

ISAIA 2019

by Katerina Isaia

Submission date: 30-Aug-2019 07:21PM (UTC+0100)

Submission ID: 110390691

File name: 41787_Katerina_Isaia_ISAIA_2019_1064837_2020616176.pdf (1.02M)

Word count: 13384

Character count: 78482

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON
FACULTY OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT
BARTLETT SCHOOL OF PLANNING

What are the conditions under which social housing estates residents can retain their homes after a planned redevelopment scheme?

Aikaterini Isaia
MSc International Planning
September 2019

Being a dissertation submitted to the faculty of The Built Environment as part of the requirements for the award of the MSc International Planning at University College London:

I declare that this dissertation is entirely my own work and that ideas, data and images, as well as direct quotations, drawn from elsewhere are identified and referenced.

23 August 2019

Main body word count: 10,120
Appendices word count: 2,042

Contents

List of tables and figures	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
Abstract.....	4
1. Introduction	5
2. The context, impacts and alternatives for council housing redevelopment	7
2.1 The context of council housing redevelopment	7
2.2 The negative impacts and controversies of council estate redevelopment	9
2.3 Alternative models and practices	11
3. Research Methodology	14
3.1 Case study selection and examination.....	14
3.2 Analysis and evaluation of the redevelopment process.....	14
3.3 Qualitative analysis of documents and news articles	15
3.4 Interviews and questionnaires.....	15
4. The two redevelopment schemes.....	17
4.1 King Square Estate redevelopment.....	17
4.2 Northwold Estate redevelopment	18
5. The conditions which facilitated the retention of council homes by their existing residents.....	20
5.1 The development components	20
5.2 Planning Requirements	22
5.3 Resident and key stakeholder involvement.....	26
6. Conclusion.....	30
6.1 Summary of findings	30
6.2 Policy recommendations	31
References	33
Appendix A – Questionnaire sent to Council officers and Guinness Partnership.....	35
Appendix B – Questions prepared for resident interviews.....	35
Appendix C – Interview/Questionnaire invites and responses.....	35
Appendix D – Risk Assessment Form	36

List of tables and figures

Table 5.1 Key redevelopment components.....	14
Table 5.2 Planning documents and policies that informed the redevelopments.....	16
Table 5.3 Summary of consultation processes.....	18
Figure 4.1 King Square Estate: plan and photo of new development.....	12
Figure 4.2 Northwold Estate: plan and render of future infill development.....	13

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my dissertation supervisor Dr. Claire Colomb for her invaluable insight, guidance and help throughout my dissertation writing. In addition, I would like to thank all the participants to my research gathering who dedicated time to responding to my questionnaires or attending an interview. Their input in my evidence gathering has been significant.

Abstract

Council estate redevelopment in London has been increasingly resulting in the displacement of existing residents. Local authorities in London have been facing the challenge of maintaining and expanding their housing stock within a narrow budget, affected by the different central government welfare state agendas since the 1980s. As a consequence, a large amount of social housing stock has been transferred to Housing Associations (HA's) and other Registered Social Landlords in order to carry the financial burden of maintaining the buildings' standards. This housing stock privatisation has resulted in many cases to the demolition and redevelopment of the estates, leading to the displacement of existing residents. The research aim of this dissertation is to analyse the conditions under which the residents of social housing estates can retain their homes after a planned redevelopment scheme. To address this aim the redevelopment schemes of King Square Estate and Northwold Estate were selected because they retained their existing residents. This dissertation has analysed the key redevelopment components, the planning framework that shaped them and the degree to which residents were involved in the decision making process. Evidence was gathered through the study of relevant planning briefs, policies, consultation reports and news articles, as well as through interviews with estate residents and completed questionnaires by Council officers and a development manager. This research concluded that the conditions that can facilitate the retention of existing residents after redevelopment are the Council being the owner and developer of the estate, a Borough and local level policy framework that resists the demolition of existing social housing stock and the frequent and transparent resident consultation that shapes the final decision making of the redevelopment.

1. Introduction

London is a city where the use and appropriation of the valuable and scarce land has been continuously contested by the different classes (Watt, 2013). Local authorities have been selling off publically-owned land to private developers in order to raise funds for their budget which has been suffering from central government cuts and to stimulate new private housing construction. Especially in London, land values have been rising steeply and many council housing estates on valuable land have been sold off by local authorities to developers for regeneration. Such schemes are usually public-private collaborations that resort to the (partial or full) demolition of council estates, on the ground that they are not fit-for-purpose. The new estates feature private and affordable housing, but in many instances they do not provide an equal amount of social rented housing as previously existed on the site. As a result, after the redevelopment, the estate is largely inhabited by new middle-class residents while many of the previous lower income tenants are displaced elsewhere due to housing unaffordability.

Numerous council estate demolitions have taken place in London and still do, which trigger the residents' fear of being priced-out and displaced and leads to their opposition. The Heygate and Aylesbury Estates regeneration schemes are two highly controversial schemes where 'state-led gentrification' dispersed the existing communities (Lees, 2014). Such cases attract public attention and result in their extensive coverage in news and academic research. The causes and effects of many council estate redevelopments and demolitions have, by now, been documented and analysed thoroughly: the consequences of profit-driven public-private partnerships from council housing demolition are now apparent.

