

Home Truths: the myth and reality of regeneration in Dundee.

Sarah Glynn

Institute of Geography,
School of Geosciences,
University of Edinburgh,
Drummond St,
Edinburgh EH8 9XP
sarah.glynn@ed.ac.uk



Copyright

This online paper may be cited in line with the usual academic conventions. You may also download it for your own personal use. This paper must not be published elsewhere (e.g. mailing lists, bulletin boards etc.) without the author's explicit permission

Please note that :

- it is a draft;
- this paper should not be used for commercial purposes or gain;
- you should observe the conventions of academic citation in a version of the following or similar form:

Sarah Glynn (2006) *Home Truths: the myth and reality of regeneration in Dundee.*, online papers archived by the Institute of Geography, School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh.

Home Truths: the myth and reality of regeneration in Dundee

This paper presents a case study of processes that are changing the physical and social fabric of Dundee, concentrating on the proposed demolition of the multi-story flats that, for over thirty years, have dominated the city's skyline. It begins with an overview of current developments in housing regeneration and governance before moving on to the specific example of Dundee. The empirical material falls into two parts. The first consists of a critical analysis of the council's housing plans, looking at the arguments given for the proposals (making use of material obtained under the Freedom of Information Act as well as documents more readily available), and also at the consultation process. The second part looks at the reactions and experiences of the tenants of the buildings, drawing on protracted participant action research with housing activists and tenants.

This case study tests some of the recent theories about the nature of regeneration under New Labour, and draws disturbing conclusions about the use of resources, the failures of local democracy and the impact of current policies on those with the least economic and political leverage.

In the summer of 2005, Dundee's chief planner told a public meeting about his vision for the city. He, himself, lives across the river in Fife, and he began by describing Dundee as viewed by a visitor arriving over the bridge, and the positive impact there would be on that view when the ugly multi-storey blocks were demolished and the largely barren riverside area was redeveloped. The demolition of the multis is hugely unpopular with the people who live in them, and any new housing in the riverside development will be focussed on attracting a new layer of middle class professionals. He could hardly have picked a better example if he had set out to demonstrate how the regeneration planning of a city can increase polarisation and consign whole sections of its population quite literally to the margins.

Dundee, the once generic industrial city whose council used to boast of having a higher proportion of public housing than Warsaw, is trying to reinvent itself, and it is doing this in part through seismic changes in housing patterns. This article looks at what this means for that large portion of the population who, whether or not they have a waged job, still make up Dundee's working-class core. The final section will look at some of the, often neglected, experiences of those at the sharp end of the new forces for change; but first I want to take a critical look at the arguments that are being used to drive these changes forward.

'Regeneration' is a term with a long history of abuse. Increasingly it is being used as the Trojan horse for an accelerating neo-liberal drive towards privatisation and marketisation that is transforming our towns and cities and our lives. The relentless logic of New Labour's 'modernisation', and its automatic dismissal of alternatives as naïve and old-fashioned, has penetrated many areas of academia; and potential resistance on the ground is being neutralised by carefully orchestrated partnership structures that co-opt grass roots organisations into the bigger project. Housing and land ownership ties up a huge proportion of Scottish and British assets, and housing privatisation is the biggest

privatisation of them all. This does not only involve the transfer of public housing to privately financed organisations. Housing policy is no longer focussed on the provision of homes for local people, but on the economic potential of the nation's real estate. Success is measured in the opportunities created for private developers to reap large profits, and different regions compete against each other to attract a new wealthier class of resident.

Housing policies in Scotland are devolved to the Scottish Executive, but they must work within a system where huge grants are made available by Westminster to promote favoured New Labour policies such as housing stock transfer. This generates a democratic gap, where both MSPs and MPs can avoid taking responsibility for what is happening, and blame decisions taken at the other level. However, it is unlikely that it has a significant impact on current policy, as the Scottish Lib-Lab coalition and British Labour government are speaking the same language. Public rented housing has played a hugely important role in Scotland. It accounted for over half of all Scottish homes at its peak in the late 70s¹, and was especially important in the industrial cities of Glasgow and Dundee, where, in 1981, it constituted 63% and 62% of homes respectively². These figures have been massively reduced through the policies of Right to Buy, stock transfer, and also demolition. The Scottish Executive blames past policy failures at local and UK level for generating a vicious spiral of decay and demolition in Scotland's municipal housing, citing bad initial planning, poor management, over-pricing of rents and government policies that limited borrowing for investment in housing and encouraged Scottish councils 'to sell their housing assets and not repay their debts'. And they observe:

Too often physical housing decay has been followed by demolition and demolition by unpaid housing debt. Unpaid debt with capital and interest to be repaid, with fewer tenants left to pay, means either rising rents, with no service increase, or reduced services, that is curtailing management and maintenance. But reduced management and maintenance then means higher vacancy rates, more abandonment and more demolitions.³

By 2002 (the figures quoted in the City Council's Financial Viability Study) public rented housing in Dundee was down to 26%, with a further 11% rented by housing associations⁴, and by the time the study was written in 2005 council housing was already down to 21%⁵. Social housing is still important, and the Executive acknowledges that 'research evidence shows' that for perhaps the poorest fifth of city households', securing adequate housing 'remains a critical shaper of household wellbeing and capabilities'⁶; however their attack on older welfare priorities is still increasing. Chik Collins has highlighted that a 'concerted effort is being made to intensify the application of the neo-

¹ Taylor and Sim (2000) p 187

² Scottish Executive (2003)

³ Scottish Executive (2003)

⁴ DTZ Pbeda (2005) p5

⁵ 15,638 out of 71,790 homes on the council tax register, Scottish Executive Statistical Bulletin, Housing Trends in Scotland: quarter ending 30 September 2005 Table 3

⁶ Scottish Executive (2003)

liberal agenda across Scotland',⁷ and he points out how the Executive's Regeneration Policy Statement, *People and Place*, takes its lead from a report by the Royal Bank of Scotland in promoting 'regeneration' as an opportunity for the growth of private business through the privatisation of public services.

