Regeneration in Liverpool: An Examination of Current Policies Symposium 24 February 2004

Contents

- Joining Up the Thinking – Executive Summary 2-3
- 1965 – 2005: a Sense of Perspective 4-9
- Speech by Professor Peter Batey
- Healthy Housing still on the Agenda 10-15
- Speech by Dr Kate Ardern
- Local Sustainability at the Heart of Regeneration Policy 16-21
- Speech by Molly Conisbee
- Regeneration in Liverpool – a Personal Perspective 22-29
- Speech by John Flamson
- “Re-kindling the Passion of Liverpool’s People” 30-35
- Speech by Andrea Titterington
- Conclusions 36-39
- Acknowledgements and Delegate List 40
Joining Up the Thinking

The following pages record the proceedings of a unique event. This symposium, held on 24 February 2004, was originally conceived by Liverpool Friends of the Earth almost a year earlier. Prophetically conceived, perhaps. In May 2004 the Government, for the first time, included environmental measures in its Index of Deprivation. It has often been implied that these agendas are in conflict; now it is clear that regeneration means tackling environmental issues along with jobs, income, health and crime.

Speakers and indeed all participants were invited purposely to reflect a balance of local government, health, environmental, community, business and academic backgrounds. They presented and debated the theme of ‘regeneration’ from a number of distinct and complementary perspectives. Some six months after the symposium, and with waves still rocking the Mersey regeneration boat after the apparent capsizing of the ‘Fourth Grace’ project, it seems timely to publish the proceedings and reflect on all aspects of this lively and challenging ‘examination’.

Professor Peter Batey provides a historical and policy context, reviewing four decades of planning initiatives: from slum clearance and new towns in the 1960s to today’s Objective One-funded growth clusters and enterprise zones.

He wonders if, in the present ‘Capital of culture’ era, Liverpool’s outlook is returning to the optimism of the ‘60s; but adds a note of caution: projects must be manageable, deliverable – and delivered.

Dr Kate Ardern examines problems and offers possible solutions from a health perspective which she characterises as both personal and social. She presents much alarming evidence. Disparities in life expectancy between the wealthiest and most deprived inhabitants of this country are far greater than in the 1930s. People’s quality of life differs widely. The neighbouring wards of Speke and Woolton in south Liverpool are cited.

Health itself is a ‘joining up’ of other issues. We all pay a high economic cost for the poor health in our society. Poor insulation of our housing stock causes many more winter deaths in the UK than in Siberia. Transport links are vital to health: why is there no bus service from the Speke-Netherley area – home to Liverpool’s highest proportion of lone parents, the majority without a car – to Alder Hey Children’s Hospital? Subjecting new developments – and underlying policies – to Health Impact Assessments, of which the government now recognises the value, is one key way to integrate health and well being into regeneration programmes.

Molly Conisbee’s ‘localisation’ approach may be described as social-cultural. Her stark figures show how fast communities are losing local services – shops, banks, post offices. The plain fact is that if people cannot draw cash in an area their local spend will plummet – a spiral that in itself quickly places whole communities in need of “regenerating”. Conversely, evidence points to a ‘local multiplier effect’.

Where planning policy favours large multiple stores and distantly run corporations, and this is combined with a lack of investment in skills training for local people, there can be little surprise that communities “fail”. If regeneration is something that “happens to communities” without their active engagement from the start, both process and results will be failures. Achieving long-lasting benefits may require a slower pace, allowing for a more inclusive manner of regeneration: for example, training residents to a level where they can bid for and carry out contracts within their communities.

John Flamson, in his ‘personal’ assessment, acknowledges that regeneration means different things to different people. Partnerships and targets are politically essential at present. Not only have Local Strategic Partnerships been devised to broaden participation in planning policy, but the regeneration company Liverpool Vision is itself a partnership. Targets potentially prove delivery (and earn votes). He notes the interesting tension between the UK government’s preoccupation with its national economy and the EU’s more regional approach. Also relevant are the fundamentally unresolved relationships between national government, the North West Development Agency and NW Regional Assembly.

Raw GDP figures suggest regeneration is working in Liverpool. But they fail to reflect the serious gap between rich and poor, between the city and other parts of the surrounding region, and between regions of the country. Many issues of social justice, in an era when ‘multiple deprivation’ is recognised, remain to be solved. This does not mean we should abandon ‘flagships’ or lose the nerve to “do big things”.

Andrea Titterington brings an essentially practical perspective – while seeing good regeneration practice as not only “transforming wastelands” but breathing “new spiritual life” into communities. Her experience highlights the conflict of interests that occurs when a public body such as Liverpool City Council is a partner in a regeneration agency, making applications to itself as the planning authority. She also calls attention to the complexity, length and cost of both planning and funding processes. Focussing on the Anfield/Stanley Park project, which she emphasises is far more than a stadium development, she portrays as crucial the involvement and inclusion of local people. This became a lively subject of the afternoon ‘question time’, with the panel of morning speakers chaired by the BBC’s North West political editor Jim Hancock. A somewhat ‘streamlined’ version of this is presented here, respecting the ‘Chatham House rules’: comments are not attributed to individuals. Naturally, a wide range of delegates raised a wide range of issues, reflecting the perspectives of most concern to the contributors.

The common thread is a desire for “joined up thinking” between organisations, across themes, disciplines, human and environmental needs...and for ownership by all parties. Whether all of these can be blended into a complementary whole or certain contradictions need also to be owned, faced and resolved is a clear challenge for all the participants. With this in mind, a set of brief conclusions from the respective steering group members completes this report.
What am I going to talk about? It says in the programme “introduction”. One of the things that I think it is very important to do in this field is to have a sense of perspective and, perhaps, a sense of recent history in relation to regeneration. It’s quite a short history but it’s an important one and Liverpool and Merseyside are important places in terms of this history of regeneration. What I’m going to do, very quickly, is to give you a series of cross sections. I’m going to talk about the midpoints of each of the last four decades and the midpoint of the present decade. I’m going to look at 1965, 1975, 1985, 1995 and 2005.

2005 is obviously a bit speculative. It’s where we are and where we are going to. The other four decade’s midpoints are pretty clear and what I shall be trying to do is to characterise what actually happened at that point; what was the state of affairs then. I think that will give us a better basis to discuss where we are now and where we might go in the future. It will also remind us that some of the ideas that we think are new now have actually been around for some time and some of them have come around again. We may not appreciate that fully. So you will see that I mention a number of examples of that kind.

1965: Concentrated Decentralisation

Let me take you back to 1965. I can’t take myself back there. I had not left school in 1965, and some people in this room may even have not been born in 1965. But I did come to Liverpool in 1969 and so I am aware of the atmosphere that pervaded planning and urban development at that time. And one of the things to say is that it was a time of optimism and innovation. A new city planning department had been set up in the early 1960s. It had attracted extremely high calibre staff from up and down the country, quite an influx from Coventry and from the old London County Council. Liverpool was an attractive place to be. If you were interested in cities, you were in urban development. One of the documents that was published at that time was really a path-breaking document with one of the most boring titles you could ever imagine: Liverpool’s Interim Planning Policy with the name of Walter Bor, the city planning officer at the bottom. Having a name Walter Bor didn’t help either. But in fact a very important document! Liverpool’s Interim Planning Policy was actually a prototype for the sort of planning that was being introduced in the late 1980s. It was an urban structure plan. It influenced the Planning Advisory Group at that time. Liverpool was having quite an influence on planning nationally.

There was also an important plan for the city centre, prepared by Graeme Shankland, and the city centre was seen to be an extremely important part of the planning of Liverpool and Merseyside. The plans were prepared in the expectation of growth; growth in the city; growth in the immediate sub-region of Merseyside. The issue that people looked at that time, and this was a common issue up and down the country, was ‘how to cater for growth, where to put it’ and at that time new towns was seen as an important way of catering for that, and so Skelmersdale was there, and Runcorn too, as part of those discussions. If you looked up the sort of the general arguments that were going on at that stage, there was a lot of talk of urban form but on a grand scale, thinking about corridors of growth; thinking about concentrating some of the development that was decentralising from the centre of Merseyside. It was what you might call strategic land use planning; even what you might recognise today as spatial planning.

1975: Urban Containment

Moving forward to 1975, the thinking has changed quite a bit. You have got a new Metropolitan County Council, Merseyside County Council; you have got five Metropolitan districts including the City of Liverpool. One of the most interesting things about that period is that Merseyside was a pioneer in coming up with the idea of an urban regeneration policy. I am open to contradiction on this but, as far as I am aware, the Stage I
Report (again a boring cover and a boring title) from Merseyside County Council in 1975 was the first statement of urban regeneration policy anywhere. What did it say about regeneration? What are the two main ideas?

- One was to talk about urban containment, to think about regenerating the city itself and to think about restricting development on the fringes. A very familiar argument, I am sure you will agree.
- There was also an argument about resources and that was an argument that probably started with the Strategic Plan for the North West 30 years ago. But it was picked up by Merseyside County Council and this was an argument that you needed to channel resources to existing urban areas rather than to think in terms of regional development and new town policies and so on. It was a swing away from the type of argument that had prevailed before. Also in the mid 1970s there was the first recognition, I think, of inner city problems. The way people viewed these was that these were pockets of deprivation or social malaise. And the way people thought in terms of dealing with these problems was the public sector. If we talked about partnership then, it was revolutionary partnerships between central and local government, central-local partnerships of the mid and late 1970s. So we had a lot of faith in the public sector’s ability to cope with regeneration by itself. I am skimming through these things because we don’t have the time and you can recognize that there is a lecture in each of these cross sections.

1985: FRAGMENTATION & URBAN DECLINE

But by 1985 the story starts to get slightly more depressing. Merseyside County Council was on the way out in 1985. It was going to go by ’86. All of the legislation had been passed. The City Council knew that it was going and Liverpool City Council was in the centre of its conflict with central government. Militants were in power at that stage. Michael Parkinson wrote a book about the city’s finances called ‘Liverpool on the Brink’ that I am sure many of you will remember which summed up the situation pretty well.

Resources were the key issue and when Merseyside County Council came to write its own document The Agenda for Merseyside, a lot of that was making the case for properly-resourced public sector-led regeneration and bemoaning the fact that things were getting worse and that, if you wanted to implement the Merseyside structure plan, then you had to be serious about putting resources in the existing urban area.