The less documented and researched forms of council housing redevelopment are the ones that do not follow the 'demolition and gentrification' route. Such cases can offer invaluable insight into how the residents of council estates managed to remain in their communities and negotiate the redevelopment schemes to their advantage. Therefore, the research aim of this dissertation is to analyse the conditions under which the residents of social housing estates can retain their homes after a planned redevelopment scheme. In order to achieve this aim, a series of objectives will be addressed. The first objective comprises of a review of the existing literature on the context of council estate redevelopment, the negative outcomes and 'state-led gentrification' arising, and the possible alternatives to avoid the residents' displacement. The second objective seeks to examine two recent council estates redevelopment schemes in London, which have retained their existing residents. For this purpose, the cases of King Square Estate in the London Borough of Islington and

Northwold Estate in the London Borough of Hackney have been selected. Both redevelopment schemes have been initiated in the last four years, have involved minimal demolition and have resulted in the retention of existing residents. The third objective is to analyse the parties involved and the processes that took place in the course of finalising the redevelopment plans and decisions. The fourth objective involves the evaluation of the redevelopment conditions that enable the existing residents to retain their homes and the final objective is to produce policy recommendations for the 'displacement-free' redevelopment of social housing estates.

The next chapter details the findings of the literature review on the context, outcomes and alternatives of council estate redevelopment in London. This is followed by a chapter presenting the methodology adopted in order to achieve the research aim. Chapters 4 and 5 comprise of the presentation of the selected redevelopment schemes and the examination of the conditions under which existing residents can retain their homes. The last chapter of this dissertation summarises the findings of the research and proposes policies for the 'displacement-free' redevelopment of social housing estates.

2. The context, impacts and alternatives for council housing redevelopment

2.1 The context of council housing redevelopment

The first objective of this dissertation is to investigate the context of council estates' redevelopment in London, the negative outcomes and controversies encompassing the topic and the possible alternatives to avoid the residents' displacement. There is a rich source of academic research regarding the drivers of council estate redevelopment in London in the past 40 years, influenced by the different political parties in power and their welfare state agendas.

London's land has been increasing in value due to the rising housing demand and scarce supply, transforming housing into an expensive commodity. At the same time, the council housing stock has been declining in terms of both quantity and quality. Since the 1970s peak of 28,000 new built social-rent housing in London, showing the past importance of the Keynesian Welfare State, the construction and maintenance of council housing have been largely neglected since. Specifically, the amount of households renting from a Local Authority in London saw a decline from 23.4% in the 1990s to 17.6% in the 2000s (Watt, 2009 b). Conservative, New Labour and Coalition Government policies, have contributed to the decline of Local Authority rented housing and the rise of Registered Social Landlord (RSL) rented housing (Watt, 2009 a).

In the 1980s and 1990s the Conservative Governments attempted to expand their electorate through 'popular capitalism' by privatising the council housing stock (Field, 1997). Under the 1980 Housing Act, the Right to Buy scheme was introduced by Thatcher's Conservative Government which drastically downsized the Local Authority housing stock, by offering tenants mortgages and market price cuts to enable them to buy the property they rented and not replacing the lost social housing stock. During the 2000s the subsequent New Labour Government attempted to restore the quality of council housing through the Decent Homes initiative. New Labour's flagship scheme, the New Deal for Communities (NDC), was an Area Based Initiative to address poor housing conditions, overcrowding and the supply of social housing, and identified ten NDC's in London. Two of the options available to Councils to choose from in order to achieve the standards set by the Decent Homes, were transferring stock to a RSL and setting up an Arm's Length Management Organisation (ALMO).

The first option led to the rise of large-scale voluntary transfers of council housing stock to housing associations (HA's) as a way to fund the ageing stock's refurbishment to the Decent Homes

Standard, which resulted in RSL's increasingly renting social housing (Watt, 2013). HA's can be described as independent and non-profit organisations, which provide social rented housing below market rates. They are hybrid organisations with characteristics from both the public and private sectors. The significance of their private function has increased since the 1988 Housing Act, under which the sources of finance available to them to build new stock were heavily based on private sector loans and strategic investments (Mullins and Murie 2006 in Watt, 2009 b). Until the summer of 2007 68,000 dwellings had been transferred to RSL ownership in London. Hall (2007) presents two successful cases of council estate redevelopment by HA's in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, one in Bow and one in Poplar. Both cases utilised private finance to an extent to fund the planned redevelopment, while at the same time being democratic in their decision making. In 1993 three council estates of 1,585 dwellings in Bow were transferred to the Tower Hamlets HAT (THHAT) in order to regenerate the estates and the wider area and ensure efficient housing management. The housing stock suffered from obsolescence and deterioration. Due to a shortage in funding, the THHAT entered into a partnership with Circle 33 Housing Association and together established Old Ford Housing to cover the remaining funds for the scheme. The housing renewal began in 1995 and the first homes delivered in 1996 were built to a generous standard of dwelling size. The process of drawing up the masterplans heavily involved the residents through meetings and surgeries for consultation. Albeit the result of the redevelopment was almost all of the existing stock to be demolished, the THHAT also managed to maintain the existing communities by rehousing households in the new development. The second case is the transfer of seven estates of 6,360 units in 1997 to the Poplar Housing and Redevelopment Community Association (HARCA) following resident ballots. The aim was to encourage investment, develop housing and promote local participation. With an initial negative housing value of £53 million, the HARCA needed a dowry from the Estate Renewal Challenge Fund (ERCF), as well as secured loans from Abbey National and BNP Paribas. Private finance was easy to acquire due to the high demand for housing in East London. By the time the redevelopment was completed in 2002 all housing was categorised as 'decent'. The outcome of the scheme was the demolition of 10% of existing stock, the building of additional 500 units and the refurbishment of all remaining, while retaining existing residents. These examples showcase how HA's had to instrument different means of acquiring funds due to the limited options available to them. Using market-oriented strategies did not lead to a profit maximisation strategy and assisted in the retention of all existing residents. Nonetheless, as will be discussed in the next section, sometimes HA's resort to a purely profit-oriented approach towards raising finance, with detrimental effects on the residents, including their displacement.

