. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing
- <sup>17</sup> Gould, M. *Escape from a housing trap*. The Guardian, November 14<sup>th</sup> 2007
- <sup>18</sup> Power, A. (2006) *The changing face of cities*. Presented as part of the UNEP-WCMC Environment on the Edge 2006-2007 series lecturers and available from [http://sea.unep-wcmc.org/resources/PDFs/EOTEII/SECTIONS/4\\_Power.pdf](http://sea.unep-wcmc.org/resources/PDFs/EOTEII/SECTIONS/4_Power.pdf);
- Lupton, R. and Power, A. (2004) The Growth and Decline of Cities and Regions. CASE / Brookings Census Brief 1. London; Centre for Cities (2007) *Cities Outlook 2008*. London: Centre for Cities.
- <sup>19</sup> Elevate's position on new eco-towns in the North, presented to CLG in September 2007.

- 
- <sup>20</sup> Sustainable Development Commission (2007) Building Houses or Creating Communities? A review of Government's progress on Sustainable Communities.
- <sup>21</sup> The Affordable Housing Development Company <http://www.ahdc.co.uk/>
- <sup>22</sup> Visits by Anne Power to Liverpool, 2005 and 2006
- <sup>23</sup> Based on site visits to North Manchester, 2005
- <sup>24</sup> Paskell, C.A. and Power, A (2005) *'The future's changed': Local impacts of housing, environment and regeneration policy since 1997*, CASEreport 29, London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE
- <sup>25</sup> Power, A. (2007) *City Survivors: Bringing up Children in Disadvantaged Neighbourhoods*. Bristol: Policy Press
- <sup>26</sup> Power, A et al. (2004) *London Thames Gateway: a framework for housing in the London Thames Gateway*. London: LSE Housing
- <sup>27</sup> The LSE Weak Market Cities programme [http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case/\\_new/research/weakmarketcities/default.asp](http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case/_new/research/weakmarketcities/default.asp)
- <sup>28</sup> Urban Splash <http://www.urbansplash.co.uk/us.php>
- <sup>29</sup> Igloo <http://www.igloo.uk.net/?gclid=CKT5zrTSnZACFOfoIAod7zE2og>
- <sup>29</sup> Priority Estates Project Reports to the Department of the Environment, 1980 – 1985; Power, A. (1987) *Property Before People: The Management of Twentieth-Century Council Housing*. Allen and Unwin; Power, A. and Tunstall, R. (1995) *Swimming against the tide: Polarisation or progress on 20 unpopular council estates, 1980-1995*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation
- <sup>30</sup> English Heritage (2003) Heritage Counts; Yates, T. (2006) Sustainable refurbishment of Victorian housing - guidance, assessment method and case studies. BRE.
- <sup>31</sup> Parkinson, M. et al (2006) *State of the English Cities Volumes 1 and 2*. London: DCLG.
- <sup>32</sup> Brownfield Briefing Northern Pathfinder Conference, Leeds. 28th March 2006
- <sup>33</sup> Brown, G. First speech as Prime Minister, 28<sup>th</sup> June 2007.
- <sup>34</sup> Power, A. (2004) *Sustainable Communities and Sustainable Development: a review of the Sustainable Communities Plan*. CASEreport 23. London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE and SDC; Power, A et al. (2004) *London Thames Gateway: a framework for housing in the London Thames Gateway*. London: LSE Housing
- <sup>35</sup> Power, A. (2007) *City Survivors: Bringing up Children in Disadvantaged Neighbourhoods*. Bristol: Policy Press; Power, A. and Willmot, H. (2007) *Social Capital within the Neighbourhood*. CASE report 38. London: LSE.
- <sup>36</sup> Power, A and Houghton, J (2007) *Jigsaw Cities: Big Places, Small Spaces*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- <sup>37</sup> Mumford, K. and Power, A. (2002) *Boom or Abandonment: resolving housing conflicts in cities*. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing.