If you looked at the regeneration of the area as a whole, there are various words you could use to describe it. One which would be appropriate is fragmentation, which I have used as the title. Disconnected would be another. You had, on the one hand, the City Council’s urban regeneration strategy based on public housing. On the other hand, the government’s urban policy initiatives with Merseyside Development Corporation, the International Garden Festival, Enterprise Zones and so on. And if have you have three hands, a third hand would be the structure plan based on urban containment.

Now, there is nothing wrong with any of these ideas. What people weren’t looking at was whether they fitted together, whether there was any concerted regeneration strategy for the area. And the answer is: there wasn’t. And various things were conspiring to make it more difficult for people to work together at that time. It was an extremely difficult time for local government. It hadn’t worked central government between different local authorities and, with central government. A lot of people were keeping on the sidelines because they didn’t want to get involved, so it wasn’t a very good time for implementing urban regeneration strategies. And it was a period of urban decline; there is no doubt about it. The city was falling behind at that stage. One fortunate intervention – and you may think that I would say this, wouldn’t I? – was that in 1985, thanks to Michael Heseltine and his ideas particularly, was drawn attention to the fact that the Mersey river system was really one of the most polluted in the whole of Western Europe. He used some very dramatic language to describe it and quite an adventurous project was set up: the idea of setting up a 25 year environmental partnership, embracing all of the partners in the public, the private and the voluntary sectors. To set something up for 25 years is unusual in political life and the Basin Campaign continues to this day and I think has been very successful in that respect. It is not as if this was a period where nothing good happened. Things did happen that were good; they weren’t stitched together particularly well.

1995: PARTNERSHIP AND URBAN REVIVAL

1995, by this stage, and we need to remember how recent this is, partnerships had become the way in which we worked. If you want to do urban regeneration, then this is how you do it. We had learned how to do it through things like City Challenge. There were three City Challenge exercises in Merseyside: the Single Regeneration Budget (which I mentioned earlier) and Objective 1. We had heard about our Objective1 status in 1993. By 1995, we were publishing the Single Programming Document. We had had our debate with Brussels about the form of the programme. These were all important stimuli, I think, for working as partnerships, but also for innovation. So again, new ideas are coming into Merseyside. Merseyside has been watched as an area of expertise and excellence in terms of regeneration. We might not always have felt it, but the outside world, I think, was looking at us with quite a lot of interest. If you had to characterise the attitudes locally, in 1995, you would have to say that we had become pretty inward looking. But Liverpool was isolated from the rest of Merseyside and Merseyside wasn’t well integrated within the North West and wasn’t working very closely with other cities up and down the country – cities, which actually would benefit from exchanging experience with and exchanging ideas with. This is something that hasn’t prevailed but I am saying that, at that

**QUESTION:** It was said that we should build a bit slower on some developments. But people tear their hair out in frustration at the length of time some of these regeneration projects take. How can we possibly justify growing any more slowly in order to assemble a work force locally?

The argument is about long-term sustainable regeneration. Just as we looked at the historical context for regeneration policies we also have to project forward. Inner-city riverside living is very fashionable now but what is it going to be in 20 years’ time? So we have to be both skilling up a local workforce and investing properly so that local economies thrive and there is a genuinely secure, more sustainable future for communities.

These “buy local” arguments have been around for at least 30 years including the view that local council contracts should go to local tradesmen. But are there convincing case studies that show you can make it work on a big scale? You can make it work on a limited scale.

By its nature construction takes a finite time. These aren’t necessarily the sustainable jobs that we really like. It’s more important to secure jobs that last.

**QUESTION:** Should we not put more pressure on the private sector to live up to its claims to be “committed to Merseyside” as well as expecting public bodies to deliver?

This comes back to whether the private sector values it in order to make an investment in it, whether public agencies value it to give those agencies a contract to deliver it.

The way we do regeneration is a hybrid between public and private sector practices. Much of the money you can bring in from other sources than the public purse is project related, tied to very specific outputs and doesn’t solve the core funding problem. Often the continuation of core funding is absolutely critical. The difficulty is sorting which areas merit it.

**continued on page 9**
stage, things had not gone very far. I think people were shocked when we got Objective 1 status, shocked that the position of Merseyside in relation to other European regions had slipped to the extent it had. The comment was made that we didn't quite qualify but at the rate were going we certainly would qualify within a few months or years of the cut-off point. Hence the declaration Objective 1 status. So, if we had aspirations at that time, it was to stem decline and that was probably about as far as people wanted to go. They could not talk optimistically about growth or anything like it.

**2005: Urban Renaissance?**

And only through to 2005, I have put urban renaissance with a question mark after it. If that period in '95 was a kind of revival, we actually started to believe in ourselves again. By the time we get to 2005, I think that our attitudes have changed quite substantially. One of the striking things in 2004, at least, is that regeneration is probably the most successful growth cluster that we have come up with in relation to all of our policies. We see growth clusters coming through Merseyside and the North West and the country as a whole. The regeneration industry is doing very well. Indeed, finds it difficult to get staff but is a significant sector. And there is not necessarily anything wrong with that, but we should recognise the fact that a lot of this has been built upon a culture of drawing in grants into the area and some of the grants won't go on forever. Some of them are time limited, Objective 1 being one of them and Single Regeneration Budget being another. If you go on listing, they are all time limited to some extent. It is only a question of when they end.

But, of course, some major new initiatives have started up in the last few years: the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy and, just lately launched, a matter of couple weeks ago, the Housing Market Renewal Initiative, the New Heartlands venture, which will be a ten year programme. They are the latest major funding sources. We have become very adept at actually steering these programmes into the area, getting them off the ground and getting them moving. There is no doubt that is an area of expertise we do have between us. The North West Development Agency is an increasingly important player. They weren't around in 1995, they weren't even being thought about at that stage particularly. But now they are here, and they are a very important partner in lots of what we do, and a very important funder. And a lot of what they are doing these days is making us start to look again at a sub-regional approach, breaking the North West region down into manageable chunks and giving us Greater Merseyside as our area to think particularly about. I see that as a good thing because that joined up thinking across Merseyside is actually going to be one of the clues to how we make the most out of our fortunate Capital of Culture declaration last year. Objective 1 is coming to an end. There may be transitional funds, there may be tapering arrangements, but the big programme will come to an end by the end of 2006 and that will be the end of quite an important era. But just as the first programme of Objective 1 started to bring many of its benefits, as the second programme was underway many of the lasting benefits of Objective 1 will actually be felt. Not just between now and 2006 but actually after that time. I think that another big change is that one of the things important to people then was the city centre. One of the noticeable things in the intervening period has been that the city centre has not been particularly on people's lips. People haven't seen it as an important part of our regeneration strategy. That has all changed and I think the city centre is now back on the top of the policy agenda and we have got a development boom in and around the city centre. And that is important as much as anything in demonstrating that something is happening on regeneration. In just the same way as in 1984, when the Albert Dock started to be available as something that could actually be used by people, people started to see that kind of tangible sign that regeneration was happening. The city centre is the best advertisement we have got for regeneration and so I think it is particularly important that that now is seen as a central part of any regeneration strategy. I include the waterfront as well as the city centre itself in that particular comment.

Another thing to say is that we seem to be revisiting some of the thinking – not necessarily the language but some of the thinking of that mid 1960s period. If you are listening to John Prescott talking all about the Northern Way and talking about corridors between here and Hull, some of that brand of urban form and strategic land use planning (spatial planning as we call it now) is back on people's lips. We have got to be a bit careful there because it suggests that we have got actually more control over things than we actually have. I would be very happy if Merseyside did a good job for itself. All of the regions between here and Hull will no doubt have their own interests in mind. We just have got to be careful that we take on manageable projects rather than take on big ones and get disappointed when they don't happen. So that is a run-through from my particular perspective and as I said at the beginning, I think that everybody here is coming from a particular angle today in terms of what I said, partly because it does embrace a lot of other things because it's connected to it. But the advantage of having the speakers that we have this morning is that we can cover many of the things that I was unable to touch on or maybe ignored, in this brief presentation.
Healthy Housing still on the Agenda

I AM GOING TO TALK about the Public Health perspective to regeneration; if you like the people perspective. I look after South Liverpool, which consist of the eight wards of Aigburth, Allerton, Speke, St Mary’s, Netherley, Valley, Grassendale and Woolton; obviously some of the richer wards within the city but also, in Speke, the second most deprived ward in the country.

NATIONAL HEALTH INEQUALITY TARGETS

The buzz word within the public health sector is ‘health inequalities’ – nothing new but we have national government targets on health inequalities. One is to look at children under one and try and reduce the gap in mortality by at least 10% between those who are most deprived and those who are least deprived. And then, looking at a local authority perspective, by 2010 reduce the gap in life expectancy between those areas with the highest and lowest life expectancy in the population as a whole by 10%. As you will guess, as that is only 6 years off, that is a fairly tall order. Especially when you look at this, of course as a public health physician I would have to put up a graph and do a bit of doom and gloom:

On average a seven-year difference in life expectancy between them and the least deprived wards. And that is true within the city and also between the city and the country as a whole. So you can go from Speke to Woolton, which is not very far, and experience a seven-year life difference. That is a difference built in from birth. So what does that mean? Well you might say, it doesn’t really matter, does it Kate, that people live seven years less than somebody else. The problem is those people who are living less time on the planet are also having a poorer quality of life. They are likely to be sicker, experience long term health problems and therefore costing the Health Service an awful lot of money. I have put up a map which shows the position of the North West in terms of inequality and life expectancy:

Figure 1: The widening mortality gap between social classes [Office for National Statistics]

This graph shows the mortality gap, the gap in death rates between social classes, between the period 1930 - 1993. And as you can see the gap between those who are most deprived and those who are least deprived, in terms of premature death, is now currently at its widest in recorded history. Translated into “what does this mean for us?” It basically means that our most deprived wards, like Speke, have on average a seven-year difference in life expectancy between them and the least deprived wards. And that is true within the city and also between the city and the country as a whole. So you can go from Speke to Woolton, which is not very far, and experience a seven-year life difference. That is a difference built in from birth. So what does that mean? Well you might say, it doesn’t really matter, does it Kate, that people live seven years less than somebody else. The problem is those people who are living less time on the planet are also having a poorer quality of life. They are likely to be sicker, experience long term health problems and therefore costing the Health Service an awful lot of money. I have put up a map which shows the position of the North West in terms of inequality and life expectancy:

Inequalities in life expectancy at birth

Males by Local Authority 1997-99

The very dark grey patches mean that these are the areas of the country where life expectancy is at its shortest – that is less than 74 years. As you can see the vast majority of those red patches are in the North West compared to Dorset or the South West where you have got the longest life expectancy in the country – that is over 77 years. Translated into “what does that mean for us?” It basically means that our most deprived wards, like Speke, have on average a seven-year difference in life expectancy between them and the least deprived wards. And that is true within the city and also between the city and the country as a whole. So you can go from Speke to Woolton, which is not very far, and experience a seven-year life difference. That is a difference built in from birth. So what does that mean? Well you might say, it doesn’t really matter, does it Kate, that people live seven years less than somebody else. The problem is those people who are living less time on the planet are also having a poorer quality of life. They are likely to be sicker, experience long term health problems and therefore costing the Health Service an awful lot of money. I have put up a map which shows the position of the North West in terms of inequality and life expectancy:

Figure 2: Inequalities in life expectancy at birth, males by local authority 1997-99 [ONS]
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BARRIERS TO HEALTHY TRANSPORT

There are lots of barriers to healthy transport: car culture – after all cars are sexy, aren’t they? – and when we did some work with young people on Merseyside, the comment about public transport was “buses are for losers”. After all, how many successful people do you see on a bus? Not very often! That is despite the fact that quality of bus provision has actually improved! We also tend to focus on the problems around public transport in terms of reliability. People want to have reliable transport! So this is a major barrier for tackling this particular health determinant.

We might translate this into my own PCT in terms of access: what does transport do? It causes quite a number of problems. For example, Speke-Garston is not directly connected with any health facility other than the Royal Liverpool. Speke and Netherley, where we have the highest percentage of lone parents with kids under five, cannot get to Alder Hey or the Children’s Minor Injuries Unit by direct bus route, which is a bit of a problem. And of course it means – translated into what it costs the Health Service nationally – over £1.2 billion nationally in missed appointments. That is a lot of money and a lot of waste in Health Service’s professional time. And a lot of inconvenience to patients and service users. So, if we are getting transport right as a health determinant, and linking that into regeneration, then we need to have joined up planning! Peter alluded to the problem of piecemeal, compartmentalisation of planning. The Health Service is really very guilty of this, just as I would comment on other organisations. In Netherley, we have a health centre that is really beautiful in its interior; but the problem was, we built it and then the population moved away. So it looks like a little ghetto by itself. We should have talked to the urban planners about what they were going to do with the配套. So the Health Service gets it wrong too and we need to be joining up our planning regimes. We need to do this to increase access to services for people who most need them. And we need to recognise that good planning increases service efficiency and helps people to use those services most effectively. We can also use it to try and tackle some of the factors that maintain us at the bottom of the league in terms of health inequalities. That means tackling heart disease, diabetes, obesity, strokes. Healthy transport can be a really positive factor in reducing the incidents of these crippling diseases.

TRANSPORT AND HEALTH

I will just run through some of the key findings of some work I did on the Local Transport Plan in 1999:

> Between 1995 and 1997 transport accidents accounted for 28% of all accidental deaths on Merseyside.
> Public transport is for ‘losers’.
> Low car ownership of Merseyside (40% don’t)
> People beginning to feel safer on public transport.
> Community transport schemes can be a precursor to conventional public transport.

It is important to recognise that there is going to be a time lag to change people’s habits, particularly around public transport use, by getting more people out on bikes, by encouraging people to take alternatives to the car. This does not come easily but we have to work on it; it is really important. Otherwise all the benefits we could achieve from having healthy transport in terms of our health and quality of life we will not see and we will not start to address that health inequalities gap.

HOUSING AND HEALTH

I am now going to talk about housing. That housing is important for health that is nothing new to anyone here. As you know Dr. Duncan 150 years ago was talking about healthy housing and, as a member of DPH, I am still talking about healthy housing today. It is a key factor in terms of respiratory disease, of people feeling stressed within their homes and therefore adopting risky lifestyles. It is also about the diversion of key professionals into dealing with medical re-housing, e.g. time spent by GPs writing “housing” letters. We should be designing housing to be healthy.

And if I tell you that in this country we have 30,000 more winter deaths than happen in Siberia, Alaska, Scandinavia – that is a bit of a scandal! That is because we do not have energy efficient and well-heated homes. Heating a home uses about 10% of the limited income of a single adult with children. In terms of regeneration that means that children will often be trying to do their homework in the one warm room in the house – where their younger siblings are watching the telly, their parents maybe having an argument or someone is on the telephone! That is not very conducive to educational attainment. And if we are going to regenerate this city we need a skilled educated workforce. Therefore having warm homes contributes to people taking up some of the educational opportunities and reaching some of the educational attainment that we need to achieve. In Liverpool, the average living room temperature is 9°C in winter! That is from Liverpool Housing Action Trust research. It is a few years old but it does constitute a real issue for us and you can see where the excess winter deaths come from.

LOCAL EMPLOYMENT

I need to talk about the Health Service’s own role in terms of contribution to regeneration. The local NHS economy is actually a major force for investment and regeneration in the city. We are the second largest employer. And if you look at the twentieth century in this city it was the railway that was the largest employer in the North West. Therefore we have a major contribution to make as an organisation to skilling local people up and contributing to the renaissance of Merseyside. We have looked within our capital programmes (the LIFT, which stands for Local Independent Finance Trust, and the Future...
Health Care, which is the capital programme across the whole of Merseyside) to support local employment schemes, local purchasing policy and creating start-up business accommodation for new entrepreneurs. We also need to take account in these capital schemes of the demographic shifts because where people are moving to affects our own recruitment and retention.

**What is Health Impact Assessment?**

To do this, we have been using a technique called ‘Health Impact Assessment’ which some of you will be familiar with and which I actually pioneered the use of in the UK. It is now, of course, government policy. This is simply a way of looking holistically at any policy programme or procedure and if you do not want to call it ‘health’, that is fine. Because what I mean by health is not about doctors and nurses or the sort of ‘sickness model’, but a proper health model that looks at people’s circumstances: their biology, their lifestyle, their environment – and I have divided environment into three components: economic, social and physical environment. Economic policy affects health, transport policy affects health. The easy way of doing this is to think of health in terms of capital, and this is an adopted model from the World Bank world accounting system where we look at the balance scorecard between different types of capital: economic; human – which takes account of vulnerable populations; social capital – which looks at crime, disorder; the social infrastructure; environmental resources and use of natural resources.

**Housing Health Impact Assessment 2003: Priorities**

When we looked at the City Council’s Strategic Housing Statement, we came up with a number of issues that were very fundamental to improving health. Greener housing is in there but also dealing with things like water pipes, travel plans; looking at how you can actually engage the community, particularly children, in regeneration and redesign of communities. We always talk about children as problems in terms of crime and disorder. I have sat on a couple of Local Area Committees in the city and the youth of today are always being mentioned as always hanging about creating a problem. If you do not engage our future citizens in the regeneration decisions we are making now, they do not have a stake, and I think it is important to do that. We found by including children as young as eight in the Housing Strategic Impact Assessment, that they had a lot of things to say, a lot of very positive suggestions to make and certainly cared a great deal about their future and the future of their communities. So, if I have got a message for you: talk to children!

What we did cover within the Housing Health Impact Assessment were a number of key recommendations:

- Health and safety and occupational health training for construction workers
- Proactive occupational health services for front-line staff
- Community consultation and development, which must address:
  - low levels of literacy and numeracy
  - support for front line officers
  - resources
  - local recruitment
- Increased incentives to use brownfield sites
- Green procurement code
- Replacement of lead piping
- Housing development to include sustainable travel plans
- Participation of children and young people in planning housing

**Key Findings from the HIA of St Helens and Knowsley Private Finance Initiative Proposal for redevelopment of hospital and community services 2002**

Applying the same technique to a hospital regeneration (a hospital reorganisation in St Helens and Knowsley) we found that the capital planners in the NHS had not taken account of demographic shifts, or the fact that St Helens and Knowsley is seeing the biggest decline in its 25 to 44 age group; the primary age group for employees within the NHS. So we had to look at the development of skills, talking to local academic institutions, making sure we were getting the transport infrastructure right and looking at use of green technology because hospitals are major contributors to global warming. And why should not hospitals be green and nicely designed instead of looking like buildings you would not want to be in?

We have modified the proposals for Whiston Hospital based on a Health Impact Assessment and, as you will see, that includes working with people like Groundwork and Mersey Forest in looking at a health promoting environment. We incorporated things like better energy efficiency, combined heat and power, solar energy and wind turbines on the hospital’s site and also did some work to look at waste minimisation. This shows a real push to look at sustainable development on a hospital site.

Then we have also looked at the human aspect. And as I said, human aspects are really important in regeneration. So I am looking at dealing with vulnerable communities: people who are disabled, people from BME communities and also looking as how we, as an organisation, can be good neighbours to our local community. Looking at things like holiday clubs, working with school starters, to create job opportunities for people with young families.

**What needs to be done?**

What I think needs to be done in terms of linking the public health agenda to the regeneration agenda is making health and well-being integral to regeneration. It is not enough to leave to professionals, it is not something that just doctors do, it is something you all contribute to public health. I cannot do it on my own, so health and well-being need to be part of your thinking. Major policies that make the Community Strategy and Unitary Development Plans need to be compatible and complementary – not done in isolation! We need to encourage and incorporate Health Impact Assessment into all major policies and I will be doing some work with Pauline Davis on the Housing Market Renewal Strategy to do just this. Thank you very much! Continued on page 17.
Local Sustainability at the Heart of Regeneration Policy

Thank you for inviting me to speak to you today. I work for the New Economics Foundation, an independent think tank. We focus on the environment and environmental issues. Whilst we are not ‘regeneration experts’ – the theme of your conference today – I hope some of the research we have been doing into local economies and communities will provide a useful angle to today’s debates.