Throughout Britain, regeneration is seen as necessary because huge disparities in wealth have left some areas struggling under multiple deprivation. Gough et al argue that poverty and exclusion are 'logical outcomes of capitalist societies' and 'social-spatial unevenness is... an intrinsic part of how the mechanisms of exclusion have their effect'. The social-democratic welfare state attempted to temper this, but the last thirty years have seen 'an offensive by capital to restore both its authority and its rate of profit'.⁸ The increasing marketisation of housing is an important part of this offensive, especially the Right to Buy policies and restrictions on public investment brought in by the Conservatives, which have led to the residualisation of council housing as poor housing for poor people. Attempts to redress exclusion are prompted, according to Gough et al, by fear of disorder, desire to improve the usefulness of the reserve army of labour, and in response to organised pressure from below.⁹ For New Labour it is the first two considerations that are paramount, and their social inclusion strategy 'accepts the main thrust of neoliberalism' and 'rejects the...universalist welfare state' but seeks to mitigate its worst excesses through piecemeal interventions.¹⁰

New Labour concepts of 'Neighbourhood Renewal' do move beyond the 'bricks and mortar' approaches of previous regeneration schemes, but are doomed to remain relatively ineffective so long as the major structural forces of neoliberalism remain unchecked. So, for example, basic training schemes ensure a ready supply of potential workers, but not well-paid jobs. Interventions are portrayed as examples of joined-up thinking, but political and geographical restrictions mean that they can only ever address the symptoms of what is going wrong, and not the underlying malaise. The consequent failures have been used to justify a new approach. If existing communities obstinately refuse to renew themselves, then they should be dispersed and replaced by a better class of people.

Through an analysis of the reincarnation of Newcastle, Stuart Cameron has shown how the ideas of people-focused community development that were trumpeted in the late nineties have come into direct conflict with new policies of housing-led regeneration. This new orthodoxy has little time for working with the people now living in the areas concerned. In fact, as Cameron explains,

[it] is not, in general, an approach that is directly concerned with the housing conditions or economic well-being of existing residents. It is an approach to regeneration which seeks to solve the problems of a locality through the introduction of a new, more affluent, population, rather than directly addressing and seeking to

⁷ Collins (2006) p10

⁸ Gough et al (2006) pp 139-40

⁹ Gough et al (2006) p 14

¹⁰ Gough et al (2006) p 3

solve the economic and social problems of existing communities and neighbourhoods.¹¹

At local and regional level, different areas are increasingly competing with each other to attract new home-owning residents. Gentrification as policy forms the basis of English plans for Housing Market Renewal, and although this phrase has not made an official appearance in Scotland, the ideas behind it are as strong north of the border as they are south. Attracting middle-class incomers – or ‘Fresh Talent’ is official Scottish Executive Policy.

This social engineering through housing policy has been promoted on the back of four main arguments: the problem of ‘low demand’, the desirability of ‘tenure mix’, the improvement of housing standards, and the need for ‘modernisation’.

Low demand housing has come to be seen as not just a symptom of area decline, but a cause of it that needs to be dealt with explicitly. Bramley and Pawson – key proponents of this argument - have suggested that under New Labour ‘there has been... greater openness in the housing profession about the problem of low demand’¹². Reasons for an area becoming unpopular are complex and it is difficult to isolate the effects of different possible causes. Bramley and Pawson suggest three principle reasons; demographic trends such as out-migration, changes in housing preference (especially away from social housing), and area stigmatisation¹³. None of these is straightforward. Even if we accept, as they do, that regional planning policies are no longer feasible¹⁴, and even if some out-migration is seen as unavoidable, what groups are leaving and how does this relate to need for different housing types?

‘Preference’ for other tenures, as opposed to social housing, is affected by the quality, cost and ease of availability of social housing. Social rent levels have risen dramatically, basic repair and maintenance has often been starved of funds, and waiting lists for good social housing can, nevertheless, be prohibitive. Meanwhile, Right to Buy and new schemes for ‘affordable’ housing have diverted public funds to subsidise home ownership, and housing benefit effectively subsidises private landlords in a growing private rental market. For those who can afford it there is an economic imperative to get a foot on the housing ladder, but it is arguable whether promotion of home ownership as the natural and desirable state is necessarily beneficial for all those affected. From the point of view of business, the responsibilities of a mortgage create a class of workers unwilling to step out of line and risk their jobs, but those workers may find themselves forced to accept poor pay and conditions without protest, and home ownership also makes it much harder to move in search of work, at a time when this is seen as increasingly unavoidable. Many of those who were persuaded that they could just afford to buy have found themselves crippled with maintenance costs or high mortgages that take no account of changes of circumstance. The Chartered Institute of Housing has now added its voice to the argument, expressing concern ‘at the way home ownership was

¹¹ Cameron (2006) p10

¹² Bramley and Pawson (2002) p 394

¹³ Bramley and Pawson (2002) p 396

¹⁴ Bramley and Pawson (2002) p 408

being sold as a route to greater social mobility'¹⁵. And as a corollary to the growth of home ownership, those with no choice but to rent can find themselves treated as an underclass.

Area stigmatisation is a different kind of problem, as it implies, not that homes are not needed, but that these particular homes are seen as undesirable. The reason for this may have little to do with the buildings themselves, and needs to be properly investigated in each case. Bramley and Pawson stress the importance of concerns about crime and anti-social behaviour, and these need to be understood and addressed in themselves. Otherwise we will see whole areas being destroyed because of a few troublemakers, while the problems are simply moved on elsewhere.

Arguments about low demand are increasingly being used to justify the diversion of investment away from the worst areas, which are seen as fit only for demolition¹⁶. In a report for the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, DTZ Piedad estimated that in England growing levels of demolition brought down around 40,000 (or 1% of) local authority homes between 1991 and 1997, and Bramley and Pawson predict a 'rapid increase' in demolitions - despite also admitting to the difficulty of predicting demand more than five years ahead¹⁷. The report for the ODPM records a significant net loss of dwellings, an even greater reduction in the amount of social housing, and a net shift from local authority social housing to registered social landlords¹⁸. Reasons given for demolition include reducing the stock of social housing and promoting tenure mix. Where housing renewal areas already extend over a mixture of tenures, then it is enormously cheaper to demolish public housing than negotiate compensatory packages for private owners¹⁹. In Scotland, around 26,000 homes were demolished in 1992 to 1997 inclusive, and demolitions continued at around the same rate with a further 29,000 being demolished in 1998 to 2005²⁰. The statistics do not give tenure, but most of this will have been public rented housing. In Dundee 6,615 homes were demolished between 1990 and 2000.

Tenure mix – and implied social mix - is often promoted simply as an unquestioned good. This is an idea with a long pedigree, but its current incarnation is based around the argument for area effects – that is that it is worse to be poor in a poor area than poor in an area of mixed prosperity. This is an idea developed in the United States, and Atkinson and Kintrea note that it is increasingly being accepted more generally, although there is little European empirical evidence to back it up²¹. They carried out a comparative study in two different areas in Glasgow and two in Edinburgh in 2000. It is difficult to isolate similarly poor households in different areas and they had to resort to using council

¹⁵ Report of Speech by head of policy, Merron Simpson, to a fringe meeting at the 2006 Labour Party Conference *Inside Housing 29 September 2006*

¹⁶ Bramley and Pawson (2002) p 412

¹⁷ DTZ Piedad (2000) p 1 and Bramley and Pawson (2002) p 412-13

¹⁸ DTZ Piedad (2000) p 3

¹⁹ Bramley and Pawson (2002) p 418, Lee and Nevin (2003) p 72

²⁰ The Scottish Office, Housing Trends in Scotland: Quarter Ended 31 March 1998, and Scottish Executive Statistical Bulletin, Housing Trends in Scotland: quarter ending 30 September 2005. The figures for the years that appear in both documents differ slightly and I have used the later and higher ones.

