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1. The wider context…

- Regeneration in England: more than 40 years of policies to address social and economic disadvantage in 'pockets' of urban deprivation

- via area-based initiatives (ABIs):
  - relatively small scale
  - additional resources to defined neighbourhoods for up to 5 years or so

- no attempts to move 'people out' of deprived areas cf US-Moving to Opportunity
Key ABIs have included…

- Single Regeneration Budget..running 1990s into 2000s -many hundreds of schemes- different sizes-different objectives

- Urban Development Corporations-13 or so 1980s to 2000s-to improve physical infrastructure e.g London Docklands

- Enterprise Zones: financial incentives to new (or more often relocating) firms
one trend community increasingly involved to….

- establish scale of problems
- work with local residents to achieve change
- leave a legacy after funding ceases
- try and boost social capital and community resources: make communities 'resilient'

- ‘Communities at the heart’ of this Programme
- 39 NDC areas: overseen by a resident-led board
- £50m each area: 10 year programmes with agencies
- to achieve change in relation to six outcomes:
  - 3 place: crime, community, housing and environment (HPE)
  - 3 people: jobs, education, health
NDCs designated ....

- across England-10 in London;
- all major cities other than Leeds received one
- all regions in England received at least 2
- on average 10,000 people in each NDC
- intensive, long-run intervention programme
Programme-wide spend and projects

- **1999-2008: £1.5bn**

Total NDC spend up to March 2008, by theme (excluding management and administration)

- Crime: £139m (10%)
- Health: £148m (11%)
- Worklessness: £167m (12%)
- Housing and physical environment: £427m (31%)
- Education: £236m (17%)
- Community: £248m (18%)

Total £1.5bn
## Key areas of spend in HPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Spend (£m)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition/demolition</td>
<td>£101m</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements/infra/buildings/landscaping</td>
<td>£88m</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes built (30k) / improved /maintained</td>
<td>£87m</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80% capital every pound levered in another 0.5£ from other sources. Many schemes run in conjunction with private developers.
What is the rationale for improving places?

- better, more integrated service delivery-more attuned to local needs
- 'shaping' places can help improve other problems eg mental health
- more attractive areas may improve economic activity
- enhancing social capital eg more people interested in decisions affecting local area
- sustain activity after regeneration funding ceases eg community assets
- but for HPE-great variation across 39-some minor management-others major refurbishment
3. Evaluation: 2001-2010

- Most intensive evaluation of any ABI in England..£25m
- Range of data collection/analysis tasks
- Including 4 household surveys: 2002, 4, 6, 8
  - 500/400 in each area in each wave
  - Created a panel in NDC areas
  - Same design in comparator areas.
Change for NDC areas and their residents?

These were very deprived areas in 2002:

- satisfied with area as a place to live: NDC residents 60%, nationally 85%
- satisfied with accommodation: 81% cf 91%

But varied considerably, in 2002:

- Islington (n London) £300k + house prices cf Manchester £20k
- satisfaction with area-42% in Liverpool cf 77% in Fulham (w London)

Tenure stable: Owners up 1% (2002-08) to 33%; social renters down 3% to 55%; private renters down 1% to 12%.
## Change HPE 2002-2008

- **For all 39 areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2008 %</th>
<th>change 02-08 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>area better last 2 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfied with area</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litter/rubbish problem</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speed volume traffic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with repair of home</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction with accommodation</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all changes significant 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change relative to benchmarks…

- comparator areas: as deprived in same LAD
- marginally greater house price rises
- and statistically significant higher rates of change for some 'area' indicators such as:
  - criminal damage
  - satisfaction with area
  - thinking area improved
- Far more change for place based outcomes cf people: education, health, jobs.
Area characteristics and change (bivariate analysis)

- Evidence from 39 places through time: identify factors associated with area-level change. A flavour of this:
  - more agencies on NDC boards more change
  - keeping senior staff..more change HPE
  - more spend on HPE greater change crime and jobs
  - tenure change not especially significant.
modelling (multiple regression)

- to give one example - satisfaction with area
- 65% variation (in 2008) across 39 NDC areas explained by:
  - proportion satisfied in 2002 - ve
  - single person households + ve
  - larger NDC populations + ve
  - type of NDC in 2002: more change in inner city areas
- factors over which NDCs had no influence!
Individuals through time: Multi-level modelling

- Created two panels: few statistically significant differences for similar individuals after key demographics + levels of deprivation in 2002.
- People change because of who they are—not where they live.
- But interestingly across all HPE indicators: 16% of variation can be explained by being in an NDC cf comp area—exceptionally high.
4. Some lessons

- HPE doesn't always sit easily with area-regeneration:
  - housing 'rebuild' schemes are far more expensive and complex than other initiatives
  - schemes gone ahead anyway?
  - take many years to 'finish'
  - raises complexities…(i) moving escalator? (ii) tenure (iii) objectives?
(i) 'Moving escalator'?

- Argument that ABIs will struggle because
  - better off leave taking benefits with them
  - to be replaced by more deprived households

- Mixed evidence here:
  - incoming populations not more deprived than 'stayers'
  - but those leaving tended to be less deprived (eg more likely to be in work) and left because of area/environmental factors
no decline in those wanting to leave…

- 39% in 2002 and in 2008-slight falls in comparator areas and nationally
- because many outmovers wanted bigger/better houses-difficult to do in short term
- but evidence that NDCs which spent more on HPE..
  - saw bigger reductions in those wanting to move.
(ii) tenure and gentrification

- Tenure patterns did not change a great deal, but may do so in the longer run.
- Some evidence that bigger decline in social rented accommodation at NDC area level means more positive changes in jobs and crime.
- But in some NDC areas, the narrative around tenure and gentrification...
…new housing = owner occupied housing!

- NDCs: not enough money (or inclination) to see housing as anything other than O-O residents: 'new housing' a vital outcome - benefiting existing residents..
- but especially in London new housing way beyond capacity of existing residents
- areas seeing more OOs may see better outcomes: health, education, jobs!
(iii) what should ABIs be trying to achieve with regard to HPE?

- Other outcomes much clearer cut: more jobs, less crime, better health, etc
- The 'PE' element easier: environmental improvements positively received e.g. 'area management projects' or area wardens'
- But housing per se more complex:
  - ABIs-limited resources
  - Subject to other agencies
  - Length of time involved
and is the intention to…?

- to improve all/some housing?
- for existing residents or potential incomers?
- to retain existing tenure pattern…
- or to change that-via new owner-occupiers?
- and how is 'success' measured?
  - fewer outmovers? More inmovers? prices? satisfaction with accommodation (always high anyway)?
Some references…

- All evaluation reports:
  - [http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/ndc_reports.htm](http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/ndc_reports.htm)
  - Recent papers:
    - 2010 Area-based regeneration partnerships and the role of central government: the New Deal for Communities programme in England (with C Beatty, M Foden and I Wilson) *Policy and Politics*, 38, 235-251
    - 2010 Linking interventions to outcomes in area-regeneration: the New Deal for Communities Programme in England (with M Foden, M Grimsley and I Wilson) *Town Planning Review*, 81, 151-171
    - 2011 Understanding the scale and nature of outcome change in area-regeneration programmes: evidence from the New Deal for Communities programme in England *Environment and Planning C; Government and Policy* 29, 520-532.