The threat to the economic viability of many local communities, from the closure of bank branches, sub-post offices, local shops and pubs to the slow death of villages, market towns and city centres, is daily news. What is less well recognised is that this decline is systematically accelerated by a national and global policy framework which incentivises the large and the remote. Regeneration initiatives, transport investment, planning laws, competition policy, food quality standards and business taxation can all work in this way. And this is leaving Britain with isolated and alienated communities that feel ignored by the big centres of power and decision-making.

Ghost Town Britain

In December 2003 NEF published a report called ‘Ghost Town Britain’, which looked at the economic decline of some of our local communities. The report calculated that between 1995–2000 we lost roughly one-fifth of local shops, pubs and post offices. This translates as the loss of 30,000 local economic outlets in the five years to the year 2000 alone. Applying a ‘best fit’ forecast to that trend suggests the likely loss of a further 28,000 shops over the subsequent five years. So if current trends continue, the number of local shops will have fallen by nearly one third between 1990 and 2010.

If all that seems like abstract big numbers – we have been losing:

- 50 specialist outlets - butchers and bakers and so forth - a week
- a general store every single day
- 20 traditional (i.e. non-chain) pubs a month
- Between 1992 – 2002 Britain lost one third of its local bank branch network

And it’s not just retail that our local communities are losing. By the end of 2002 we had also lost:

- a playing field a week in Britain
- the green space equivalent of 7 Hyde Parks to development in London alone

Problems for Local Communities

The problem is, for many of our local communities, that the loss of one or two key local businesses and services can create a ‘tipping point’, where the number of local services can crash dramatically rather than following a steady rate of decline. When the number of retail outlets falls below a critical mass, the quantity of money circulating within the local economy will suddenly plummet as people find there is no point trying to do a full shop with an impoverished range of local outlets. This is particularly true if people can no longer withdraw cash because of local bank branch closures.

There can be few of us who have not bemoaned this loss of local services; the lack of choice on our high streets; the fact that from Bognor to Bangor our town centres increasingly look the same, dominated by the big multiple retail outlets. And on the smaller local high streets, the picture is often even worse – with retail and ‘comestible deserts’ being created - as local retailers and suppliers can no longer compete with big out of town developments. This can leave older people, or those with little or no access to personal transport, trapped with virtually no local amenities whatsoever.

As really local services are lost, people have to go further and further away from their homes for employment and their shopping, leisure and other needs. They are not spending time in their local community, they are travelling miles for work, educating their children far from home, spending money in out-of-town developments – in short they are failing to invest their own financial and social capital in their communities any more. This is destroying the fabric of local life. It is also an unsustainable way to live. Not only are we all

Nearly all the shops on this street in Garston in Liverpool have been shut down.

Q&A

Question: Different lobbying techniques are probably required for local services owned by private people, national companies or even international companies?

That is why NEF argues that local authorities should have much more power to make local retail plans, incorporating a local community voice and to do an impact assessment of the loss of any local service. For every pound you spend locally in a truly locally owned enterprise, about 80p stays in your local economy as opposed to flowing out to remote shareholders.

Question: Local authorities do allow out of town shopping and leisure centres and they must know this will have a consequence. For example, Cheshire Oaks at the bottom of the Wirral peninsula. People queue up to get into these places. Is that the new community?

We have progressively lost choice and have probably all become a bit complicit. I have to say also developers have been extremely sneaky in this regard. For example, supermarkets by building upwards rather than outwards can potentially double their floor area; I think local authorities do not have sufficient power at the moment to counter this. Local authorities should be able to do a proper local economic assessment of the effects on their local economy of out of town developments. But at the moment the power is very much with the developers. There is not enough community voice and often not enough local authority voice.

You have thriving shopping centres where people have a lot of money. Whereas in Anfield, even people without cars have to go to ASDA, which is beyond the ring road, because all the local shops have shut. It’s very difficult then to reverse that unless you have public powers and a strategy.

Continued on page 19
driving our cars more, with knock-on environmental consequences—we are spending longer and more stressful hours travelling—for even the most basic of amenities. The average person now travels nearly 900 miles a year for food shopping alone.

**Local sustainability**

This is an undesirable state of affairs from any angle. It is creating a political, economic and social vacuum at the heart of some of our communities—with the potential consequences of rising crime and insecure neighbourhoods. It also means that many of our communities need ‘regenerating’—I don’t just mean in the traditional top-down cash-injection sense, but in terms of giving local people more of an investment in where they live, whether that’s a leafy suburb or a dense high-rise.

But if ever a policy reflected un-jointed up government thinking, it is regeneration. We allow communities to decline, by failing to invest in good local schools and local health initiatives. We don’t invest in training, skills and apprenticeships in areas of high unemployment. We fail to create an environment where really local enterprise can thrive and compete fairly with big business, with its stranglehold on local producers. We structure a planning system that suits the gross multiples and distant corporations. Then we wonder why some communities fall by the wayside and need regenerating! So we have to have the idea of local sustainability at the heart of regeneration policy—because whether your interest is in well-run schools, better public health or easy access to local shops, we all have an investment in how our community develops. Sadly, however, many local regeneration projects have become little more than an exercise in class cleansing.

I’m sorry that I cannot speak with knowledge about some of the regeneration projects that have gone on in Liverpool—but I know from my own corner of London, that one of the key results of regeneration policies has just been to re-assert already existing inequalities within local communities. Local authorities have understandably chased new revenues and tapped into fashionable inner-city and riverside living—from London to Bristol to Birmingham to Liverpool. These have incorporated major developments like art galleries and museums, cleaning up riversides, and tremendous plans for hugely deprived inner-urban areas, which in some cases involves moving many local families out of the area altogether. As an aside, this was tried in the post-war period too—with families uprooted to new and growing towns like Northampton and Stevenage. Incredibly, this did not make poverty go away!

The history of our urban decline is well documented and linked to the politics of the industrial revolution and so called post-industrial world. I don’t need to go through them in this illustrious company, I’m sure! But its historical legacy has been a United Kingdom disunited by huge regional income differentials. According to Lord Rogers’ Urban Task Force, in London and the South East the average income levels per head in 1995 were 140% of the average GNP per head, in contrast with Merseyside, with incomes as low as 75% of average. Having said that I don’t want to oversimplify here. There are pockets of extreme deprivation and affluence in all regions—we need to acknowledge this complex social reality.

**Regeneration ideology**

I believe that one of the major stumbling blocks to real improvement in community life chances can be what I shall call ‘regeneration ideology’.

The problem of local economic decline—leading to local ghost towns and eventually calls for regeneration—is really ignoring the central issue, which is about wealth distribution in our communities. To me it is scandalous that a child born in a deprived area or region of the UK has on average five years less life expectancy than a child born in an affluent area. Before conception life chances are defined. And no amount of rebuilding or regenerating will ever change that. Regeneration becomes a process that ‘happens’ to communities if we are not careful. Individuals feel they can’t have any impact on policies and targets and designs set for them. They lose their stake in the process. So their needs become lost in the process too. Like the community that loses its local post office, because new, expensive housing, attracts new, expensive people who don’t use their local amenities and don’t see the people who do.

This maybe all sounds a bit damning of the regeneration process, which is not entirely fair. There are good examples—and goodness knows there are houses that should be demolished and people whose lives have been dramatically improved by regeneration in their local area. And the best way to make all of this happen is through real civic engagement. Getting local communities really involved in these projects. So their needs become central to the process. Like the community that loses its local post office, because new, expensive housing, attracts new, expensive people who don’t use their local amenities and don’t see the people who do.

The post office is important for the community.
gradually building capacity inside our communities so that they are increasingly able to undertake their own development needs. For example, a scheme could be created to strengthen relevant local building skills in the first couple of years of a regeneration programme. Then those trainees could form the basis for local tenders for contracts in subsequent years. Alternatively, administrative support could be offered to groups of small local traders to help them negotiate contracts as a co-operative to win bigger contracts. According to at least one Nobel Prize-winning economist, developing such mutually sustainable local and regional markets will, in many cases, be a more reliable foundation for sustainable economic development than becoming dependent on unpredictable and volatile international markets. This localism vision is about sustainability – but sustainability for everyone.

**LOCALISM**

NEF believes ‘localism’ is an important factor in regeneration because it determines our immediate quality of life. If we live in a safe area with a good range of facilities, where we feel like we belong and that our material and social needs will be broadly met, we will have a better quality of life – and health. Conversely, if we feel insecure and find dealing with distant service providers stressful and difficult, quality of life will be undermined. If we feel we are listening to and that we can influence how our local area develops then that is better still. That is why the New Economics Foundation (NEF) developed and launched a flagship campaign on localisation, which we have tied to a Local Communities Sustainability Bill. We hope this all-party supported Bill will gather momentum and eventually pass into law. It gives a framework for local authorities to incorporate sustainability indicators on all aspects of community life – perhaps as part of their community strategies, for example. And it places a community voice at the heart of regeneration issues – vital if we are to tackle some of the inequalities that exist at the heart of our regions, cities, towns and villages. Thank you.

**THE LOCAL MULTIPLIER EFFECT**

NEF has done a study called the ‘local multiplier effect’, which shows how money spent in really local enterprises continues to circulate and be reinvested in that community – unlike money spent in major chains or big multinationals, which flows away to remote shareholders. Sadly, nowhere does money leak out of communities faster than in those attempts to ‘regenerate’ socially deprived areas. This is how it works. Take a regeneration area, with a hefty chunk of New Deal or SRB funding – or whatever the latest cash initiative is called.

The contracts awarded to ‘regenerate’ an area are nearly always given to large external contractors. It is understandable that overstretched regeneration staff would do that, as it gives them a greater chance of meeting a specific target – for example on a housing development. But what happens to the money awarded? It winds up in the pockets of remote developers. A more effective long-term approach would be to undertake work more slowly, immediately, and with a community voice at the heart of regeneration decisions.

A study by the NEF showed that money invested in local business continued to circulate and was reinvested in that community.

**U&A**

I am very concerned about pots of money, e.g. New Opportunities Fund. The health service, voluntary and community bodies sometimes start substantial, expensive projects with an implicit understanding that the NHS or some other public sector will pick this up. We are not very good at working with voluntary community bodies to ask “Where is it going? Is it sustainable or are elements of what you are doing so good that a public body should adopt it?”.

There are issues around at the moment with Health Action Zones. We do need a Primary Care Trust to address the mental health needs of black minority ethnic groups which have never been met in the same way as they are for the white population. This is because the NHS hasn’t got that expertise and the majority of their staff are white.

