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The Urban Problem
‘Regeneration’: correcting market failure

- Regeneration: ‘the broad process of reversing physical, economic and social decline in an area where market forces will not do this without intervention.’ (House of Commons, 2011)
Urban Policy 1960s

- Rediscovery of urban poverty
- Racial tension
  - Enoch Powell (1967) speech “Rivers of blood”
- Social pathology approach
- Managed by Home Office
Urban Policy 1970s

- Problem = structural economic decline
- The *Urban Programme*
  - Public partnership approach
  - Managed by Department of the Environment (DoE)
Urban Policy: 1980s

- **Ideology**
  - the “enterprise culture”

- **Objective**
  - “to make our inner cities places where people want to live and work, and where the private investor is prepared to invest his money” (Heseltine, 1980)
Urban Policy: 1980s

- Logic
  - business leadership
  - physical development
  - wealth creation
Urban Policy: 1980s

- Examples
  - Enterprise Zones
  - Urban Development Corporations
  - Estate Action
  - Housing Action Trusts
Urban Policy: 1980s

- Private sector role
  - Direct profit
  - Corporate social responsibility
  - The ‘business case’
Urban Policy: 1990s

- Ideology
  - pragmatic response to problems of 1980s: fragmentation, narrow focus, exclusivity
Urban Policy: 1990s

- Challenge funding
  - competition
  - partnership
  - targeting
  - comprehensive regeneration
  - time limited
  - output monitoring
Urban Policy: 1990s

- Examples
  - City Challenge
  - Single Regeneration Budget (SRB)
Urban Policy: 1990s

- Stock transfer
  - Large Scale Voluntary Stock Transfer (LSVT)
  - Estates Renewal Challenge Fund (ERCF)
Urban Policy: ‘New Labour’

- The Third Way: The end of ideology?
  - Reconciling neo-liberalism and social justice?
Urban Policy: ‘New Labour’

- Logic of Third Way urban policy
  - Supply side intervention
  - Local intervention
  - Partnership
  - Participation
  - Public investment
Urban Policy: ‘New Labour’

- Examples
  - Neighbourhood renewal
  - Urban renaissance
  - Sustainable communities
The Coalition Government

- Pre-election 2010
  - The ‘nasty party’?
  - Detoxifying the Conservative brand
- Post-election 2010
  - Deficit reduction / economic growth
‘Zombie’ neo-liberalism

‘The brain has apparently long since ceased functioning, but the limbs are still moving, and many of the defensive reflexes seem to be working too. The living dead of the free-market revolution continue to walk the earth, though with each resurrection their decidedly uncoordinated gait becomes even more erratic’. (Peck, 2010)
Coalition government urban ‘policy’

Coalition government urban ‘policy’

- Local Enterprise Partnerships
- Enterprise Zones
- Tax Increment Financing
- Regional Growth Fund
- New Homes Bonus
The ‘Big Society’

Work. Dishes. Dressing the kids. Now he wants you to run the school and hospital as well.

What exactly will he be doing?
Current regeneration discourses

• ‘Area based initiatives may have an important role to play in public good provision (e.g. better parks, lower crime) but they have not, on average, improved individual economic outcomes in target areas … Overall, policy should focus on encouraging labour market activity and removing barriers to mobility’ (Overman, 2011).
Current regeneration discourses

- ‘The expectations of previous regeneration initiatives have led many people to say that ‘they did not work’ because they failed in their aim to narrow the gap. Long-term strategies are needed which are realistic about how much change is likely to happen’ (Crowley et al, 2012)
Britain’s public finances

“I am afraid there’s no money left. Kind regards and good luck. Liam.”

Liam Byrne 2010
Local government expenditure reductions (2010/11 – 2014/15)

- Average grant reduction (cash terms) – 28%
- Average grant reduction (real terms) – 40%
- Schools – marginal cash increase, reduction after inflation
- Capital expenditure reduction – 67.5%
Local government cuts
(Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2012)

- Biggest losers: Liverpool, Manchester, Knowsley
- Smallest losers: Richmond upon Thames, Wokingham, Windsor and Maidenhead
- Explanation
  - Grant dependence of poor authorities
  - Cessation of specific programmes
Conclusions

• Changing stakeholders
• Changing priorities
• Poorly defined objectives
• Uneven results
‘It took a riot’!

- ‘It took a riot: No sentiment was more frequently expressed to me during my time in Merseyside. There is no escaping the uncomfortable implications’ (Michael Heseltine, 1981)