²¹ Atkinson and Kintrea (2004) pp 438-9

renting and low social class as proxies for poverty, so attempts at statistical comparison may not have been very meaningful. However, they found that the poorer areas did not conform to the model stereotype of an isolated and inward-looking place where criminal behaviour is normalised, though they did uncover a very strong belief that an address in an area with a poor reputation made getting a job more difficult.²² Even more interesting, was their follow up paper, based on interviews with local community workers of various kinds, which gave a more complicated and sometimes contradictory picture of both negative and positive area effects. Here, stigmatisation and discrimination, lack of useful external contacts and an aggressive territoriality are combined with, and set against, the benefits of sharing a similar socio-economic position with others in the neighbourhood, support of local friends and family, and sense of community²³. More unmitigated disadvantages arise from overloaded and under-funded welfare services, but these are problems that should be addressed directly and are more to do with how resources are allocated than area effects per se. There is little here to suggest that new wealthier neighbours would improve the lives of those in poorer areas, but the mantra of ‘tenure mix’ has become an important tool for those promoting the middle-classing of our city centres, and the normalisation of home ownership.

It is also noticeable that, despite the predisposition towards tenure mix, there is very little pressure to bring social rented housing into areas of private ownership (apart from some of the homes that developers have been obliged to provide as part of larger developments, generally south of the border). People who buy their homes do not want social rented tenants next door, not necessarily for social reasons but because of the effect on the value of their house.

One reason why arguments about tenure mix have come to the fore is the concentrations of poverty resulting from the residualisation of social housing and the push to move all those who are a bit more successful financially, into home ownership. This shows up statistically as an increasing proportion of those in social housing being on low incomes and benefits. It also removes a layer of people who might be best able to contribute to community life, and increases the division between those who can afford to buy into the new marketised system and those who cannot. While tenure mix will not break down this division - and only put pressure on social rented housing in desirable areas - the division would be addressed by a re-expansion of social rented housing to take in a wider range of people²⁴, and an end to the fetishisation of homeownership.

No-one would dispute the need for improving housing standards after decades of under investment, but the nature and limits of funding mean that the new standards are being used to force through stock transfers and demolitions, as councils are anxious to divest themselves of homes they cannot afford to improve. Rather than being a means of

²² Atkinson and Kintrea (2001) p 2290

²³ Atkinson and Kintrea (2004) P 451

²⁴ While there has been some discussion of opening up social housing to lower priority groups in areas of low demand, there is a danger that this will be used as a ploy to raise social rents and bring this housing into the market system. Bramley and Pawson (2002, p414) note that ‘This change will reinforce any policy push towards social rents moving towards a more market-like structure’.

improving council housing, the new standards are driving another nail in its coffin. Improvement targets force councils to turn to the bribe of housing-debt relief for stock transfer; and, with or without transfer, business plans increasingly depend on large-scale demolitions. Long overdue improvements to some homes will only be achieved through the total destruction of others.²⁵

Arguments about ‘low demand’ are still being used – not least in Dundee – but in interviewing regeneration practitioners in the North East of England, Cameron noted that the discourse around the policies was changing. He observed a new emphasis on the need for modernisation of housing stock and tenure to meet new aspirations.²⁶ This demonstrates a much more open adoption of the market agenda (and language), and it also obviates the need to prove lack of demand, allowing the renewal approach to be rolled out across much wider areas.

The implementation of these market-led policies is made easier through new forms of local governance that purport to be giving a greater role to local communities, but actually give increasing control of important decisions to unelected business ‘partners’ and to the target-setters of central government. Cameron contrasts housing market renewal with the idea of neighbourhood renewal, in which power is supposed to be devolved to existing residents. However, Mike Geddes, writing about England, has shown that far from giving real power to local people, structures erected in the name of neighbourhood renewal and community-led regeneration can tie people down in highly regulated bureaucratic processes, while the important decisions are made elsewhere. Indeed he criticises the whole move towards partnership forms of local governance as undemocratic and biased towards the needs of capital. He describes how scope for real political debate is restricted and the state is able to ‘maintain tight control over local institutions and actors who might challenge the hegemony of neoliberalism’.²⁷

...acceptance of the rules of the game by local residents commits them to structures and processes which often both disadvantage them... and which incorporate them within the apparatus of the state as much, and maybe more than they open up the state to citizens.²⁸

In examining the use of ‘community engagement’ in Scotland, Collins notes that the very term ‘is itself an import from the corporate world’, where it is used to describe a hearts and minds approach to carrying out business in a difficult environment; and he identifies a new twist to the incorporation of community groups. Using the example of the centrally organised ‘Community Voices Network’ Collins shows how years of frustration and anger at the running down of public services are being harnessed and redirected at the

²⁵ This point was raised in parliament in the debate on council housing held on 29th June 2005. Lynne Jones, Labour MP for Birmingham, Selly Oak, stated that: ‘The only way that the Government have any chance of meeting the decent homes standard without more resources is by demolishing a great deal of houses that are not decent. We now have a crisis, not only because of the condition of homes, but because of homelessness: hundreds of families are now in temporary accommodation. Hansard 29 June 2005, Column 427WH

²⁶ Cameron (2006) pp5-6

²⁷ Geddes (2006) p 93

²⁸ Geddes (2006) p 89

local authorities in order to help break down their resistance to the new changes; and he identifies a new willingness to encourage protest in order to exploit it.²⁹ Similar processes can be seen at work in the Scottish Executive's promotion of stock transfer as increasing 'community ownership' and 'tenant control'³⁰; and the emphasis on transfer as increasing tenant power is maintained despite mounting evidence to the contrary. (Even the Community Based Housing Associations, set up in Glasgow in the 1980s – which are often cited as an ideal example for stock transfer – have been criticised in the research literature for being largely led by their professional staff and being 'reliant on Scottish Homes [now Communities Scotland, an agency of the Scottish Executive] for almost every strategic decision'³¹.) The same spin can be seen in the promotion of registered and funded tenants' organisations under the 2001 Housing (Scotland) Act, which may initially make tenants' groups more pliant to local government, and may ultimately provide an instrument for bypassing the traditional mechanisms of local democracy in favour of greater control, not by tenants, but by Communities Scotland.