The other option available to Councils was the setting up of ALMO's to upgrade the housing stock

to a two or three star rating to secure additional public funding. ALMOS's are semi-autonomous bodies delegated to manage the stock. Ownership stayed with the Council and the tenancy tenures remained unchanged (Pawson, 2007). Despite their advantage of separating strategic functions, ownership and management, ALMOS's had limited access to finance and thus had restricted power in merely managing the stock without building new. Despite Councils being able in theory to retrieve control of management once compliance with the Standards was achieved, there were many anti-transfers campaigners who feared that ALMO's would inevitably lead to a full stock transfer and ultimately privatisation (ibid.). Hence ALMO's were not as extensively established as the HA's stock transfers in the Councils' effort to upgrade an aging housing stock.

The existing difficulties were accentuated in the years that followed. In the aftermath of the global financial crisis, in 2010, the newly formed Coalition Government proceeded with the devolution of economic and social responsibilities to the local level, without an equivalent devolution of power. Centrally determined austerity and welfare cuts left the local authorities making decentralised decisions within a narrow budget. This forced the local government to rely more on local sources of income, i.e. the sale of local assets, local reserves and alternative revenue sources (Gray and Barford, 2018). Namely, the Emergency Budget drastically reduced subsidies towards new council housing building with a reduction from £6.8 billion in 2010 to £2 billion by 2015. Consequently, the successive government reforms since the 1980s have left cash-strapped Councils trying to find alternatives to maintaining their social housing stock and led to the transfer of a significant amount of Local Authority housing stock to RSL's.

2.2 The negative impacts and controversies of council estate redevelopment

As explained in the previous section, council housing redevelopment has been managed increasingly by HA's and HAT's which have resorted to market-oriented fund raising. In many instances these actions have led to the displacement of the existing lower working classes by middle professional classes resulting in state-induced gentrification (Watt, 2013). Watt (2009 a) discusses the flagship schemes of Clapham Park Estate NDC in Lambeth and Ocean Estate NDC in Tower Hamlets to elaborate on the effects of stock transfers to non-profit HA's, including housing privatisation and estate demolition. Lambeth Council, in order to meet the Decent Homes Standards, preceded to partial housing stock transfers to Clapham Park Homes Housing Association to tackle the extensive deprivation facing the Clapham Park Estate. In spite of the anti-transfer campaigns, the HA proceeded in 'demolishing half the estate, privatising the rest and building nearly 1,500 luxury flats' in order to fund the remaining flats' repair, resulting in the eviction of a

large number of residents (Watt, 2009 a p. 237). Similarly, Tower Hamlets Council and the Ocean Estate NDC sought the funds needed to refurbish the flats by transferring stock to Sanctuary Housing Association. The anti-transfer campaigns led by residents, highlighted their fears of home demolition, their displacement and loss of community networks. Eventually, the transfer led to the demolition of council housing, the building of private luxury flats and resident displacement, which made evident that profit from the private property market, was the redevelopment driver instead of the provision of more decent affordable housing.

The Aylesbury Estate in Southwark is an infamous case of urban injustice. Built between 1967 and 1977, by the 1980s the Estate had become a place of disrepair and therefore, was awarded a NDC status in order to be regenerated. Since then, its residents had become victims of misinformation. In 2001, Southwark Council proposed a stock transfer to a HA, which was voted against by the residents. Following this result, the Council tried to persuade the tenants that the Estate was in such poor condition that its demolition and redevelopment was more cost-effective than its refurbishment (Lees, 2014). The Council and the NDC made significant efforts in portraying the Estate as a 'sink estate', promoting negative publicity around the Estate's physical state and safety in order to influence public opinion and endorse its demolition. Lees (2014) reveals the tenants' positive experiences in their estate which are largely different to the image of decay presented by the NDC. Another discrepancy with reality was the degree of tenant participation. Southwark Council asserted that a group of resident representatives were consulted and informed regularly, but at the same time the ballot's result against the estate's demolition was ignored. Claims of creating mixed communities by improving the physical space were used as a social engineering practice to displace current tenants and attract middle-class residents. This would lead to the displacement of 20% of residents and the pricing out of leaseholders who bought properties under the Right to Buy. The residents were essentially given a 'false choice' between their estate's demise and gentrification (Lees, 2014). Nonetheless, the Aylesbury Tenants and Leaseholders First had clearer views; the wholesale demolition should not be the solution, the Council should not be selling off its assets enhancing them instead, and the means to redevelopment should be examining each block's refurbishment. The Aylesbury Estate highlights the negative effects of redevelopment resulting from misinformation, poor resident engagement and a profit-driven HA.

Lees and Ferreri (2016) examine the case of the Heygate Estate, in the London Borough of Southwark, which was completed in 1974 and only 30 years later was marked for demolition in a plan to regenerate the wider area of Elephant and Castle. Home to 3,000 residents with 1,212 council and leasehold flats, the Council had neglected the maintenance of the Estate and started

the process of evacuating the flats, depicting Heygate as a 'failed estate' to shape public opinion that demolition was the only solution. Secure tenants were forced to find alternative housing within the Borough through a bidding process, while non-secure tenancies were terminated. The leaseholders were promised a zero-cost exchange of housing within the Borough but later this was transformed to shared ownership while the few residents left on the estate were forced out by Compulsory Purchase Orders. During the period 2010-2013 residents engaged in active resistance against the Estate's demolition. The Elephant Amenity Network was formed by residents and other interested parties in order to demand open masterplanning and community inclusion for a more democratic redevelopment process. The network organised regular meetings and a 'visioning' workshop and produced the 'Imagining the Elephant' report following public consultation. The network mobilised the expertise of professionals from planning to architecture, and created publicity around the Estate. This effort could not reverse the determined demolition, but was aiming at ensuring adequate social housing numbers in the redevelopment. The Council's attempts to portray the Estate as nearly vacant during the eviction period were met by the residents' initiatives to occupy open spaces with allotments and organised public events. The new development eventually gained planning approval despite its inadequate affordable housing provision (25% instead of 35% which is the Council's policy) which triggered peaceful resident protests that attracted the attention of the media. The Heygate Leaseholders Group was founded in order to defend the rights of the remaining few residents and oppose to gentrification. Despite the ultimate demolition of Heygate, the organised efforts of residents exposed the misinformation of the residents and became a symbol of resistance to displacement.