---

## CURRICULUM VITAE

### ANNE POWER

64 Hamilton Park West, London N5 1AB  
tel: 020 7226 1131 (h); 020 7955 6330 (w)

Date of Birth: 22.04.41

### QUALIFICATIONS AND AWARDS

- 2000 CBE for services to regeneration and promotion of resident participation
- 1997 City of London Dragon Award for foundation of National Tenants Resource Centre
- 1988 MBE for work in Brixton on the Priority Estate Project
- 1987 Member of the Chartered Institute of Housing
- 1985 PhD on history of council housing in Britain 1885-1985 and the emergence of unpopular estates, London School of Economics
- 1966 MA in Sociology, University of Wisconsin
- 1964 Graduate Diploma in Social Administration, London School of Economics
- 1962 BA Hons. Modern Languages, University of Manchester

### POSITIONS HELD

- 2000 Member of Sustainable Development Commission
- 2000 Member of Caisse des Dépôts et Consignations Committee d'évaluation
- 1999 North Manchester Regeneration Area Expert Panel
- 1998 Holly Street Group
- 1998 Social Exclusion Unit Policy Action Team on Unpopular Housing; adviser to Policy Action Team on Neighbourhood Wardens, Neighbourhood Management and Housing Management
- 1998 Professor of Social Policy
- 1998 Member of Urban Task Force
- 1997 Advisor to Minister of Housing, DETR (Housing Sounding Board)
- 1997 Responsible for the new MSc Housing (International), London School of Economics
- 1997 Deputy Director of the ESRC Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE); Area Programme Director
- 1996 European Partner with the Joblessness and Poverty Programme at Harvard University directed by Professor William Julius Wilson
- 1996 Director, Gatsby Programme, documenting and evaluating a five year nation-wide project of tenant training and self-help experiment
- 1995 European partner in German Government regeneration programme sponsored by the European Community
- 1991-1995 Founder, National Tenants Resource Centre
- 1991-1992 Member Groupe de Travail sur les Rencontres Bilaterales Europeennes; adviser to Villes et Banlieues ad the Quartiers en Crise programmes, France
- 1991 Reader in Social Policy, London School of Economics
- 1989 Director of LSE Housing, research and consultancy centre

---

1987	Lecturer in Social Policy at London School of Economics; Course Director, MSc / Diploma in Housing
1984-1988	Visiting Research Associate, Department of Social Policy, London School of Economics, setting up the post-graduate Diploma in Housing
1982-1985	Part-time research student, Department of Social Policy, London School of Economics
1981-1984	Academic visitor at the London School of Economics
1979-1987	Consultant, Department of the Environment and Priority Estates Project
1972-1979	Co-ordinator, North Islington Housing Rights Project
1967-1972	Co-ordinator, Friends Neighbourhood House, Islington
1966-1967	Warden, Africa Centre, London
1966	Organiser with Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference in Chicago
1965	Community Worker, US Poverty Programme, with Mexican migrants in Wisconsin
1963-1964	Sixth form teacher, Iringa, Tanzania
1959-1962	Organiser, Madrid, Spain with Vanguardia Obrera (anti-Franquist Woman Workers' Organisation)

#### **ACADEMIC AND RELATED ROLES**

- Academic Planning and Resources Committee, London School of Economics
- Course teacher for MSc Housing Policy Development and Management; course teacher for MSc International Housing and Social Change
- Lecturer on MSc courses in Social Policy, Social Research Methods, Social Exclusion and the "underclass", Sociology and Social Policy
- Steering group member of City Policy, Architecture and Engineering programme and contributor to their seminar programme
- Adviser on ESRC research projects
- Referee for OUP, Urban Studies, Royal Journal of Public Administration, Housing Journals
- Adviser on Joseph Rowntree Foundation projects
- Contributor to professional housing journals
- Supervise of 6 PhD students; external PhD examiner including Essex and Dortmund Universities
- Adviser for 2 major TV documentaries about marginal housing areas
- Radio and TV interviews on urban, social and housing developments
- Conference speaker in UK, Europe and US

#### **CONTRIBUTION TO LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS LIFE IN ADDITION TO TEACHING AND RESEARCH**

- Organiser on social policy centenary conference and library exhibition, July 1995
- Associate of the Welfare State Programme and the Interdisciplinary Centre for Management
- Member of the Greater London Group
- Organiser of departmental events

- 
- Organise of EU supported workshops on marginal areas and social exclusion
  - Responsible for LSE Housing's Executive Seminar Programme and Annual Public Lectures

## **OTHER ACTIVITIES**

- Committee member, Holloway Tenant Co-operative Housing Association (1990-1997)
- Patron of the Octavia Hill Society and Museum
- Director, Priority Estates Project Ltd (1987-1995)
- Trustee – Inner City Development Trust (1989-to date)
- Director of Bootstrap Enterprise – an employment support, non-profit organisation in Hackney (1979-1999)
- Director, National tenants Resource Centre (1991-to date)

## **SPECIAL EXPERIENCE**

### **Languages**

I speak French and Spanish fluently; I understand and can communicate in German, Italian, Portuguese. I spoke fluent Swahili while living in Tanzania, though it would need practise to be fluent again.