Most of these processes and forces can be seen at work in Dundee, and it is only when examined against this background, that current events in the city begin to make sense.

The renaissance of Dundee has been frequently heralded, and the council leader boasts of 'a remarkable transformation'³². But, as money is poured into the riverside showpiece, what is happening in the places where most people actually live? – especially in those areas that notoriously score so highly on standard disadvantage indicators such as life expectancy. What is the council doing towards, in its own phrase 'building stronger communities'³³?

Dundee is not – for the present at least – facing large-scale housing stock transfer. We have had partial transfers, but a city-wide tenants' consultation in 2004 voted 2 to 1 against proceeding with the full transfer process – despite the efforts of the Dundee Federation of Tenants' Associations, who had organised the consultation on behalf of the council. Their council-funded glossy magazine, delivered to all council houses, presented transfer as the only practical alternative, but the Federation has little connection to the majority of tenants.

However, almost as soon as the council had acknowledged the result of this consultation, it announced the next stage in its plans for the transformation of the city's homes. This involves the demolition of thousands of council houses – initially nearly 2,000, including multis in the Hilltown in central Dundee, and Menzieshill in the west end. According to council documents this is being done for three good reasons: 1. the housing is surplus – there is no demand for so much social housing, 2. the homes being demolished are unpopular, and 3. this makes economic sense, freeing up money for improving other

²⁹ Collins (2006) p12.

³⁰ Audit Scotland (2006) Introduction and Summary point 11

³¹ Clapham and Kintrea (2000) pp 548 and 556

³² Council Press release 4 July 2003

³³ Dundee Partnership Community Plan 2005-2010 p19

homes³⁴. The trouble is that none of these statements are supported by the evidence, which suggests that the opposite is the case every time.

The council defends its housing strategy by reference to a report it commissioned from the private consultants, DTZ Pieda. When Dundee tenants in some of the homes scheduled for demolition requested to see that report under the Freedom of Information Act, they were refused, on the grounds that disclosure of the methodology used would cause real harm to the commercial interests of the consultants. We finally had to extract it by appealing to the commissioners.

So what does the report tell us about the three good reasons for demolition?³⁵

First, let us look at demand. The report gives no data or arguments to support its claim that the ‘most likely’ scenario for Dundee is ‘population decline and social rent residualisation’³⁶. We know that Dundee has seen a fall in population³⁷ and also a decrease in average household size; but under this scenario the report predicts (without supporting evidence) that between 2002 and 2012 the total number of households in the city will fall by just 200 from 66,600 to 66,400, and that the number of households living in socially rented housing will fall dramatically by 5,386, from 24,642 to 19,256³⁸. The logic behind this claim needs to be made publicly available. This is a city with large numbers on low wages and on benefits, and an aging population, which would suggest the need for the provision of more, rather than less, social rented housing.

It is also noteworthy that the report simply ‘assumes’ that the number of housing association homes will rise from a current 6,400 to 7,700 (by 2008), and that the overall reduction in social housing will be made entirely from council housing stock³⁹. There is no basis given for this assumption.

The report also tells us that across the city only half the people who apply for a council house are actually allotted one. (Each year the council allots around 2,500 houses of which around 2/3 are new lets and 1/3 transfers.)⁴⁰ The number of people cancelling their names from the list is increasing⁴¹, but this could reflect frustration with a system that is

³⁴ See report by the Director of Housing to Dundee City Council Housing Committee, 21 June 2004 ‘Building Stronger Communities – physical regeneration in the council sector’. It was on the basis of this report that the council voted to consider the demolition of the multis discussed in this article and to declare them ‘at risk’. Similar arguments are still being repeated – see the response of housing convenor Councillor George Regan to my critical analysis of the DTZ Pieda report discussed below, as printed in the Courier 28th April 2006.

³⁵ Glynn (2006b)

³⁶ DTZ Pieda (2005) para 2.18-2.19

³⁷ Between 1991 and 2004 the population fell every year bar one, declining in total by 8.8% over the period (*About Dundee 2005*, Dundee City Council), however in 2004-5 net migration led to a reversal of this trend and a very slight rise in population (General Register Office for Scotland – Mid-2005 Population Estimates)

³⁸ DTZ Pieda (2005) para 2.18

³⁹ DTZ Pieda (2005) para 2.19

⁴⁰ DTZ Pieda (2005) para 1.12-2.13

⁴¹ DTZ Pieda (2005) para 1.15

not delivering, rather than falling demand. And the report acknowledges that ‘the Council is currently experiencing problems finding alternative accommodation for tenants living in properties that are likely to be scheduled for demolition’⁴².

Some areas and some homes are, of course, much more popular than others. But the report does not consider the option of improving the less popular areas and housing so that they could take the pressure off the over-subscribed areas⁴³. It is also significant that, as less popular areas are often more neglected, low demand can become an increasingly self-fulfilling label.

Further, the report notes that younger tenants (under 25) are disproportionately renting in the private sector (where they make up 42% of tenants) rather than the social rented sector (where they make up only 5% of tenants)⁴⁴. Our surveys in Hilltown and Menzieshill showed very significant dislike of the private rented sector (which is generally a much more expensive option, except for those on housing benefit), so we need to ask why younger tenants do not appear to be looking for social rented housing, and whether this reflects actual preferences, or difficulties in getting suitable homes in the social housing sector within a reasonable time-frame. Is there, in fact, a potential demand here that is being missed?

Crucially, and this point is so often forgotten, demand for council housing, or social rented housing more generally, is not a fixed number waiting to be discovered, but will increase if this housing is improved or otherwise made more desirable.

So much for lack of demand, what, then, about popularity?

Those who, for whatever reason, wish to dismiss the anti-demolition campaigns that have been taking place in Dundee are quick to characterise them as condemning tenants to poor quality housing that no-one wants. This is, of course, the opposite of the case. No-one is arguing for keeping the status quo, or for council tenants to make do with second-rate housing. Clearly, too, it is not appropriate to put families with young children in high flats; however, the high rise boom in the private market demonstrates that high buildings can provide much sort after homes if they are well maintained and looked after.

The DTZ Pidea report explains that less popular housing areas were identified through letting records and through more subjective assessment by council officers, and that this information was combined with the maintenance costs of different types of building, and various other factors, to determine which homes should be demolished so as to reduce the total number of homes roughly in line with the report’s projected scenario. Those homes to be kept (11,491 homes) were classified as ‘core’ stock, those deemed definite

⁴² DTZ Pidea (2005) para 3.49

⁴³ Recent research carried out for Angus Council has also found that rural areas north of the city are also over subscribed, with a clear need for more social rented housing (Angus Council, 2006: p2)

⁴⁴ DTZ Pidea (2005) para 2.9

candidates for demolition (3,290 homes, including 1,761 out of 2,357 multi homes) were classified as ‘surplus’ and others (2,250 homes) were described as ‘at risk’⁴⁵.