Due to cases like the above, throughout London stock transfers have been met with resistance from estate residents, led by the Defend Council Housing campaign. From 1992 to 2007 one third of transfer ballots resulted in a 'no-vote' ballot, which stemmed in the residents' concerns around rent unaffordability and security of tenure.

2.3 Alternative models and practices

In order to address the negative impacts arising from council estate redevelopment, numerous good-practice or opposition guides have been compiled to inform residents, Councils and developers. The *Anti-Gentrification Handbook* (2014) compiled by the London Tenants Federation, Just Space and other contributors, provides a guide to residents facing the redevelopment of their estate on how to act and what alternatives are available to them. The Mayor of London's *Good Practice Guide to Estate Redevelopment* (2018) sets out the principles of good estate redevelopment

which involve the transparent engagement and consultation with the residents, the net increase in affordable housing and the Right To Return. The *Refurbishment and Demolition Community Toolkit* (2015) has been created by the UCL Urban Lab and Engineering Exchange to help social housing residents question the decisions made about their estate, make a case for refurbishment and seek professional advice. The anti-displacement guidance can be categorised into the main actors driving the process; residents on one side and councils and developers on the other.

Social housing residents can utilise local policy to their advantage. The policies outlined by the Localism Act 2011 are supportive towards neighbourhood planning which provide 'community rights' to estates' residents to create their own vision for the wider area and build their own homes. Based on this, the first alternative discussed in the *Anti-Gentrification Handbook* (2014) is Community Planning, presented through the example of Carpenters' Community Plan. Carpenters Estate was being faced with redevelopment by Newham Council in 2013 through the demolition of half the estate's buildings. Just Space and London Tenants Federation were commissioned to compile a community-oriented plan, which put forward the refurbishment alternative to demolition, argued through economic, social and environmental costs. The Community Plan showed evidence of a strong community and constituted a material consideration for assessing the planning application for the Carpenters Estate. This led to the creation of the Greater Carpenters Neighbourhood Forum and a legally recognised Neighbourhood Plan, which gave the community the power to shape development of the estate and the wider area.

Furthermore, the *Refurbishment and Demolition Community Toolkit* (2015) provides guidance to residents on making a case for refurbishment as an alternative to demolition. TRA's are advised to compile a social, economic and environmental analysis quantifying the impact of a potential displacement of the residents. Factors like time periods and distances to measure relocation, CO2 kilograms to measure environmental impact of longer travel and cost estimation of refurbishment, are proposed.

In both the Mayor of London's guide and the *Anti-Gentrification Handbook* Councils and developers are prompted on the necessity of resident involvement in shaping planning applications. Residents must be engaged from the onset of the proposal and given opportunities at different stages to develop the design and delivery of a redevelopment scheme. Communication must be transparent, extensive, responsive and meaningful. Examples of engagement methods are surveys, votes, door-to-door conversations, workshops, steering groups and newsletter updates. Councils and HA's must give the opportunity to residents to select an independent tenant and leaseholder advisor (ITLA)

paid for by the landlord, so as to advise and support them in the decision making process. The Mayor's guide also supports the engagement with the owners of local businesses who will be impacted by any future development and ensure to minimise their disruption. Resident Charters are written commitments of Councils' and HA's towards the residents, and must be set out at the beginning of discussions.

After examining the research around the topic of council estate redevelopment, it becomes apparent that there is a rich source of findings on the political and regulatory factors that have shaped the way in which estate redevelopment happens, as well as the displacement and gentrification effects in many cases. Nonetheless, the different alternatives of estate redevelopment that do not lead to the displacement of existing communities need to be further researched. Hence, the research aim of this paper is to analyse the conditions under which the residents of social housing estates can retain their homes after a planned redevelopment.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Case study selection and examination

In order to explore the conditions under which housing estate redevelopment can result in the retaining of the estate's existing residents, the cases of King Square Estate in Islington and Northwold Estate in Hackney have been examined and analysed. The selection of these estates was influenced by their mention as 'success stories' in retaining their residents on the *Architects for Social Housing* website, which monitors estate redevelopment in London. In addition, as an employee at Islington Council, it has been easier to gather information for an Islington housing estate.

Northwold Estate was purposely chosen from a different London Borough in order to study the processes of different local authorities. The two estates had different developers and freeholders of land, in one case the HA and the other the Council. In addition, the funding sources available to each developer were different as well as the initial reasons for redevelopment. All these differences provided a different point of view in examining estate redevelopment and the way each factor impacted the final result.

Both estates comprise of a similar scale and tenure split of social housing flats and have been targeted for redevelopment in the last four years. In both cases, redevelopment has or will take place with only minimal demolition. Instead, the alternative of infill development has been preferred, resulting in the absence of resident displacement. Therefore, these two case studies have provided valuable insight into the processes and decisions that helped avoid estate demolition and retained the existing communities. Information for both schemes was collected from the redevelopment Planning Brief and the Contract Award for King Square Estate and the Planning Statement for Northwold Estate.