We should never get to a stage where we can mainstream everything to create absolute security. We need a degree of tension in the system, which forces people to think about new and better ways of doing things. The difficulty comes if that tension gets too great. In the shift from the first Objective One programme to the second, there was uncertainty whether people would continue to get funding. But we shouldn’t expect that the majority of projects will have a life beyond their initial grant. It’s almost inevitable – some jobs are finite. While it might be nice to continue, it’s not necessarily a good thing except for the people immediately involved. It’s not necessarily going to deliver anything more in the future.

Regeneration funding can never deal with long term issues; it is a catalyst for innovation. The voluntary and community sector deserves a lot of credit in this city for trialling a number of public service issues that should have been mainstreamed and have not. If they are good why are they not being subsumed in the mainstream?
Regeneration in Liverpool –
a Personal Perspective

THANKS very much for the invitation. I was just talking to the other speakers; I said what are we going to call ourselves? I think we decided we are ‘regenerationists’ and probably have got our careers to thank for the never ending initiatives over the years but that gives a certain perspective, not necessarily an expertise. It won’t surprise you as well that some of what I wanted to cover has been covered by Peter so I’ll be briefer on those points – but you know, you can take the person out of planning but you can’t take the planning out of the person! You know I was going to say to the planners in this room ‘rise up you’ve got nothing to lose but your shame’ but I decided not to because it was actually somebody in planning who once said to me ‘planning is writing your history today’ and I think that people need to look forward to the year 2020 and 2040 and say what would they have written about the period that we are experiencing and maybe will get closer what we mean by a vision - but that is another talk.

Regeneration – a Japanese guy stopped me once at the Garden Festival site and said ‘what was generated that you are now seeking to regenerate?’ and I said ‘a dream that we never quite caught up with’. But it was a fair question and unfortunately we mean so many different things by regeneration and I have got to be brief on these slides so I apologise for racing through.

In Government Office we tend to look at this axis between economic growth and social inclusion and some people like to stay on one line and some people like to stay on the other. Some like to go in a perfect straight line, as it were, from the south-west quadrant to the north-east, and some like to go in some elliptical arch or whatever. But a lot of those are about your values and what you mean by regeneration. A lot of people say ‘oh yes, we have a vision for the city region’ and sometimes people emphasise one aspect of that vision more than another and then some people say ‘this is regeneration’ and then some people say ‘this is regeneration’. I asked at a conference once for people to put up on a flipchart anything that wasn’t regeneration and it was no wonder that there was confusion in the debate that followed because people had different definitions in their heads. And it’s a tough one because many of these things are connected. But what it means is that there isn’t a canon of coherent policy in government or anywhere else for regeneration. Whatever anybody tells you it’s closer to a planning theory that Peter and I and other planners in the room would be familiar with: disjointed incrementalism.

We also have a crowded stage of people operating. I have just thrown some logos up at random; we couldn’t get them all on! And I say to people in this regeneration theatre ‘what is played? Is it a comedy, is it a tragedy or is it a farce?’ Again it depends what’s in your head. Where is the added value in what we call regeneration activity? I think we were starting to pick up from our previous speakers this morning that some of that added value is probably around the connections between agendas that people may have an expertise and interest in. Where they meet is often where the value is. And I think we may need to come back to that in discussion. Of course, we operate in a partnership world and there are many definitions of partnerships: ‘people brought together by mutual loathing and suspicion in search of a common grant’ is one that springs to my mind often when I am chairing PMC meetings. Is it a blessing or a curse? Well, I think it can be both actually. A second sort of collection of thoughts is that we do need a sense of perspective. Peter has covered some of this and I think it is vital, because I think if you want to know what you should do, you need to know where you are and where you have been. You also need to know what you want to be and you need to be able to enthuse people about the journey because if you are constantly telling people you are at the bottom of the hill and we haven’t moved, then don’t be surprised that you never will! So I think the sense of perspective is important. And I would say that regeneration is a long game, its rules are slightly more complex than cricket but only a little and certainly not as complex as European funding!

A SENSE OF PERSPECTIVE

The way we were… the one thing that I would add to what Peter said is that there was a mixture in the ‘60s but it was the first time that housing was a key political issue. In places like Liverpool (I think in around the mid-1960s) it was over a hundred thousand houses that were declared ‘unfit for human habitation’ – that’s a dreadful phrase! That sent shockwaves through the city… just at the time that the port was changing, so that was a sort of major crisis.

In the ‘70s you will see that there is a sort of musical ocean here. So some of you will recognise the more recent, some of you will recognise the more distant. The ‘70s was a period when this city (probably towards the end of the ‘70s) was on its knees economically. And we had social unrest, which came in the early ‘80s, but we are beginning to see that already in the ‘70s, we had essentially market failure. The introduction, as Peter said, of this sense of inner-city partnerships programmes grappling with some of these inter connected issues, was starting in the 1970s.

In the ‘80s – an era which I suppose frightened political opinions of all shades, but also a period (just 20 years ago) when the International...
Garden Festival was opened. Richard Cass here had a big hand in that. And, at the same month, Albert Dock opened. 3.4 million visitors came to the International Garden Festival in 6 months. That was an incredible achievement for a city that people had seen as a basket case! Delivered on time, on budget! What took the Germans eight years, took the Scousers three to do a Bundesgartenschau, you know. That was quite important. Wavertree Technology Park! These things were about some symbolism, about some change. There was still deep-seated economic and social stress.

The ‘90s was a period of European money coming in. But I know only too well European money is very fixed on economic regeneration. With the European Commission saying ‘don’t spend it on housing, don’t spend it on health, don’t spend it on substituting your transport system, don’t spend it on crime reduction, don’t spend it on retail’ – in other words: don’t spend it on things that matter most to people. Spend it on reconstructing your economies. So we have that tension of how can we sometimes mask those investments? But money coming in, partnerships as Peter had picked up, and also a UK economic upturn. Where we are now is: we still have some of those strands of money, we have partnerships in the city like Liverpool Vision, Liverpool Land Development Company. We have a very important new initiative in the last few years of Local Strategic Partnerships. I have a view on this. I think we either make the Local Strategic Partnerships work because it’s where these agendas come together, or we abolish them. I firmly believe we should make them work because for all the agendas that have been discussed here, that is a proper planning debating forum – for getting the joined-up planning right! Don’t wait for somebody else to do it at a national or regional level. Do it at the local level! I actually believe in localism because some of those things could actually find their way into plans of agencies that are represented in this room, debated in a forum in Liverpool. Atomic Kitten is an example of the vicissitudes of regeneration – bands come and go as well.

And all of that took place, the whole regeneration journey, at a time when the world is changing. Liverpool is no different from any other urban part of the United Kingdom and, of all of these things, globalism has had a massive impact on the way our supermarkets are structured and so forth. Travel has an impact on relative poverty: can you or can’t you travel? Do you have access to holidays? Technology – people in this room probably have gadgets like microwaves and videos, mobile phones, the internet. These things didn’t exist when we started that regeneration journey!

**Today’s key policy drivers**

What are today’s policy drivers? I think there are four in terms of government and I have basically captured a number of strands within that:

- **Delivery** – on delivery there probably is an obsession with hospitals not health. But this is what drives senior government officials in London – how are we doing with our targets for hospitals? That’s what civil servants get kicked around at the moment. How are we doing with schools? Mainly in terms of GCSE attainment A* to C and also reducing exclusion. In some areas, not necessarily just in this area, public transport has become a key issue. These things only become key issues if you can win votes on them as the politicians here will tell you. Crime and community cohesion are another significant delivery issue for United Kingdom government. And in some parts of the country, but not necessarily every part, housing is coming back onto the political agenda and I think that there are opportunities for us there.

- **Social inclusion** – this has really come from a number of stable issues within government; I suppose if I summarise that it would be two-fold. One is about containment, in the same way as you have urban containment, you can have social containment. How do we keep a lid on some of these problems we have got? And then there is another ruse that a number of these policies come through which is slightly more generous, which is ‘we have got problems and they are unfair and how do we address inequality?’ And so all of the various initiatives that you are seeing coming out of government are actually addressing both of those.

- **Economy** – in terms of the economy, local economic development is not a priority for United Kingdom government. What is a priority for United Kingdom government is getting the national economy right and that is why you have seen this focus by the Chancellor on key macroeconomic factors. We start to see in places like Merseyside that a slight tension in this is the intervention of European regional policy which runs up against UK policy. So the Objective 1 battleground that I am in, is sometimes at a dividing line between the UK government on the one hand, and the European Commission on the other hand.

**Question:** How do we measure the effects of regeneration? Are the indicators we have the right ones? Are they effective? Do they tell us the right thing?

- **Delivery** – this is very difficult even for planners or regeneration specialists. How could you tell what would have gone on without these regeneration initiatives? When do you measure them? For what area do you measure them? Where do you get the data from, in some cases?

- **Local Agenda 21** promotes subsidiarity – decisions being made as locally as possible. This is a commitment UK government has made at the UN, but many local authorities disregard it.

**Question:** How do we overcome the challenge of maintaining the regeneration impetus as time limited funding sources come to an end and we need to show short-term gains?

- **In applying for public grants people say ‘yes, this is a sustainable project!’ When you see the same people three years later you say ‘why are you coming back?’ I thought you had a sustainable project!**

- **It actually becomes a far more specific issue for community and voluntary organisations. Less so for public organisations, they cut certain things and prioritise in order to do what is important and if things funded through regeneration money have not proven their worth they won’t do them.**

- **What people want is not a contract but core funding and they go to whatever pot of money there is. And that begs a much bigger question, not about regeneration money: ‘Are those organisations doing something of worth and if so why are we as the public, public agencies or as tax payers not supporting them?’ Sometimes the answer is ‘No, you are having no appreciable impact on the lives of people in the area.” There will be others of course where the answer is: “This is so important that we need to keep it!” - which is why a lot of public grant bureaucrats actually do bend the rules.**

*continued on page 27*
one hand, the European Commission on the other and the Merseyside stakeholders, as it were, right on that boundary. I suppose if I put this in simple terms, the major difference between the UK and the European Union is that the UK would say ‘let us just have a good economy’ and the European Union would say ‘let’s have a good economy everywhere and let’s narrow the gap between the highest performing regions and the lowest performing’. Whether that is a vain hope, I think, is a massive debate and the UK government has a number of pillars as you see there.