When it came to the multis, it seems that in fact it was maintenance costs that were the deciding factor. The report quotes an earlier consultants’ assessment of the multis as in ‘good condition’ with a likely minimum life of 30 years (subject to 5 yearly inspections)⁴⁶, but DTZ Piedad go on to note that ‘Very high costs are associated with the mechanical and electrical aspects of the multi-storeys and this includes lift replacement twice throughout the projected 30-year life.’⁴⁷ They do not consider the many savings in areas such as road maintenance, public transport and street lighting that are associated with high-density vertical living, and which could well significantly outweigh the cost of the lift. These costs will come out of different sections of the Council’s budget, but all, eventually, from the same pot. Similarly, the costs of the concierge and security systems need to be set against substantial savings in maintenance, as well as the less easily accounted benefits of reducing ‘anti-social behaviour’. There are also, of course, strong sustainability arguments in favour of a ‘compact city’ with minimal travel distances.

The rhetoric of ‘social inclusion’ demands the demonstrable involvement of local people to legitimise the changes in the eyes of the wider public, and reduce the potential for dissent among those affected. For the final decisions to demolish the various groups of buildings, the council’s housing officers presented the housing committee with a brief document that quoted both the DTZ Piedad report, and also, importantly, feedback from what was termed tenant ‘consultation’. This consultation process had been carried out very quickly, shortly after the possibility of demolition was announced. Tenants were asked to vote in a postal survey for or against demolition, without being given any background information about the reasons for the proposal, or any realistic idea what they would be offered instead – though they were told they would get £1,500 for moving. Although DTZ Piedad had already classed these buildings as ‘surplus’, council documents officially described them as ‘at risk’⁴⁸, a term that naturally led to assumptions that there must be structural problems; and although many people were sceptical, others assumed that they were being moved to be given ‘braw wee hoosis’. There was no time allowed for proper discussion or debate. This rushed process produced the desired majorities in favour of demolition, and councillors were able unanimously to agree the demolitions almost without debate. Despite an impassioned plea from tenants’ representatives and a packed gallery of protestors, the Hilltown demolitions were given the go-ahead with hardly a murmur of dissent from among the councillors, and 6 months later the fate of the Menzieshill Multis was confirmed in just 5 minutes⁴⁹.

However these decisions were followed by growing unease and anger among tenants, and in two of the areas, housing activists worked alongside tenant campaigners to produce

⁴⁵ DTZ Piedad (2005) para 2.28-2.41

⁴⁶ DTZ Piedad (2005) paras 2.23 and 2.25

⁴⁷ DTZ Piedad (2005) para 2.23

⁴⁸ 1,898 homes had been declared ‘At Risk’ by the Council Housing Committee on 21st June 2004

⁴⁹ The council meetings were held 18th October 2004 and 18th April 2005.

alternative independent surveys⁵⁰. These were able to give a more realistic assessment of tenants' views after anti-demolition campaigns had generated discussion of the issues in the media and in the blocks concerned, and there had been time for people to understand what was involved and the other options available.

The picture that emerged was very different from that portrayed by the council – and I think that the tenants involved in carrying out the surveys were themselves surprised at the extent of the opposition to demolition. Our surveys show that in the two Derby Street multis at the top of the Hilltown, 71% of people wanted to remain in the buildings. Only 18% wanted to leave - and several of those told us that they needed to find somewhere without stairs for medical reasons, or somewhere cheaper. Only 9% supported the idea of demolition. (We also found that 30% of the households said they had not received the council ballot paper on demolition.) In the five multis in Menzieshill, the results, though strong, were not quite so dramatic. This is probably due in a large part to three factors that all have implication for planning a future for buildings of this kind, and could all be solved with better maintenance and management. First, unlike in the Hilltown, these buildings do not have a 24-hour concierge system, and this had major implications for security and problems with neighbours. Second, these buildings house several families with young children, who, unsurprisingly, want to move somewhere with access to a garden, and third, some of the flats have damp problems and there are, of course, no plans to over-clad the building, which would remedy this. There were also several people living in the multis while working in temporary contracts at the nearby Ninewells Hospital. Nevertheless, we found that 47% wanted to stay in the multis, compared to 43% who wanted to move, and that 64% were opposed to the idea of demolition, compared to 22% who supported it (with support for demolition dropping to 11% if the buildings were properly repaired and maintained). And, importantly, 77% wanted, whatever happened, to remain in the area. This is unsurprising as around half had other family members with homes in Menzieshill, but will not be possible as there is little housing available.

The two areas surveyed were both reasonably well maintained, but even in an estate that is less well sited and has become palpably run-down and neglected, such as the four 30 flat multis in Foggyley Gardens in Lochee, it is difficult to talk about unpopular buildings per se. Similar buildings in nearby Dryburgh Gardens, where a housing association has been able to invest money in improvements and maintenance, provide much sort after homes.

In all the areas targeted for demolition, some people have, of course, been glad to move – especially those who had previously been turned down for a transfer and now found themselves at the top of the housing queue, and there were others for whom it was of no great importance, but in both of the areas surveyed there was a core group of tenants who did not want to leave their homes. The surveys demonstrate how widely held that feeling was, and the depth of attachment felt by many was clear at the first public meetings, when anger at what was happening made it difficult to hear what was being said. Some of these people had been in the buildings for many years, such as Betty and Jim who moved

⁵⁰ Glynn (2005) and Glynn (2006a)

into a top flat in the Menziesshill multis when they were first built. Betty told the Menziesshill meeting that when she left 'it would be in a wooden box'; but it has not only been long-term or older residents who have been reluctant to give up their homes. Liz, who was one of the group who organised the Hilltown survey explains that she and others just love living there. 'Are we going to greet [cry] when they knock this down? Yeh. I'm going to be oot the country... Cos I think it would break my heart if I drove past it when they were knocking this down... I think a lot of people that's in this multi would feel that way, ken?' And there are good reasons for her enthusiasm: 'It's quiet, peaceful, beautiful view, you've everything at your feet when you walk out of the door there. What else could you ask for?'⁵¹

So much for unpopularity. Perhaps, then, despite all the fine talk, it is simply a case of money. Here the figures produced by DTZ Pineda really are quite startling for anyone not familiar with the huge public subsidies involved in privatisation.

The report's financial model predicts that if the council were to demolish large numbers of homes over the next ten years, the combination of demolition costs and lost rent income would mean that for at least the next twenty years the council's housing department would have even bigger debts (though finances would be better 30 years on)⁵².