3.2 Analysis and evaluation of the redevelopment process

After outlining the two selected council estate redevelopment schemes, it was essential to gain insight in the processes that took place for the completion of the schemes. The analysis has been organised into three main categories:

1. The components that made the redevelopment possible: In order to understand the key components of the schemes, the parties involved and their roles were identified, including the

planning authorities, the freeholders of the land and the developers. Further information was gathered on the funding sources used and the reasons for the redevelopment schemes.

2. The policy requirements that informed the schemes: The policy framework that shaped the redevelopment from a Borough-wide level to a local plan level was studied.
3. The degree of resident and other stakeholder consultation by the Councils and developers: The study of resident and other stakeholder consultation included the opportunities for participation, the chains of communication and the degree to which their views have been taken into consideration.

3.3 Qualitative analysis of documents and news articles

The documents used to collect this information for the King Square Estate in Islington are the Planning Brief, the Contract Award, the Use of Right to Buy Receipts, the Core Strategy, the Development Management Policies, Finsbury Local Plan (Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan), the Section 106 Agreement, the Consultation Report, the Planning Review and the Pre-Application Meeting Report. The documents studied for Northwold Estate in Hackney include the Planning Statement, the Core Strategy, the Development Management Local Plan, the Draft Stamford Hill Area Action Plan and the Statement of Community Involvement. News articles from Hackney local news websites (Hackney Gazette, Hackney Post, Hackney Citizen) were also consulted to reflect on the controversial reasons for redevelopment as reported during relevant times.

3.4 Interviews and questionnaires

In order to gain further insight, a representative group of people (residents, Council, Guinness HA) was contacted to secure an interview or the completion of a questionnaire (Appendix C). An e-mail was sent outlining the purpose of this dissertation and asking for an interview or the completion of a questionnaire to discuss their experiences and views of the redevelopment. Some parties preferred to answer the questions (Appendix A) via email: an Islington Council New Homes Development Projects Manager, the Hackney Council Affordable Housing Project Manager, Neil Cleary, and a Guinness Housing Association Ltd development manager. One interview was conducted after contacting the TRA of King Square Estate, and two interviews through the Save Northwold Campaign of Northwold Estate. As preparation for the interviews a list of questions was prepared specifically targeted to the experiences of residents (Appendix B), but throughout the interviews some questions were skipped or new ones added depending on the flow of the conversation.

The research involved a degree of ethical risk due to the nature of data collection. In order to mitigate such risks the parties were given the right to be interviewed anonymously and no disclosure of sensitive information, like names and employment, took place without receiving the interviewees' informed consent. Before the beginning of the three interviews the participants were asked whether they consented to the interview being recorded either in audio recording or in writing notes. One participant agreed with being recorded and the other two preferred my taking notes. All participants expressed the wish to stay anonymous. All records of the interviewees have been disposed of after the completion of this research.

4. The two redevelopment schemes

4.1 King Square Estate redevelopment

Moreland Primary School is a key community resource located within the King Square Estate in Bunhill Ward, Islington. Islington is the freeholder owner of both the school and the estate. In 2010 the Council started exploring how the educational opportunities in the area could be improved, based on concerns about Moreland School over the existing teaching facilities, the number of vacant school places and the standards of education. Following community consultation and a demand assessment, it was agreed to reduce the school places of Moreland School to 30 per year and to build new school premises. The lower student intake meant a reduced new building footprint and thus a surplus of developable land, which led to the Council's decision to dedicate this land surplus to new housing and add to the existing 470 council flats (373 tenancies and 97 leaseholds) (Islington Council, 2012).

The redevelopment scheme was granted planning approval in April 2015 with the scope to build six new housing blocks on five infill sites. The scheme was divided into two phases to deliver a total of 140 new homes, with 67% social rent, 3% shared ownership and 30% private housing, a community centre, a nursery, new landscaping and public realm improvements. Phase one took place in 2016-2017 and delivered 47 social rent units, partly on surplus area and partly through the demolition of Turnpike House (Flat No's 3 -11). The nine units demolished included three leasehold properties which have been re-purchased (completed 15 October 2015) and six tenanted properties whose residents have already been rehoused with the right to return to a dwelling within the estate. Phase two was completed during 2017-2019 and was developed mainly on surplus garage areas and surplus education land (part of the Moreland School site that was appropriated for housing purposes). Phase two delivered 93 new units; 47 social rent, 4 shared ownership and 42 private housing. Overall this redevelopment retained all existing residents on the estate. On top of the retention of existing communities, the redevelopment delivered 94 social rented units which will greatly contribute to the Borough's affordable housing need (Executive Member for Housing and Development, 2017).



Figure 4.1 King Square Estate: plan and photo of new development (Pollard Thomas Edwards)

4.2 Northwold Estate redevelopment

Northwold Estate located in the Cazenova Ward is currently owned by the Guinness Partnership Housing Association, after its housing stock was transferred from Hackney Council to the local housing association Clapton Community Housing Trust in 1999, which was later subsumed by the Guinness Housing Association in 2009. The Estate comprises of 580 flats, 117 leaseholds and 462 tenancies (Rolfe Judd, 2019). Despite the lack of proper maintenance to the estate in the last 15 years by the HA, all buildings are fit-for-purpose, according to the residents (Snaith, 2018). In 2016, the Guinness Housing Association announced its decision to redevelop Northwold Estate in order to “provide more homes and create mixed communities” as per a developer manager at Guinness. The three options proposed were full demolition, partial demolition and infill development. These options have been highly contested by residents, especially the proposed plans considering full demolition. As at August 2019, the redevelopment has not yet commenced, but the final plans are nearing completion with most major decisions including the infill development selection and the housing tenures already made (Rolfe Judd, 2019).