And a final area of that policy arena is the area of governance. What it is introducing is not only a crowded policy agenda that we have just touched on briefly, but a crowded operational stage because all of these things that we are involved in are about a very simple thing: they are all about political will. And political will usually comes down to who decides. Who decides what should be done? Who decides what should be spent on something? Who decides whether a gap is acceptable? We have got many players in that policy arena. I actually think that is a problem for the UK and it is a problem that is not going away. And it may not go away even with the introduction of regional assemblies. It could, if we get our regional assembly right but that would then mean local authorities and others and sub-regions being subsumed into some other power structure. So you have then set in train another set of issues. What we have here is elected bodies and non-elected bodies. And I think it is getting the balance between those right. I am actually a great supporter of local government. I think local government powers should be increased. I believe in regional government and then I think there needs to be a firm definition of what’s the threshold between the two, I would be quite happy for a lot of initiatives hitherto carried out by public agencies to be subsumed within some organisation of elected bodies. I have no problem with that, but they are key political issues.

Is it working?

Is all this working? I remember going to Bilbao on a study tour and every Spanish person we asked, when we were questioning on something, always said ‘si y no’, and the answer is yes and no. It usually depends on what answer you have arrived at. And so whatever answer you have arrived at, you prove it. It also depends on what question you ask. So if somebody says ‘is UK regeneration policy working?’ – then that begs the question ‘is there a UK regeneration policy?’ It also then begs that you know what a successfully regenerated place would look like and therefore could measure yourself against whether you have arrived there. I don’t think we do and therefore we constantly keep on asking the question. So what you measure is important. How far you look back and forward is important. And whether you compare yourself with the past or with others is important. In other words: you can have absolute improvement in any area and be way off the pace. And, if I was giving you a summary of Liverpool in terms of many of its indicators, it is that there has been absolute improvement, the gap has narrowed in quite a number of factors but it is still too wide in most and that would be a summary.

Physical – you make up your own mind. How has this area changed from 1965 to 75 to 95 to 95 and now? Are they good things? Are they bad things? Has there been noticeable improvement?

In economic terms, it gets complicated because you’ve got so many different indicators. Yes, there have been new users coming into the economy of Liverpool and Merseyside. Our GDP, or now what we tend to refer to as Net Value Added per head, is about 72%, of the UK average. We are off the pace. But Net Value Added i.e. economic activity in the city has been growing at an increasingly faster rate. So we are closing the gap but there is still a gap.

Business formation – people say have we have a problem with businesses in Liverpool and Merseyside. That’s not true – the business formation rate, i.e. the rate at which businesses form as a percentage of the current business stock, is the fastest in Liverpool over the last year compared to the UK and the region. We have got smaller numbers failing but we still don’t have enough companies given the size of the population.

Church Street, Liverpool city centre.

Procurement of infrastructure and buildings is a different issue because you have delivered something with a use that carries on. It becomes an area of considerable stress for a lot of organisations engaged in tackling key issues around community or environment or health or basic skills.

This raises a much bigger issue than regeneration funding: it’s about the value that we as a society put on grant users who are providing services to people. It’s a mixed bag: we need to pull a lot of subsidised activity that doesn’t have an appreciable impact and to offer real long term support for those activities that need it, without pretending something is a contract when it is a core funding grant.

**QUESTION:** Glasgow went through a major regeneration exercise but now has a lower GDP per head than Merseyside. What can we learn from this and how can we be sure it doesn’t happen here?

GDP is a very crude measure of economic activity in an area. If Merseyside wished to raise its GDP per head it would subsume Halton. All the chemical works add a lot of value! We need some other measures of long-term economic improvement.

Some of the lessons learned from Glasgow we also have to learn from Manchester. You can have a fizzing city centre and quite serious deprivation on the edge of it. The city centre is a very important economic motor. But will we have succeeded if we get that spanking new, while people’s lives chances have not improved substantially, they are living in neighbourhoods with fear of crime, with poor housing and so forth? We need not to be obsessed by inner core regeneration because that is the “sexy” bit.

Liverpool City Council is very conscious of that - certainly the policy section and the Capital of Culture team. The City Council is talking to Glasgow; there is a lot of material on what went well and what didn’t go well there.
Jobs – we have a massive increase in jobs. Yet the activity rate is a big problem for Liverpool and for Merseyside: that is the number of people who are in work as a percentage of those who are available of working age. We are off the pace. The only other place that I think is worse than us is Glasgow. Unemployment rates have come down but they have come down nationally and regionally on a steady curve. Skills levels are up in the adult workforce in Liverpool. Just in case you are getting into doom and gloom, skills levels are up. We still get a higher percentage than the UK and the region of people who have no qualifications but we are starting to see an increase in the skills levels. But there is a bigger gap at the higher levels of skills. So in the middle part of the skills NVQ 2/3/4 we are fine but in the higher level we are just behind.

On the social side, I won't cover the ground that Kate and others covered. We have too many disparities between parts of the city and other parts of the country. Educational attainment is up. Actually Liverpool recorded the highest growth in GCSE attainments in England! A 2% increase on the previous year. Health – people are dying sooner but they should in Liverpool, I think is the message. Housing – well, many of you are housing experts here – we still have big problems and what needs to be done. Crime is down in many parts of the city. The fear of crime, rather strangely, is up in some of those areas where the crime rates are down! Household earnings have increased in absolute terms and they have increased faster than some of the UK averages because you have to look at different groups. But the gap is still very wide. Other factors – well you can make your own judgement about Liverpool!

**Lessons learned**

And finally just some lessons learned: it was Ricky Gervais, or David Brent as he is known (two management gurus!), who did say once that ‘if at first you don’t succeed, bury all the evidence that you ever tried’. Ever there was a metaphor for regenerationists, that would be it.

Wouldn't it? Hard questions have been asked and I hope they'll get debated. Can we narrow the gap between the rich and the poor? Who knows? Because it depends on what you think is an acceptable gap. That is a political choice. What is an acceptable gap within the city and between the city and elsewhere? Determining that actually will drive all regeneration policy and I don't think we ever really have. We have got to tackle economic inactivity! We have got to make sure that we put the emphasis on enterprise not just social enterprise. Social enterprise in a city like this may create something up to 2% of the jobs that people will be seeking. That will be good for getting certain people into work. But it will not address the large scale problems and we need more higher-value enterprise. Health and health equality – I think many people who are not in the health field do see the NHS as a superb emergency and sickness service with almost scandalous disregard to the health of the nation. And I think much of this is about accessibility in all its forms to healthy living and health care. Just to let you know how impressed I am on this, I believe this is, in Government Office: in looking across all our different activities, the health of society is the one thing that is really integrated health and healthy living as one of two core priorities where each department of Government Office is looking at how we can see how we can contribute.

As a councillor once said – he is not in the room, he was from Liverpool – is ‘What’s all this John about sustainability?’ and I said ‘You don’t know how close to the truth you are’. I think people concentrate too much on the money side and not on some of the broader issues that we were hearing about in terms of the new localism.

We have however, as Peter alluded to earlier, probably created a training industry rather than training for industry and I think we have got to tackle some of that. Regional imbalance – just to give you one quick sense how you close this gap. The UK economy is growing at something like 2.1-2.2% per annum. If Liverpool and Merseyside as a sub-regional economy wanted to close the gap on the UK average it probably would have to grow at twice that rate for the next 20 years! Now you ask yourself is that politically doable? Peter said it, we have actually been here before: the 1970s inner-city partnerships, race, multiple deprivation, the inter-connectedness of those issues, spatial concentration and that we won’t do anything unless we have mainstream actions not more initiatives. My other lessons are: let’s have some real time evaluation, not stuff at the end that tells you what you did wrong. But let’s have real time evaluation and real policy debate in the appropriate forum.

I think we need a renewed sense of social justice. I believe that our regeneration policies and the funding do not address some of the issues that constantly get raised, which are about multiple deprivation and we might have to reconsider some of our political priorities. We need an understanding of what is the right size and shape of an economy. This economy doesn’t have to keep on growing exponentially. What is the right size for the economy? That economic growth and social inclusion are not mutually exclusive, that we want more concrete plans not just ideas. People just get turned off by ideas. I believe very much in flagship projects but not just big buildings. Flagships are a symbol of regeneration and I think we need more of them. I think we are losing our nerve to do big things and I believe that we should do more. I would echo a phrase of a German at an economic development conference I organised some years ago, which said control ‘The trouble with you Brits is you are a meandering about sort of nation, you just about get something right, then you move on because you get bored’.

**Final thoughts**

My final thoughts – I get inspired by the most important things in life – the character in Jurassic Park said that creation is a matter of will. I actually believe that regeneration, however you define it, is a matter of will but it’s a matter of political will. Don’t be worried if there are tensions and arguments, because you are arguing about some very big things. And I’ll leave you, finally, with the thought of Seneca: “It is not because things are difficult that we do not dare but it’s because we dare not that things are difficult”. Thanks very much.
“Re-kinding the Passion of Liverpool’s People”

I LOVE THE WORD REGENERATION. Its first meaning is about `investing with a new and higher spiritual nature, improving moral condition and breathing new and more vigorous spiritual life into people…and potentially places.’ And its second meaning is about `generating again – bringing into renewed existence’ and `forming afresh.’ For those of us who are lucky enough to be able to transform derelict buildings for a new life or long-neglected wastelands into places of inspiration and joy, the ability to work with the vast resources now available to us is both an exciting challenge and a huge responsibility.

It can all go terribly wrong. In a career spanning over 30 years – as a developer and manager of housing and mixed use projects totalling many thousands of units, as a funder with the Housing Corporation responsible for a grant programme of £78 million per annum for 17 local authority areas, as a policy officer with the National Housing Federation, a Board Member of Liverpool Vision and a NW Representative of CABE – I have seen the products of bad decisions and the continuing misery of the people who have to live with the consequences of those decisions. We have to ensure that we don’t get it wrong this time. Our mistakes can blot the landscape for generations. History will judge us. And our contemporaries will judge us too. I don’t mean awards and accolades from fellow professionals – but people living in the neighbourhoods and cities where we work.