In a separate, and even more telling, calculation, DTZ Pineda calculate the public subsidies that would be needed to balance the books, and ensure all housing is brought up to the new Scottish Standards, under different scenarios. Their baseline figure, with no demolition, is £89M. If the council were to demolish 4,630 homes this would rise to £121M, and on top of that there would be another £60M of grant subsidy for 1,350 new housing association homes subsidised at 60% of construction costs – giving a staggering total of £181M (and a net loss of 3,280 social rented houses). If demolitions were increased to 7,390 homes, the costs rise to £128M, with a £185M grant for 4,100 new homes, or a grand total of £313M⁵³.

Demolition, according to the figures used by the council, is a hugely more expensive option than repair and improvement. *But*, these vast sums of money would not have to come from council funds; they would be paid by the Scottish Executive. In other words, a critical examination of a report that we weren't meant to see, demonstrates that public money is being used to subsidise extravagant and unpopular policies on the basis of groundless assumptions.

The way housing expenditure is geared towards government subsidy has made it unnecessary for improvements that would not attract subsidy even to be properly considered and costed. When tenants in the Derby Street multis were told that their homes did not comply with the new housing standards, one of them challenged the council to say what was needed, as the only obvious problem for those living there is a

⁵¹ Interviewed 28th July 2006

⁵² DTZ Pineda (2005) para 3.50

⁵³ DTZ Pineda (2005) para 4.27

poorly conceived heating system. In reply, he was sent heat-loss measurements from other multis of different construction, and told that insulated cladding would cost ‘up to £2 million per block’⁵⁴. Besides new heating, he was informed that the building needed rewiring (which is relatively inexpensive) and new bathrooms and kitchens (for which there seems no pressing demand from the tenants). The council claims that improvements to the multi-storey flats would cost, on average, £30,000 per unit – as opposed to an average cost of £11,000 per unit for the homes it intends to retain⁵⁵ - but it is difficult to account for these figures. The biggest cost for the multis would indeed be recladding, assuming this is always necessary; however the experience of Glasgow suggests costs would average at around £1.3m per multi⁵⁶, or £11,600 a flat⁵⁷. It is also worth noting that the estimated costs of demolition and site reinstatement, combined with the cost of re-housing, averages at £6,317 per flat⁵⁸. And while new insulation standards have been brought in for reasons of energy conservation, responding to them with programmes of demolition and new construction is hardly the best way to preserve energy or resources.

The short- termist policies that arise from the council’s need to divest itself of all property requiring expenditure, are demonstrated on a much smaller scale by the fate of a walk-up block in Douglas following a fire in one of the twelve flats. This was one of a row of ten identical blocks, and there was no suggestion of any problem with the others, however the cost of repairing this block was estimated at £116,600, with a further £156,720 for bringing the building up to the new standards. The council voted to demolish the building at a cost of £71,500, rather than pay an extra £16,818 per flat and have 12 good quality homes⁵⁹. The wasteful demolition of 84 four-in-a-block houses in Charleston was even condemned by a local developer, who had wanted to take them on as a commercial proposition⁶⁰.

The council’s housing strategy document for 2004-2009 gives a short-term (5 year) target of just 98 new social rented units in the Hilltown. On the sites where over 900 council houses in the multis and adjacent buildings now stand, there are tentative proposals for 300 ‘mixed tenure units’, and the report gives a 30-year target of 250 units. In Menzieshill, the short-term target for social rented housing is 90 units. The council ‘would welcome proposals for social rented development following demolition of [the] existing buildings’ provided housing associations ‘can fund [the] land value’⁶¹ - but this is prime land close to the hospital. It was always clear that if demolition is allowed to go

⁵⁴ Letter from the Head of Housing to Tom Black, 28th November 2005

⁵⁵ Letter from the Chief Executive of Dundee City Council to the author 1st September 2005

⁵⁶ This is the cost that has been given for recladding the 120 flat Yoker multi (see Glasgow Housing Association press release, 5th September 2006. The eleven multis in the Hilltown and Menzieshill have an average size of 112 flats

⁵⁷ This is not very different from the cost of cladding other homes, which the council has done for an average of £10,000 each (Dundee City Council, Home Energy Conservation Act Fourth Progress Report 2003-2005). Although multis have obvious problems of access, smaller wall areas per home along with economies of scale could account for this.

⁵⁸ Letter from the Chief Executive of Dundee City Council to the author 1st September 2005

⁵⁹ Dundee City Council Housing Committee 18th April 2005

⁶⁰ The Courier 5th September 2006

⁶¹ Dundee City Council *Local Housing Strategy*, pp 25 and 27

ahead in the Hilltown and Menzieshill, only a fraction of those tenants having to leave their homes will be able to be accommodated in low-rise buildings in the area: these plans demonstrate a willingness to allow that fraction to be even smaller. An internal council discussion document on affordable housing, leaked to housing activists in the summer of 2006, demonstrates how closely events in Dundee conform to the patterns of gentrification and marketisation outlined at the start of this paper. The document presents the development of private housing on the demolition sites in the Hilltown and Menzieshill as improving the quality and choice of *private* housing in the city, and as bringing ‘regeneration benefits through encouraging more balanced communities with more diversity of tenure’; and it also points out that it will generate more income for the council⁶². No account is taken of the views of existing tenants being forced to leave their homes, for whom these are ‘fancy houses for somebody else to buy on my plot’⁶³. The document also notes that registered social landlords are ‘reporting difficulties in competing with private developers to acquire land... for new housing development’ and that ‘[t]here is a danger that RSLs are only able to secure land in locations that are least attractive to the private sector’. This leaves little hope for new social housing in Menzieshill, and suggests that those who require such housing will increasingly be pushed to the margins of the city. Finally, the document notes a rise in buy-to-let and private renting in the city – making nonsense of the council’s claims (which the paper repeats) of falling demand for social rented homes. We can expect to see more tenants having to rely on the private rented sector, which, of course, is itself heavily subsidised through the mechanism of housing benefit.

To make sense of all this I have attempted to draw up a balance sheet for the different players involved, beginning with the Scottish Executive. Housing-led regeneration forms a major plank in the Executive’s privatising agenda and an important boost to what are thought of as key players in the Scottish development and finance industries. Investment in construction can be seen as beneficial at many levels, but for the same amount of government money, this privatised system produces fewer homes, and bigger profits for the developers. The Executive is encouraged in this path by the availability of very substantial grants from Westminster, for example for housing debt relief conditional on stock transfer, but it is a willing partner.