### **Communities**

I lived in low-income neighbourhoods in Britain, USA, East Africa, Spain and France for 20 years. This developed my understanding of different cultures, language groups and the dynamics of small-scale and marginal communities, providing the basis for much of my academic work

### **Organisations**

Until 1985, my main work was in creating new organisations and experimental initiatives to address social and community problems, using innovative organisational techniques and an entrepreneurial style. I discovered at first hand the impact of policy on practise, ideas on reality. These experiences fed directly into my earlier writing, my PhD and my subsequent teaching and research.

## **PUBLICATIONS**

### **Books**

Power, A (2004) *Sustainable communities and sustainable development: A review of the Sustainable Communities Plan* London: CASE and the Sustainable Development Commission



---

*East Enders: Family and Community in East London* with Katharine Mumford (2003) Bristol: Policy Press

*Boom or Abandonment: Resolving Housing Conflicts in Cities* with Katharine Mumford (2003) Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing

*Cities for a Small Country* with Richard Rogers (2000) London: Faber and Faber

*The Slow Death of Great Cities? Urban abandonment or urban renaissance* with Katharine Mumford (1999) York: York published for the JRF

*Estates on the Edge: The social consequences of mass housing in Northern Europe* (1999) London: Macmillan

*Dangerous Disorder: Riots and violent disturbances on 13 areas of Britain 1991-92* with Rebecca Tunstall (1997) York: York Publishing for the JRF

*Swimming Against the Tide: Polarisation or progress on 20 unpopular council estates, 1980-1995* with Rebecca Tunstall (1995) York: York Publishing for the JRF

*Priming the Pump: An evaluation of the Department of the Environment's Pilot Programme to support tenant participation initiatives in 19 English local authority areas, 1991-1995* (1995) London: DoE.

*Hovels to High Rise: State housing in Europe since 1850* (1993) London: Routledge

*Housing Management: A guide to quality and creativity* (1991) London: Longmans

*Running to Stand Still: 20 unpopular housing estates 1982-1988* (1991) London: Priority Estates Project / DoE

*Under New Management: The experience of thirteen Islington Tenant Management Co-operatives* (1988) London: Priority Estates Project / DoE

*Property Before People: The management of twentieth-century council housing* (1987) London: Allen and Unwin

*PEP Guide to Local Housing Management* Vol. 1: The PEP Model. Vol. 2: The PEP Experience. Vol. 3: Guidelines for setting up new projects (1987) London: DoE

### **Book Chapters**

Power, A, 'Where are the Poor? The changing patterns of inequality and the impact of attempts to reduce it'. In A Giddens (ed) *The New Egalitarianism*. Forthcoming

Power, A, 'Neighbourhood management and the future of human settlements'. In UIA World Congress (ed) *Socially Inclusive Cities: emerging concepts and practice*. lit.verlag. Forthcoming

---

Power, A & Willmot, H (2005) 'Bringing up families in poor neighbourhoods under New Labour' in J Hills & K Stewart (ed) *A More Equal Society? New Labour, poverty, inequality and exclusion*. Bristol: Policy Press

Power, A & Lupton, R (2005) 'Disadvantaged by where you live? New Labour and neighbourhood renewal' in J Hills & K Stewart (ed) *A More Equal Society? New Labour, poverty, inequality and exclusion*. Bristol: Policy Press

Power, A and Mumford, K (2004) 'Abandonment as Opportunity'. In Kulturstiftung des Bundes in cooperation with Gallery for Contemporary Art Leipzig (eds) *Shrinking Cities*. Bauhaus Foundation Dessau, Archplus.

Lupton, R & Power, A (2002) 'Social exclusion and neighbourhoods' in J Hills, J Le Grand & D Piachaud (ed) *Understanding Social Exclusion* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Power, A (2002) 'Cities for a small continent', in H. Thomsen (ed.) *Future Cities: the Copenhagen lectures*, Fonden Realdania, Copenhagen.