According to the latest planning submission, the redevelopment will involve the demolition of Brierley House, a community building and a redundant garage block. 73 new homes, with a split of 23 social rent units, 14 shared ownership and 36 private, will be constructed, as well as a new community centre, communal amenity space, the provision of a new children's play space and public realm enhancements throughout the Northwold Estate. Redevelopment will take place within seven infill development sites utilising previously developed land, cleared land, available land and vacant or underutilised spaces. Brierley House only comprises of two homes; one private and one social rented. The two flats to be demolished will be replaced within the scheme and have been designed to address the existing residents’ needs. The social rent flat marked for demolition is not included in the affordable housing provision calculations and is considered a straight replacement of

the existing housing block under the same lease agreement (Rolfe Judd, 2019).



Figure 4.2 Northwold Estate: plan and render of future infill development (TM Architects)

5. The conditions which facilitated the retention of council homes by their existing residents

The findings that emerged from the research aiming to identify the conditions under which social housing estates' residents can retain their homes after redevelopment, can be categorised into three sections; the development components, the planning requirements and the resident and key stakeholder involvement. The development components comprise of the estate ownership structure, the developer of the schemes and funding sources. The planning requirements entail the policy, regulation, Local Plans and the Section 106 agreement that shaped the nature of the redevelopment, being legally binding. The resident and key stakeholder involvement is comprised of the opportunities for participation, the chains of communication and the degree to which residents shaped the final decision making.

5.1 The development components

The first pillar to examine in order to understand the conditions that facilitate the retention of council homes by their residents is the key components of the redevelopment scheme, i.e. the ingredients that render the redevelopment possible. As illustrated in Table 5.1 the components that shaped the development schemes are the estate owners, the developers, the sources of funding, the construction contractors and the reasons for redevelopment.

Development Components	King Square Estate	Northwold Estate
Planning authority	Islington Council, Planning Department	Hackney Council, Planning Department
Freeholder of land	Islington Council	Guinness Housing Association Ltd
Developer	Islington Council, Housing Department	Guinness Housing Association Ltd
Construction contractors	Higgins Construction Plc	Guinness Development Ltd
Funding source	Sale of private housing 1-4-1 RTB Other sources	Sale of private housing GLA grant
Reason for redevelopment	Surplus land in the estate	Provision of more housing, buildings of deteriorated standard

Table 5.1 Key redevelopment components

The freeholder owner of the King Square Estate and Moreland School is Islington Council. The reason for the planned redevelopment was the freeing up of new surplus land on the estate as a result of the school redevelopment (Islington Council, 2012). Islington Council being the owner of the estate made the decision, after public consultation, to redevelop the site through infill development to provide more affordable housing. According to a new homes development project manager, "the housing blocks were already in good state of repair thanks to good maintenance by the Council". This combined with the fact that the Council is not a profit-making developer the demolition option was never considered. This is a fundamental reason why the residents were safe from displacement from their homes.

Islington Council being the Statutory Planning Authority was responsible for determining all planning applications made for the redevelopment independently of its other function of being the developer. The Council commissioned Higgins to be the construction contractor for phase one, following the official procurement process, and depending on their performance they would be commissioned to complete phase two hence providing incentive to deliver high quality results. Moreover, the Council has a duty to remove or minimise disadvantages and take steps to meet residents' needs, and therefore a Resident Impact Assessment was carried out to safeguard the residents' interests. The findings of the RIA identified that there would be positive impacts on people living in the existing and new dwellings and the immediate neighbourhood (Executive Member for Housing and Development, 2017).

As a developer the Council assumed the entire cost of development of £55m. In order to raise the funds for the redevelopment, various financing sources were used. The receipts from the open market flats sales raised £30m. This income was complemented with £11.1m from 1-4-1 Right to Buy receipts, which is Council income from the purchase of social housing flats from their residents and can be used by the Council to fund the provision of social housing (Executive Member for Housing and Development, 2018). The remaining redevelopment cost was covered by borrowing, Revenue Contribution to Capital Outlay and other capital receipts (Executive Member for Housing and Development, 2017).

In the Northwold Estate redevelopment scheme the freeholder and developer is Guinness Partnership, separating the roles through two different legal entities; one for the registered provider of social housing and one for the development of homes. The initial reason for redevelopment is twofold. Guinness asserted that the aim was to "provide more homes and create mixed communities" but also to "rectify the deteriorated buildings", as confirmed by the affordable

housing development manager at Hackney. The second reason was a major source of conflict between the HA and the residents. One resident contested that the HA “deliberately neglected the maintenance of the estate to make it harder to live in and make a better case for demolition”. This argument has been denied by the HA who stated that they have invested a significant amount of funds in the estate, including £1.1m in 2016 (Barratt, 2017). Despite this allegation, the state of repair of the estate does not validate a one million investment, according to residents interviewed. In addition, refurbishment as a redevelopment option was never considered by the HA, which alludes to the profit considerations of the developer. Since the redevelopment scheme has not received planning permission yet, there is no official evidence on the funding sources. However, for other developments undertaken by the HA the main sources of funding have been the income from the sale of flats to the private market and funding from the Greater London Authority (Guinness Partnership, 2019).