For the city council, demolition means saving on the cost of refurbishment, which would be greater than the loss of rent, and it releases valuable city centre and west end sites that can be sold to private developers to raise revenue. Any new social housing built by housing associations to replace the demolished homes would receive government subsidies not offered to the council. It is also hoped that new private houses built on these sites would contribute to attracting a new middle class to the city, boosting the economy and tax base, but in this Dundee is competing with other cities following similar policies. The plans being pushed forward would also result in a huge net loss of social rented housing and an even greater loss of housing under direct council control. Good value decent housing would no longer be available for a sizable section of the electorate, and a hugely valuable asset, built up over generations, would be dissipated. The council may

⁶² Dundee City Council (2006)

⁶³ Interview with Liz 28th July 2006

find itself presiding over an even more geographically divided city, with those on low incomes banished to the periphery.

And what about the tenants? What is happening affects not only tenants in the buildings scheduled for demolition, but many other existing and would be tenants, as the number of houses available decreases and people whose homes are to be demolished move to the top of the housing queue. It will also have knock-on effects on private rentals and first time buys.

The casework for Dundee's MPs and MSPs exposes the crisis in Dundee's housing, with examples of incredible overcrowding and people being stuck for months in temporary accommodation because there is no-where for them to move to⁶⁴. For those with particular housing requirements the wait may be as long as 18 months.⁶⁵ The city's homeless unit is becoming increasingly overwhelmed, not only because Scottish homelessness legislation is relaxing the rules that restricted who local authorities had to find accommodation for, but also because many people are no longer getting homes through the mainstream waiting list. Families staying with friends and neighbours, but looking for their own home, lose out in competition with those being re-housed from temporary accommodation and from the buildings threatened with demolition, until worsening circumstances or desperation force them to declare themselves, too, potentially homeless.⁶⁶

The shortage of homes for those with limited mobility is already severe, and people are stuck upstairs in upper floor tenements, while level-entry multi flats stand empty waiting demolition. The case of Gladys Storrier made newspaper headlines. Gladys and William Storrier and their daughter and grandchildren lived in council-owned tenements not far from Derby Street. They were moved temporarily into a ground floor flat when their second floor flat next door was rewired, and for the first time in years, Mrs Storrier, who can only walk with a frame, was able to go out of the house. The difference this made to her life and her health was enormous, and the family asked to stay in their 'decant'. Their request was refused, and after months of legal wrangling, which appeared to take no account of public petitions or her doctor's warnings, the family was evicted, and Mrs Storrier, bedridden with worry, was physically carried out into the close. The council's hard line can be explained by a fear that there are many others for whom a move to ground floor accommodation would make a vital difference – and if they were seen to be responding once they would be inundated with similar requests.

Some of those forced to move from the buildings scheduled for demolition will find themselves in better homes, or grow to like new areas, but often they will also end up paying higher housing association, or even private, rents and service charges. Service charges are not covered by housing benefit, and if benefits are being given to cover high rents, then that can put tenants into a poverty trap where they cannot afford to take on a,

⁶⁴ Meeting with Shona Robison MSP and Stuart Hosie MP (both Dundee East) 6th October 2006

⁶⁵ Interview with director of the Council's Homeless Unit, 31st October 2006

⁶⁶ Interview with director of the Council's Homeless Unit, 31st October 2006

generally low paid, job. Others have gone to other multis in the city, and several people have a housing history of moving from flat to flat ahead of different regeneration schemes. People are being put under a lot of pressure, which encourages them to accept places they may not be happy with, in areas where they have no links, for fear of something worse. There are many stories of people who regret having moved and who miss their multi – the security, location, friends, generous sized rooms and, of course, the views.

The sense of security in a multi with a full-time concierge, as in the Hilltown, is frequently commented on – not least by the council, whose website still extols the advantage of this system even as it is dismantling it (including the comment that ‘there is now a waiting list for some of these blocks, when once they had empty properties’⁶⁷). A good concierge system is able to deal with problems quickly and in a low key way. One of the Hilltown concierges commented, ‘It’s like you could be a social worker, financial advisor, you name it, you are it... It’s a combination of everything. ’Cos you build a relationship with the tenants, you see.’⁶⁸ This could be a model for the kind of community policing that is often proposed for troubled estates, but it is being run-down as the buildings empty out, and tenants will find nothing similar elsewhere.

Although there are new homes being built in the Hilltown, this is a slow process, and there will be never be any-where near as many as are being demolished. This means that many people will be forced to move to other areas and away from a place that is walking distance from the city centre, with many services on the doorstep and others just a bus ride away. It would be hard to replicate this anywhere else. Liz’s description sounds almost poetic:

You’ve got the doctors, dentists, coropodists, supermarkets, pubs
- if you want to go there - and hairdressers. There’s butchers,
bakers, candlestickmakers, and you cross the road and there’s
even undertakers.⁶⁹

At Menzieshill, where there is no sign of new building, there is a busy community centre just at the foot of the blocks, where activities range from youth groups to the modern sequence dancing classes at which Betty is a regular attender. And of course the flats are very convenient for anyone who works at the adjacent Ninewells Hospital. The demolitions will mean a substantial reduction in low-cost rented housing in the centre of the city and in the west end, so that many existing tenants, and also new tenants looking for social housing, will find themselves in peripheral estates, away from the services they are used to, and often with few services altogether.

At the time the multis were built, slum clearance schemes were accused of destroying communities. Now another generation of linkages is being pulled apart. In most places today, community ties are not seen to be as strong as they were at that earlier time, but that does not mean that they are not there, or not important. There are several families

⁶⁷ www.dundee.gov.uk downloaded 20th October 2006

⁶⁸ Interviewed 18th August 2006. He also emphasised that they did not take on responsibilities for which they were not trained

⁶⁹ Interviewed 28th July 2006

with two or even three generations living in different flats in the same multi, and many people, as our Menzieshill survey demonstrated, who have other family members in the area. There are also long-term friends. The Hilltown concierge quoted earlier, was especially concerned about those who lived on their own and relied on each other for company:

There is life long pals in the multi... There was a clique of sort of alcoholics, like bachelors that have maybe gone on hard times... there has been 3 or 4 of them where I work have voiced concerns about when the multi comes down they're frightened about being split up and what. The sort of last 20, 25, 30 years they've lived together, visited each other's flats... like a big community. Now they're wondering what's going to happen.⁷⁰

And there are examples of more traditional community organisation: before the building started to empty out, one of the Menzieshill multis held such a boisterous pensioners' Christmas party that complaints were made to the police about the noise.

The condemned buildings were designed to more generous space standards than many homes built today, as people have realised when they have had to sell their larger furniture on moving out. And the views from many of the flats would make an estate agent drool. One of the tenants in Alexander Street, in the middle of the Hilltown, described the view from her windows as something 'money couldn't buy', but in a time when high flats are increasingly being built as luxury homes, perhaps she is wrong. The only disagreement among the tenants about the views, is whose is the best.