Power, A (2001) 'The action plan', in P. Ratcliffe *et al.*, *Breaking Down the Barriers: Improving Asian Access to Social Rental Housing*. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing.

Power, A (2001) 'Poor areas and social exclusion', in A Giddens (ed.) *Sociology: introductory readings*. Cambridge: Polity.

Power, A (2000). 'From unlettable homes to urban sprawl: Planning for housing need', in R Bate, R Best and A Holmans (eds.) *On the Move: The housing consequences of migration*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

*Housing, Poverty and Crime* Chapter 9 in *Crime and the City* Ed. David Downes (1989) London: Macmillan p.206-235

### **Refereed journal articles**

Power, A (1999), 'High-rise estates in Europe: Is rescue possible?', *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 139-163

Power, A (2001) 'Social exclusion Urban Sprawl: Is the Rescue of Cities Possible?', *Regional Studies*, 35 (8): 731-742

### **Other journal articles**

Power, A (2004) 'Reaching the Goal of Sustainable Development', *Public Service Review: Transport, Local Government and the Regions*, Summer 2004

Power, A (2004) 'Review of *'Bread and circuses'* by Jonathan Glancey', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28 (4): 491-492.

---

Power, A (2004) 'Reaching the Goal of Sustainable Development'. *Public Service Review: Transport, Local Government and the Regions*, Summer 2004.

Power, A (2004) 'Review of 'Childhood, Poverty & Social Exclusion' by Tess Ridge' *Children, Youth and Environments*, 14 (2)

Power, A (2001) 'Rigenerazione urbana e leadership in Gran Bretagna', *Territorio* (Department of Architecture and Planning, Polytechnic of Milan), 19: 45-50.

**Social Exclusion and Urban Sprawl: Is the Rescue of Cities Possible?** (2001) *Regional Studies* vol 35, no 8, pp731-742

Power, A (2000) 'Social Exclusion', *RSA Journal*, 2 April

*Social Exclusion* (2000) *RSA Journal* 2/4 No. 5493 p.46-51

*High-rise Estates in Europe: Is rescue possible?* (1999) *Journal of European Social Policy* Vol. 9 (2) p. 139-163

*Area-based Poverty, Social Problems and Resident Empowerment* *Urban Studies*. November 1996 p.1535-1564.

*Empowerment and Estate Regeneration* *Review, Journal of Social Policy*. October 1996 p. 602-604

*A New Era for Social Policy: A New Enlightenment or a New Leviathan?* *Journal of Social Policy*. April 1991, with Howard Glennerster and Tony Travers. p 389-414

*Habiter Dans un Grand Ensemble ... et le Gerer* (1990) *Service Social dans le Monde* Numero 34 p9-20

*Home is Home* (1988) *Architects' Journal* 26 October p. 30-31

*Is Public Housing Manageable* (1988) *LSE Quarterly*, Spring p.65-83

*Residents and Public Housing* (1988) *Commission nationale pour le developpement social des quartiers* Paris.

*Reversing the Spiral* (1987) *Architects' Journal* 9 December p. 1-2

*Omega, the Problem Estate: A Review* by Francis Reynolds in *British Journal of Criminology* (1987)

*The Crisis in Council Housing* (1987) *The Political Quarterly* July/September Vol. 58 No. 3 p. 283-295

*Design, Vandalism and Human Remedies* (1986) *The Municipal Journal* 12 December. p.2240-2250

*How to Rescue Council Housing* (1985) *The Urban Environment: A new society social studies reader*. p. 388-389

---

*Trouble in Utopia: Rescuing unpopular council estates through local management* (1984) The Geographical Journal, November. p. 351-362

*Grossstadt-Morphologie und Lebensqualität, Die Zukunft der Metropolen* Aufsätze. p. 177-183

*France, Holland, Belgium and Germany: A look at their housing problems and policies.* Habitat Vol. 1. No. 1. p. 81-103

### **Government Reports**

*Cost and Benefit Analysis of Neighbourhood Management* with Emmet Bergin (1999) for the DETR

*Perspectives on Europe: Unpopular estates in Europe and what can we learn from Europe?* (1996) London: Housing Corporation

*Housing Plus: An agenda for social landlords* with Liz Richardson for the National Tenants Resource Centre and the Housing Corporation (1996) London: LSE Housing