In the King Square case the Council was the planning authority, freeholder of land and the developer. This led to a better alignment of the Council’s targets for affordable housing in the Borough and the vision’s realisation by the in-house developer. Profit considerations were not a barrier towards delivering the maximum amount of affordable housing. Also, the good maintenance of the buildings helped eliminate any demolition prospects. The King Square Estate case shows that when a Council possesses the necessary funds, it can deliver high quality, displacement-free redevelopment, with greater flexibility in achieving its affordable housing targets and more negotiating power in selecting a good construction partner. On the other hand, Northwold Estate’s maintenance had been largely neglected by the HA for a few years preceding the redevelopment which considered to demolish at least part of it. Demolition is not necessarily linked to displacement; however the multiple examples of gentrified redevelopment in London indicate that there is a high displacement risk associated with it. The HA being a limited liability company had to weigh in the profit aspect when considering different redevelopment options, which could have resulted in the selection of the (partial) demolition option. Nonetheless, the ultimate decision depended on more than one factors, namely the planning framework and the resident involvement in decision making, which ultimately led to the infill development option, as will be discussed in the following sections.

5.2 Planning Requirements

The redevelopment schemes of the King Square and Northwold Estates consulted various policy documents and were shaped by the Local Plans and a Section 106 agreement. Table 5.2 summarises

the documents and policies that informed each development.

King Square Estate		Northwold Estate	
Document	Policy	Document	Policy
Islington's Core Strategy (2011)	CS 12 Meeting the Housing Challenge	Hackney's Core Strategy (2010)	CS 19 Housing Growth CS 20 Affordable Housing
Islington's Development Management Policies (2013)	DM 3.2 Existing Housing	Hackney's Development Management Local Plan (2015)	DM 19 General Approach to New Housing Development DM 20 Loss of Housing DM 21 Affordable Housing Delivery
Finsbury Local Plan (Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan) (2013)	BC 1 King Square and St Luke's	Draft Stamford Hill Area Action Plan (2016)	Draft Housing policy
Section 106 agreement (2015)		No Section 106 agreement signed as at August 2019	

Table 5.2 Planning documents and policies that informed the redevelopments

The *NPPF* (2012, 2018) contains the government's national planning regulations while the *London Plan* (2011, 2016) facilitates the delivery of the Mayor's vision and objectives for London through specific policies. Both documents are high-level policy frameworks that any development in London must comply to. For the purposes of this research the focus will be placed on the Council and neighbourhood level planning documents that guided redevelopment.

Islington Council published its *Core Strategy* in February 2011 and Hackney in December 2010 in order to set out the policies to shape the two Boroughs' futures, making use of their planning powers. These are legally binding documents aimed at shaping prospective development. One of the policies that informed the King Square Estate redevelopment is *CS 12 Meeting the Housing Challenge* which echoes the *London Plan* and targets the identification of sites for the supply of land for housing development, resisting the loss of existing family housing units and the increase in provision of affordable and market housing. Council owned land is specifically identified as a valuable asset in securing additional affordable housing in the Borough. The policy specifies that a proportion of 50% of all additional housing developments must be affordable, with a tenure split of 70% social housing and 30% intermediate. Similarly, in Hackney's *Core Strategy* (2010) policy CS 20

Affordable Housing seeks to meet a borough-wide affordable housing target of 50%, with a tenure split of 60% social housing and 30% intermediate, while policy *CS 19 Housing Growth* seeks the growth of housing supply, the identification of developable sites and the resistance to the loss of family accommodation.

Islington's *Development Management Policies* (2013) and Hackney's *Development Management Local Plan* (2015) were created to make decisions on new planning applications and permissions steering development towards the Boroughs' visions of sustainable development. Islington's vision about social sustainability includes sustainable communities which are achieved through a mix of housing tenures, sizes and resident age within each new development (DMP, 2013). Policy *DM 3.2 Existing Housing* pertains to the resistance to the loss of existing housing, including affordable housing, and the replacement of at least equivalent floor space if necessary. It specifies that the redevelopment of affordable housing should not be permitted unless it is replaced by better accommodation and equivalent floor space. Likewise, Hackney's policy *DM 19 General Approach to New Housing Development* underlines the general presumption in favor of affordable housing and policy *DM 20 Loss of Housing* indicates that the loss of housing will only be permitted if the current state of housing is not fit-for purpose and equivalent replacement housing of appropriate type is provided. Finally, policy *DM 21 Affordable Housing Delivery* clearly states that the Council may refuse any applications which have the capacity to deliver more affordable housing than proposed.

Key themes in the aforementioned documents are the resistance to the loss of housing, including affordable housing, and the promotion of council-owned sites that could constitute developable affordable housing land. These policies constitute a clear indicator to all new developments of the Councils' housing protection and intensification agendas. They hint that developments proposing the loss of affordable housing without a clear plan to replace an equivalent amount could be refused, which aims to safeguard the tenures of existing residents. This creates a solid framework for authorities to prefer infill and intensification schemes over demolitions.

The *Finsbury Local Plan (Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan)* (2013) provides a policy framework to ensure that the area develops according to the sustainability objectives of the Borough. One of the policies set out is the *BC 1 King Square and St Luke's*, which recognises the area as a significant residential community and targets the growth of affordable housing. King Square Estate and the adjacent Moreland School have a focal place in this policy, which states that new development must deliver, among other things:

- an upgrade to the existing school premises
- the redevelopment of underused and low density land and buildings for residential uses
- a range of social rented homes that maximise the supply of family dwellings
- improvements to the exterior of existing estate buildings to integrate the redevelopment into the existing fabric

This policy designates a specific site allocation BC4 which comprises of King Square Estate, Moreland Primary School, garages, a games area and the car park adjacent to Turnpike House. This allocation states that 'as part of this (development of new school premises) there is an opportunity to comprehensively reconfigure the layout of the northern side of the King Square Estate to provide new housing'. In addition, the Council commits to actively engage the residents, local community, housing partners and voluntary sector in the project decision making implementation (FLP, 2013). This policy designation of the site effectively safeguards it from any demolition or resident displacement plans by specifying the type of redevelopment that will be allowed and is in the best interest of existing residents.