I want to talk about practicalities today. But I don’t want us to forget the spiritual dimension of what we are embarked upon. I also want to say that I am passionate about Liverpool. I love it. I wouldn’t want to work anywhere else. So I don’t want to give the impression when I speak about barriers and difficulties that I don’t think that they can be surmounted, given the will and true co-operation of everyone in this room and beyond. So here it goes – whinge, whinge, whinge. I have worked in Liverpool for 12 years – first as CEO of Maritime Housing Association and now as Project Manager, Regeneration, for Liverpool Football Club working in partnership with the city council on the regeneration of Anfield Breckfield. I am also on Liverpool Vision’s Board and therefore concerned with the successful re-birth of the city centre. Therefore, my examples of practical issues will draw upon some developments I have been directly involved in over the past few years in these roles.

COMMUTATION PLAZA
Maritime Housing Association was 40 years old last year. It builds and manages housing for rent, for sale and mixed-use projects as well as being active in neighbourhood initiatives across a broad spectrum. It is one of the first housing associations in the UK to be awarded Investor in Communities status. Maritime knew that the success of Liverpool’s city centre – with increased job opportunities – would benefit its residents and was also committed to ensure that residential development in the city centre should not only be for high income individuals. It took on numerous complex projects from 1994 onwards before it was thought that city centre living could be a reality in Liverpool. This was when John Flamson was at the London Rd. Development Company so he will remember these projects well!

Maritime improved the derelict Georgian terrace at the upper end of Lord Nelson Street that used to greet visitors to the city as they left Lime St. station and the old department store on London Rd. that was an empty eyesore for many years. Both were mixed use schemes and the architects and builders did wonders to retrieve these buildings from the brink. Also key to the success of these schemes was the involvement of local artists. It had been hoped that an artists’ co-operative could own and manage the studios below the Lord Nelson Street flats, but the funding bid was not successful for that aspect of the scheme. Yet the links forged meant that Maritime could sponsor works by various artists in its future developments and other projects.

Having successfully undertaken these complicated schemes, London Rd. Development Agency, the Housing Corporation and the city council challenged Maritime to take on the derelict block known as Commutation Row – a terrible blight directly opposite the Walker and St. George’s Hall. Various schemes had been proposed for the site, but no one in the private sector could see any commercial use for it. Not that I don’t think that they can be surmounted, given the will and true co-operation of everyone in this room and beyond. So here it goes – whinge, whinge, whinge. I have worked in Liverpool for 12 years – first as CEO of Maritime Housing Association and now as Project Manager, Regeneration, for Liverpool Football Club working in partnership with the city council on the regeneration of Anfield Breckfield. I am also on Liverpool Vision’s Board and therefore concerned with the successful re-birth of the city centre. Therefore, my examples of practical issues will draw upon some developments I have been directly involved in over the past few years in these roles.

COMMUTATION PLAZA
Maritime Housing Association was 40 years old last year. It builds and manages housing for rent, for sale and mixed-use projects as well as being active in neighbourhood initiatives across a broad spectrum. It is one of the first housing associations in the UK to be awarded Investor in Communities status. Maritime knew that the success of Liverpool’s city centre – with increased job opportunities – would benefit its residents and was also committed to ensure that residential development in the city centre should not only be for high income individuals. It took on numerous complex projects from 1994 onwards before it was thought that city centre living could be a reality in Liverpool. This was when John Flamson was at the London Rd. Development Company so he will remember these projects well!

Maritime improved the derelict Georgian terrace at the upper end of Lord Nelson Street that used to greet visitors to the city as they left Lime St. station and the old department store on London Rd. that was an empty eyesore for many years. Both were mixed use schemes and the architects and builders did wonders to retrieve these buildings from the brink. Also key to the success of these schemes was the involvement of local artists. It had been hoped that an artists’ co-operative could own and manage the studios below the Lord Nelson Street flats, but the funding bid was not successful for that aspect of the scheme. Yet the links forged meant that Maritime could sponsor works by various artists in its future developments and other projects.

Having successfully undertaken these complicated schemes, London Rd. Development Agency, the Housing Corporation and the city council challenged Maritime to take on the derelict block known as Commutation Row – a terrible blight directly opposite the Walker and St. George’s Hall. Various schemes had been proposed for the site, but no one in the private sector could see any commercial use for it. Not

The process of regeneration is not all about transforming derelict buildings but also “re-kinding the passion of Liverpool’s people”.

QUESTION: You stressed that regeneration projects rely on a wide range of funding streams for different requirements, programmes and outputs. What suggestions do you have for providing a more streamlined fundraising mechanism?

Q: Both the Urban Regeneration Company and Liverpool Learning and Development have their main funders represented on their boards.

Q: Prioritisation seems critical, we need to focus on what everybody is trying to achieve. It would be useful if that was coordinated on a regional and/or local level, in some sort of funders’ forum to decide who is going to fund what.

Q: If you think of the window of resource that we have got in the next couple of years this is absolutely critical. We could waste a lot of time going from door to door instead of saying collectively “this is what we need to achieve, how are we going to get there?” Where is the private money coming from? Where is the public money coming from and how do we streamline that process? Otherwise the private sector in particular loses money. There are some investors interested in Anfield but before they even put in their first full application they have got to pay out 35 thousand pounds on top of the year they have spent coming to Liverpool. If the funding isn’t there, that is just money gone.

Q: We have to make it easier for the private sector to invest. If it is not a priority tell people straightaway and they will go somewhere else.

Q: There is more joined up planning than people might think. It starts to break down somewhere else.
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one to ignore a challenge, we set off to create a mixed use, mixed tenure scheme with Maritime’s Head Office on the ground floor. The Housing Corporation allocated grant for shared ownership and rented housing and we sought English Partnerships funding for the cost value gap for the commercial space.

This is when we faced a belief gap. English Partnerships at that time could not understand why a housing association would be developing a mixed-use scheme. If we were just transferring jobs from one part of the city centre to another, there were not enough outputs in jobs created. Maritime should have a commercial partner. So, we went through a lengthy selection process to interest a commercial partner (when people were not interested in building in Liverpool) only to have them drop out after a year of negotiations.

In the meantime, the planning process was complicated by the fact that the block faced the largest grouping of Grade 1 listed buildings outside of London! English Heritage was involved with the planners on every detail of the design stage. And then we had to brave the Royal Fine Arts Society as well. Local consultation was primarily with the Civic Society and local historical societies, the National Museums and St. George’s Hall, as there was not an adjacent residential community as such. We finally gave up on English Partnerships funding – the process had cost us two years – and the city council assisted with the shortfall. From start to finish, it took 6 years to develop and build Commutation Plaza. It is now a highly desirable location with some of the best views in the city. The apartments sold off plan. But the value of the penthouses had risen so high that they had to be sold for full owner occupation – otherwise the Housing Corporation ceiling on sales prices would have meant that people got an outstanding apartment and an instant gift of £30,000! Lottery wins with public funding! The rented flats are at social housing rent levels – around £50 per week – and the subsidy beyond grant level for each flat was £15,000 from Maritime’s reserves. Now when people walk out of St. George’s Hall, they don’t see a derelict block, but a complementary modern building that is lived in 24-hours a day, as well as a revitalised Empire Theatre and successfully re-vamped classic railway hotel that is student accommodation for JMU.

ISSUES

- Vision is necessary for every project. Without the vision matched with bloody-minded determination, Commutation Plaza would not have happened.
- Attitude – everyone needs to have a ‘can do’ attitude. It is not enough that people have comfortable jobs and another month in the bureaucratic process isn’t an issue. It is an issue. Time is Money. The private sector would have walked away from this (and many more challenges) because people with choice work in the place that makes it easy. I have been told on numerous occasions by private developers that ‘doing it’ in Manchester is easier. We have to get better at smoothing the path.
- Partnership. Without the co-operation of the city council, this project would not have been possible. This included site assembly, design advice, and ultimately some funding. What makes partnerships with the local authority strained, now more so than ever, however, is the need for the total independence of the local authority as planning authority as opposed to its partnership role as a regeneration agency. With constant threats of judicial review and public enquiries the planning process has become a field day for consultants and lawyers – something that is extremely costly, lengthy and fraught. I am amazed that we get anything delivered sometimes with the hurdles that are constructed along the path of the planning process.
- Funding partners. Without the faith of the Housing Corporation, this development wouldn’t have happened. However, the role of English Partnerships at that time was negative and cost the project at least two years. That has now, thankfully, changed. And the more complex schemes become in regeneration areas, there can be as many as 5 or 6 different funding agencies involved: all with their different timetables, criteria and processes. This is also expensive and can lead to significant financial loss to organisations. Even the information required for them to assess the funds is costly and the risk of abortive costs narrows the field of people willing to invest. There may be dozens of developers who have already expended hundreds of thousands of pounds in schemes, for example, in the expectation of NWDA funding. If this is now not forthcoming due to NWDA’s re-assessment of their 3-year budget, there will be serious repercussions for some companies.

STATUTORY CONSULTEES

Complex regeneration schemes call for consultation with a wide range of agencies – particularly English Heritage and Merseytravel – but also CABE, Sport England, the Garden History Society, the police and others. English Heritage and CABE now have a very good relationship with Liverpool in tackling the major schemes planned for the foreseeable future. But keeping everyone informed and the right people involved is a real challenge.

- Utilities – this is a real issue in the city – one that has been tackled by Liverpool Vision. When Commutation Plaza was completed, it was

Q&A

- Several years ago Government Office offered local authorities a pot of money saying “We don’t care if people never come applying to us ever again as long as we buy the strategic deal with you”. The local authorities rejected that because it was all too difficult and as one chief executive said: “We prefer to throw bricks at you rather than you throw them at us”. That was a political choice.

QUESTION: What is the mix to be at Anfield Plaza?

- A retail strategy for Anfield came through a retail working group of the overall steering group and that was for mixed retail. The plaza has a different function from the shopping street. The stadium at Anfield gets well over a million visitors a year and that’s not just on match days. But at the moment there is nothing for all those visitors to spend money on in Anfield other than tickets and a football shirt.

- Private money is used to set up businesses in the local areas and we want sustainable businesses that will succeed on their own merit. We must train people to run those businesses that will succeed on their own merit.

QUESTION: I was at a meeting at Breckfield comprehensive school. 600 people turned up. Virtually 100% were opposed to the development.