The consultative vote organised by the Tenants' Federation indicated that a substantial majority of Dundee tenants are opposed to stock transfer, which recent ballots in other areas have shown to be a deeply unpopular policy. However, the proposed demolitions will result in a substantial reduction in the city's council housing, without the chance of a vote. As a local trade unionist put it, it's not even privatisation by the back door, it's by the front door⁷¹.

Those who thought that moving would take them away from anti-social neighbours may be in for a shock. They may have simply exchanged one anti-social neighbour for another; and, of course, their old neighbours have moved too, and taken their problems with them. In fact they have often been the first to accept the money and go. Households relocated to the award-winning regenerated Ardler 'Village' have found their new location the subject of frustrated letters in the local paper chronicling violence and drug abuse⁷², and one of the respondents to the Menzieshill survey noted that the flat they had been offered 'is upstairs from [a] drug dealer'.

Although £1500 for moving can seem a lot to someone with few possessions and no investment in their home, many people have spent significant sums and many hours of their own labour on improvements. Flats can be in a depressing state when they are first

⁷⁰ Interviewed 18th August 2006

⁷¹ At a meeting of Defend Dundee Council Housing

⁷² Evening Telegraph 18th August 2006 and 27th September 2006

let, and, like anywhere, some are better cared for than others, but, to quote the concierge again, some ‘are like five star hotels’⁷³. To reproduce what they have got now, elsewhere, will cost them large amounts of time and money, for which there is no compensation beyond a derisory £150 decoration voucher (which has to be spent all at once).

Moving itself is always stressful – even when it is our own choice to move. A sense of powerlessness and inability to control events is known to increase stress. This is particularly unsettling for older people – of whom there is a disproportionate number. It has been shown that taking older people away from the places with which they are familiar can have serious affects on their psychological – and consequently physical – health. Already we have heard about older people being made ill with worry. And as the buildings empty out, there are growing concerns about vandalism. People are beginning to find themselves the only ones left on an otherwise empty landing. The vital concierge system is being cut to the bone, and the four multis in the middle of the Hilltown are having to rely on a single concierge station in place of the current two⁷⁴. There are no longer landing checks and tenants try not to think what would happen if someone was to light a fire in an empty flat⁷⁵

In the longer term, others living in these areas may also suffer. The people who live in the multis form a large proportion of the people who use local shops, schools, health centres, bus services and community organisations. If large numbers of people are forced to move out of an area, many of these things, the things that are at the heart of a healthy community, may no longer be viable.

The multis may not be pretty, and many of their inhabitants may not fit the new image of the ‘City of Discovery’, but Dundee is their city. The new Dundee that is planned to greet visitors coming over the bridge will conceal a very different world, out of sight on its peripheral estates.

This is not happening without protest, but the angry defiance of the first months is increasingly being replaced by a bitter resignation as tenants come to realise that no-one with the power to influence events appears to be listening. Those who are pushing forward the plans for a new Dundee may be winning this war of attrition, but we need to be aware that all these changes are happening with little research into their impact on those most affected - who are generally also those with the least economic and political leverage. As academics we have a duty to expose the realities behind government claims, and we also need to work much more closely with those at the receiving end of government policy to discover, and publicise, what is really happening.

⁷³ Interviewed 18th August 2006

⁷⁴ Housing Committee Minutes 20th February 2006

⁷⁵ This point was raised in my discussion with the MP and MSP

Bibliography

Angus Council (2006) Report no 1154/06: Sidlaws Housing Needs Research – Research project report

Atkinson, Rowland and Keith Kintrea (2001) ‘Disentangling Area Effects: Evidence from Deprived and Non-deprived Neighbourhoods’ *Urban Studies* 38:12 pp 2277-2298

Atkinson, Rowland and Keith Kintrea (2004) ‘Opportunities and Despair; It’s All in There’: Practitioner Experiences and Explanations of Area Effects and Life Chances’ *Sociology* 38:3 pp 437-455

Audit Scotland (2006) *Council housing transfers* (Edinburgh: Audit Scotland)

Bramley, Glen and Hal Pawson (2002) ‘Low Demand for Housing: Incidence, Causes and UK National Policy Implications’ *Urban Studies* 39:3 pp 393-422

Cameron, Stuart (2006) ‘From Low Demand to Rising Aspirations: Housing Market Renewal within Regional and Neighbourhood Regeneration Policy’ *Housing Studies* 21:1 pp3-16

Clapham, David and Keith Kintrea (2000) ‘Community Based Housing Organisations and the Local Governance Debate’ *Housing Studies* 15:4 pp533-559

Collins, Chik (2006) ‘“The Scottish Executive is open for business”: The New Regeneration Statement, the Royal Bank of Scotland & the Community Voices Network’ *Variant* 26 pp10-13

DTZ Pida (2000) *Demolition and New Building on Local Authority Estates*, summary of report commissioned by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, downloaded from <http://odpm.gov.uk>

DTZ Pida (2005) *Dundee City Council – Financial Viability Study Phase 2: Final Report*

Dundee City Council *Local Housing Strategy* (for 2004-2009)

Dundee City Council (2006) ‘Affordable housing and housing choice issues in Dundee’, consultation paper

Dundee Partnership Community Plan 2005-2010, Dundee City Council

Geddes, Mike (2006) ‘Partnership and the limits to local Governance in England: Institutional Analysis and Neoliberalism’ *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30:1 pp 76-97

- Glynn, Sarah (2005) Ed. 'More time for Butterburn and Bucklemaker Courts? The tenants' survey'
- Glynn, Sarah (2006a) Ed. 'Views from the Menzieshill Mulits: The tenants' survey'
- Glynn, Sarah (2006b) 'The Report They Didn't Want Us to See: an analysis of DTZ Peda's report on Dundee's council housing' for Defend Dundee Council Housing
- Gough, Jamie, Aram Eisenschitz and Andrew McCulloch (2006) *Spaces of Social Exclusion* (Abingdon: Routledge)
- Lee, Peter and Brendan Nevin (2003) 'Changing Demand for Housing: Restructuring Markets and the Public Policy Framework' *Housing Studies* 18:1 pp 65-86
- Scottish Executive (2003) *A Review of Scotland's Cities – The Analysis* Section 4.3.5 'Housing Tenure: Changing Social Housing' (downloaded from www.scotland.gov.uk 22/9/06)
- Sim, Duncan (2004) (Ed) *Housing and public policy in post-devolution Scotland* (Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing)
- Taylor, Mary and Duncan Sim (2000) 'Social inclusion and housing in the Scottish parliament: prospects?' *Critical Social Policy* 20:2 pp 183-210