Report on the feasibility of establishing the National Tenants Resource Centre (1993) London: DoE

Feasibility report n Tower Hamlets Housing Action Trust with Trevor Hendy (1993) London: LSE Housing / DoE

*Local Housing Management: A Priority Estates Project Survey* (1984) London: DoE

*Priority Estates Project: Progress in unpopular estates* (1982) London: HMSO

*Priority Estates Project: Upgrading problem council housing estates* (1980) London: HMSO

*Tenant Management Corporations in the USA* (1979) London: NIHRP / DoE

*Facts and Figures about the Holloway Tenant Co-operative* (1979) London: NIHRP / DoE

### **Other publications**

Power, A, Richardson, L, Seshimo, K and Firth, K with others (2004) *London Thames Gateway: a framework for housing in the London Thames Gateway.* LSE Housing.

*Neighbourhood Management and the Future of Urban Areas* (2004) London: CASEpaper 77

*Sustainable Communities and Sustainable Development: a review of the Sustainable Communities Plan,* (2004) CASEREport 23, LSE, January.

*The Growth and Decline of Cities and Regions* (2004) CASE/Brooking Brief No1, LSE, July.

*What We Know about Neighbourhood Change: a literature review,* (2004) CASEREport 27, LSE, September.

---

Power,A (2004) and Lupton,R *Minority Ethnic Groups in Britain* CASE-Brookings Census Briefs No.2, LSE, November.

‘Urban regeneration and urban leadership’, and ‘Introduction’, (2002) in *A Vision for the City of Bradford*, Bradford City Council New Local Government Network.

Power, A, (2001) ‘Advancing Community Enterprise: The National Tenants Resource Centre’, in *Taking Stock – the future for enterprising communities*, LGA/DTA.

‘Active involvement in social policy’, *STICERD Review 2001*.

*Neighbourhood Management* with Emmet Bergin (2000) London: CASEpaper 31 (plus supplementary report)

*Social Exclusion and the Future of Cities* with William Julius Wilson (2000) London: CASEpaper 25

‘Area Problems and Multiple Deprivation’ in J Hills (ed) *Persistent poverty and lifetime inequality: The evidence, Report of a seminar organised by HM Treasury and CASE* (1999), CASereport 5, LSE, March.

*Poverty, Social Exclusion and Neighbourhood: Studying the area bases of social exclusion* with Howard Glennerster, Ruth Lupton, Phillip Noden (1999) London: CASEpaper 22

*A Local Housing Companies: A new kind of partnership—the Fortunegate experience* with Anthony Lee and Rebecca Tunstall (1999) London: Housing Corporation

*Area-based Poverty, Social Problems and Resident Empowerment* (1994) Welfare State Programme, Discussion Paper No. 107 London: STICERD

*Governance Issues: The European perspective on development in the British housing association movement* (1994) A research document for the NFHA Inquiry into Housing Association Governance

*Development of estate-based poverty, its impact on social conditions and on resident empowerment* (1994) for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation

*Ballymun with Hindsight* (1993) Introduction to report on the history and workings of Ballymun Task Force, Dublin

*Empowering Residents* (1992) OECD

*Le Logement Social en France et en Grande-Bretagne* (1992) APIC Conference publication from paper presented to APIC Formation Conference, Paris (1 June)

*Community in Family, School and Community: Towards a social crime prevention agenda.* (1992) Report of a conference organised by Crime Concern and supported by Marks and Spencer plc (April 8)

*L’Histoire du Logement Sociale en France et en Grande Bretagne* (1992) APIC, Paris

---

*Housing Estates: A Problem or a resource* (1990) PEP Annual Conference. (November)

*Mass Housing Estate and the Spiral Breakdown in European Cities.* (1990) CECOHDAS and the European Community (October)

*How to Handle Change* (1989) PEP Annual Conference.

*Tenants in the Lead* (1989) Report of the PEP National Co-operatives Conference (September)

*Council Housing: Conflict, change and decision making* (1988) Welfare State Programme, Discussion Paper No. 27 STICERD, LSE

*Council housing and change* (1988) Paper to the DoE Regional Conference of DoE Regional Co-ordinators. Leeds (June)

*Small Scale Employment Opportunities on Unpopular Estates* (1987) Report for the Policy Unit, No. 10 Downing Street