- Vision. That is the key. It is the attitude of those people. And we have to keep people interested in the project.

QUESTION: I was at a meeting at Breckfield comprehensive school. 600 people turned up. Virtually 100% were opposed to the development.

- Statutory consultees – this is a real issue in the city – one that has been tackled by Liverpool Vision.
results were then subjected to an independent survey of an area of 19,500 households and endorsed as part of the overall regeneration package.

The current regeneration strategy comprises:
- A new Anfield Stadium with 60,000 seats, a museum and shop, offices, conference facilities, a sky walk, and a community resource centre including a new Vernon Sangster Community Sports Centre, a college for Liverpool Hope University College, and LFC’s community department and Reduce@te centre that works with schools.
- A restored Stanley Park including renewed football pitches and listed buildings with a restored Gladstone Conservatory. The Conservatory is to be re-named the Isla Gladstone Conservatory after the deceased mother of the current elder generation of Gladstones. She was a textile designer and her works have been catalogued and will form the basis of a community craft business. The Conservatory itself will also be a community business that will offer a visitors’ centre, café and exhibition/retail space.
- A restored Anfield Cemetery with a genealogy centre linked to the Liverpool People’s Project of the Central Library and Records Office.
- Anfield Plaza on the site of the existing stadium – a mixed-use development with high quality open space.
- An improved Anfield Youth Club and a new internet café as one of the several new community businesses under the auspices of the Anfield Breckfield Community Partnership.
- The area will also benefit from:
  - The North Liverpool City Academy – a state of the art secondary school
  - A Lift health centre
  - Significant investment in improved and new housing through the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder and an English Partnerships gap fundung pilot.

What is key to this vast project is overcoming parochialism and cynicism – raising expectations in communities who have heard it all before and not seen much happening to capture their imagination. During the next two years an unprecedented amount of work has to be carried out on the ground. And local people have to be included in the benefits not just to their environment, but with increased chances for education, training and jobs as well as better health and safer streets. This is the only way that true regeneration in its first meaning can happen. Yet some opponents of this scheme – who have no alternative proposals and no ability to bring in public or private investment – can jeopardise 4 years of work by the community by threatening judicial review and further delays. In its development of the City Centre Strategic Framework, Liverpool Vision embarked upon a massive consultation exercise that involved some 350 people over several months. The fact that there was direct input and people were listened to (and continue to be listened to) is essential if what we are delivering is to make a difference to the fabric of people’s lives.

For personal regeneration – not just the re-birth of the environment – this is about re-kinding the passion of Liverpool’s people. In an on-going poll about the Capital of Culture carried out by the local newspaper, when asked what would be the biggest advantage to the city from being European Capital of Culture – the majority of people say it isn’t the jobs or increased house prices, but the increase in people’s pride. All of the new and refurbished buildings and open spaces are important, but they are just the outward manifestation of what is going on in people’s hearts – expressed in their smiles and laughter. So we have a tremendous responsibility. We have to deliver an unprecedented regeneration programme here in this city now. Let’s work together to overcome the barriers. To borrow the phrase from a well-known sporting goods manufacturer – Just Do It!

Q&A

End of Q&A
CONCLUSIONS:
What can we take forward in terms of influencing regeneration policy?

This report demonstrates that the Symposium succeeded in its aims of bringing together participants across the whole spectrum of the regeneration field, providing high quality information on the latest thinking in the field and beginning a debate on how the regeneration agenda should be taken forward. However the challenge now is to continue the work begun at the conference and develop structures that will permit an ongoing debate.

It is important that the structures we develop are not tokens or talking shops, but working groups with a real agenda. This will be a challenge to all concerned. It will challenge those currently responsible for the regeneration agenda to allow others to participate, accepting that this will sometimes mean delays and criticisms. It will challenge those whose work has not up to now focussed on regeneration to give it the time and commitment it deserves. It will challenge those who have campaigned on aspects of regeneration issues to approach the field holistically and not focus exclusively on single issues, important as they are.

Friends of the Earth suggests the establishment of working groups to cover the various themes that have arisen from the conference. These could include:

- Health & regeneration
- Environment & regeneration
- Localism - Ensuring regeneration benefits local people and exploring the balance between local needs and the greater good.
- Participation - Ensuring that the maximum number of people can participate in the process.
- These groups should meet at least twice a year for a half day session. More, shorter meetings could be arranged if the members of a group felt it necessary. There should be a summarizing meeting once a year for all members of these groups - and strictly limited it to group members - to bring all the threads together and maintain the whole picture.

We realize that this would require considerable effort, but I believe that the Symposium showed there is both the need and the will to do this.

The City of Liverpool

The most important messages we took away from the conference were:

- The need for clear and open communication to enable all the players in regeneration to understand and respect their respective skills, priorities and responsibilities.
- The need to better co-ordinate assessment and monitoring to ensure that we do not lose sight of the real, on the ground, improvements that we are all trying to make.

Superficially, regeneration is interpreted, in orthodox terms, as primarily investment in physical infrastructure: buildings, roads and employment facilities. This Symposium was successful in highlighting the additional complexities and breadth of the components involved in such activities. While investment may be seen as the foundation of such activity, as Molly Conisbee of the New Economics Foundation, strongly indicated, the nature, ownership and retention of such assets can be crucial in determining the extent of the ‘multiplier effect’ and the consequent wealth creation within the city region in question.

Admittedly, many projects cannot be contemplated without the involvement of national and even international capital, yet an awareness of the importance of a local stake and involvement is a factor which can be overlooked in the euphoria of the announcement of the achievement of the project in question. Perhaps the most neglected ingredients in the regeneration process are the human factors; not only health, living conditions and well-being, but also inner morale and external perceptions. These aspects have recently become emphasised through the impact of the successful ‘Capital of Culture’ bid. The associated impact of the physical investment promises a great deal. Yet it is the excitement generated and the potential involvement and participation of the ‘citizen’ that seems to have captured the imagination of many people. This component is linked with the positive image created externally; not only within this country, but also internationally. This attitudinal factor, involving a pride of place and sense of belonging, requires nurturing and maintaining through the medium term; particularly necessary to counter the many disruptions and inconveniences which will inevitably accompany construction programmes.

I hope that those who attended this event came away with a better understanding of the many factors involved within the regeneration process, but above all with an appreciation of an often maligned multi-disciplinary perspective brought to the Symposium by involved and also the fresh interpretations afforded by non-mainstream economic viewpoints. An important conclusion which could have been adopted by many of those attending might have been “successful regeneration should provide a shop window for the whole of the sub region, however we acknowledge concerns that the creation of thriving communities outside of the centre will also be vital for sustainable regeneration and we will continue to prioritise this work.”

The City Council will have a role to play, both as a large business and as a local community leader, on wider issues of environmental concern.

GARY MAHONEY

There are fundamental principles that must be recognized if the public health agenda is to be linked to the regeneration agenda and health and well-being are to become integral to regeneration. These are represented as the essential basis of everyone’s right to good health in the draft Charter of the Politics of Health Group (University of Liverpool, June 2004) and are as follows:

- Governments have a fundamental responsibility to ensure that the health of their populations is their first priority in the formulation of all policy and intervention strategies.
- Participation and responsibility of people have a fundamental right to be informed and engaged in the development of policies and interventions aimed at sustaining and developing their health. People also have the responsibility to engage in collective action that enhances health.
- Economics - economic policy should prioritise health and sustainable development as two interrelated and mutually enhancing fundamental goals.
- Relationships - people have the right to develop and experience loving and supportive human relationships that are joyous, respectful and life-affirming.
- Freedom from discrimination - everyone has the right to good health regardless of class, race, culture, religion or belief system, physical ability, age or sexual orientation.
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The city and its main regeneration agencies have moved decisively into the delivery phase of its strategy. Liverpool Vision’s essential role is to harness the entrepreneurial energies of the private sector and co-ordinate the activities and interventions of our public partners in creating a world-class City Centre. In this sense Liverpool Vision is the custodian of ‘the big picture’, and the guarantor of a focussed and coherent approach that will deliver benefits and opportunities to all the communities of Merseyside.

The conference was interesting for many different reasons and the delegates made a real effort to network and contribute as much as possible. From the high level strategic visions set out by John Flamson and Andrea Titterington to the fascinating presentation by Dr Kate Ardern from South Liverpool PCT on the social benefits of successful regeneration schemes, it was very encouraging to see the enthusiasm for the transformation happening in Liverpool. Of course there is still a lot to do but it’s clear that the city is in a period of positive and dramatic change. We know that the challenges are considerable and the timetable demanding, but the prize is immense. For all the partners involved in the regeneration of Liverpool and Merseyside it is now time to deliver.
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Liverpool has a chance to develop the kind of partnership network that can ensure that future policy and investment is guided by complementary economic, social and environmental perspectives to provide a holistic and lasting prosperity for the city. Government Office will do all it can to help the network created on this basis thrive.

Peter Wilson

As the Urban Regeneration Company for Liverpool’s private sector and co-ordinate the activities and interventions of our public partners in creating a world-class City Centre, Liverpool Vision was delighted to be involved in the ‘Regeneration in Liverpool Symposium’. The event was a chance to share best practice, experience and gain a greater understanding of the aims and achievements of other regeneration and community organisations in Liverpool and Merseyside.

By bringing together a diverse range of public, private, voluntary and community organisations, Government Office North West helped to facilitate an important dialogue amongst partner organisations. The city and its main regeneration agencies have moved decisively into the delivery phase of its strategy. Liverpool Vision’s essential role is to harness the entrepreneurial energies of the private sector and co-ordinate the activities and interventions of our public partners in creating a world-class City Centre. In this sense Liverpool Vision is the custodian of ‘the big picture’, and the guarantor of a focussed and coherent approach that will deliver benefits and opportunities to all the communities of Merseyside.
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The report can be downloaded from the organisers' websites:

Friends of the Earth: www.foe.co.uk/campaigns/local_groups_and_campaigns/northw.htm
Government Office North West: www.go-nw.gov.uk
Liverpool Vision: www.liverpoolvision.co.uk
Merseyside Environmental Trust: www.metnet.org.uk
Liverpool City Council: www.liverpool.gov.uk
Liverpool Housing Action Trust: www.liverpoolhat.org.uk
South Liverpool Housing Group: www.slhfd.co.uk
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