Hackney drafted the *Towards a Stamford Hill Area Action Plan* in December 2016 which emerged from Neighbourhood Forum action and aims to deliver sustainable growth in the area. Even though it is still not completed, it provides insight to the residents' concerns and expectations for their neighbourhood. Housing shortage and unaffordability are predominant issues with proposed policies pertaining to increasing affordable housing provision, especially for families. Unlike the *Finsbury Local Plan* which identifies King Square Estate as a site allocation, this plan does not include Northwold Estate in its opportunity areas or site allocations. The estate is excluded from potential intensification development, hence why the infill development was not the initial scenario considered for the Northwold Estate redevelopment. The draft policies on housing are a good framework in driving development in the area, but a specific site allocation of the estate or its wider area would be more effective in defining its future especially when the developer is not the Council.

A Section 106 Agreement is a legally binding document that sets out a number of conditions to be fulfilled to make a development acceptable in planning terms, by mitigating its impacts. Even though there is no signed Section 106 agreement for the Northwold Estate redevelopment yet, the applicant has expressed their willingness to enter into a legal agreement with Hackney Council to cover any relevant planning obligations. In order for the King Square Estate and Moreland School redevelopment to receive planning permission a Section 106 Agreement was signed and included the provision of 'subsidised low cost housing owned by local authorities and registered providers

and rented to eligible households in perpetuity (social rented housing) comprising no less than 69.4% of all habitable rooms in the development'. The condition ensured also that none of the private market housing could be occupied before all the affordable housing units have been constructed and are ready for occupation. This agreement underlines the Council's commitment in prioritising the affordable housing provision and the social interest over private housing.

5.3 Resident and key stakeholder involvement

In order to analyse the extent and impact of resident and other key stakeholder involvement in the decision making process of both redevelopments, three aspects will be examined for the evaluation of their consultation; opportunities for participation, the chains of communication in the process, and the degree to which the views expressed by the correspondents were taken into consideration in the decision making process. Table 5.3 is a summary of the consultation process for both redevelopments in terms of the consultation aspects.

Consultation Aspect	King Square Estate	Northwold Estate
Opportunities for participation	4 stages Public exhibitions, drop-in sessions, questionnaires, meetings, brochures, website	3 stages Surveys, public events, drop-in sessions, public exhibitions, meetings, home visits, door knocking, online platform
Chains of communication	Council – residents Council – TRA Council – other groups Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects – TRA	HA – residents HA – RSG HA – other groups HA – Save Northwold Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor – residents
Views taken into consideration	Yes, determined final decision	Yes, determined final decision

Table 5.3 Summary of consultation processes

The consultation process for the redevelopment of King Square Estate took place in three separate stages. The first consultation took place in October 2010 and March 2011 when Islington Council was gathering the community's views on improving education opportunities in the area, by sending out questionnaires to a wide area. Following this consultation, and an assessment of demand for school places, the roll at Moreland Primary School was permanently reduced to 30 places per year and the Council agreeing to consider a new school building for Moreland School at its existing location (Islington Council, 2012 b). This was an initial stage which was instrumental in freeing up space for more development on site and the beginning of the housing redevelopment scheme in the

estate. The second stage of consultation took place from February to March 2012 when the Islington Council Planning Department carried out consultation on a draft Planning Brief for the King Square Estate and Moreland School redevelopment to give the local community the opportunity to comment on how the site could be redeveloped at an early stage. The Planning Brief contained details on indicative areas for the additional housing development, proposed land uses, redevelopment objectives, design and density and proposed housing tenure among other things. Approximately 9,000 consultation brochures were distributed to residents, local businesses and stakeholder groups in the vicinity of the site containing information on the Council's vision for the site and where to find the Planning Brief. Information about the consultation was also published on the Council's website holding similar information. Throughout the consultation period, an exhibition was held at Moreland School and at Finsbury Library, as well as three staffed drop-in sessions. Participation was extensive with 534 responses to the planning brief received including 168 copies of a signed letter from the King Square TRA, 115 questionnaire responses, eight from stakeholder groups or representative individuals including the local MP and the sports coordinator for the multi-use games area. The Planning Brief was revised according to the feedback received, and adopted by the Council Executive to guide the selection of a development partner. The Council received requests for additional meetings from King Square TRA, estates residents' representatives, elderly residents and non-native English speaking residents, which were all accepted and realised. The vast majority of feedback received was in favor of the new housing development on site while the main concerns raised were related to the loss of parking spaces from the conversion of garages into housing and the relocation of the Multi-Use Games Area from the school's relocation (Islington Council, 2012 b). The third main stage of consultation was the opportunity given to the TRA to have a say in the architect selection process and give the candidates insight on their priorities and needs. The architecture firm ultimately selected in 2013 was Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects (PTEA) following two meetings with the TRA. In the first meeting the TRA challenged many of the ideas proposed. In the subsequent meeting the architects had implemented the feedback to propose revised plans, which were positively received (PTEA, 2013). The final stage of consultation followed the architect's selection and took the form of two public exhibitions in June 2014, where all the estate and neighbouring residents were invited to review the detailed proposed plans and submit their comments (PTEA, 2014).

In 2016 the Guinness Housing Association appointed NewmanFrancis as engagement and involvement advisors, to 'develop a comprehensive engagement strategy' for Northwold Estate. Consultation was undertaken in three phases throughout 2016-2018. The first phase focused on a household survey to understand the residents' aspirations, with 70% of households responding. The

HA organised two public events, two drop-in sessions, public exhibitions for interested local groups like business owners and community groups, meetings with the Residents Steering Group (RSG), home visits and door knocking. This helped Guinness Association to prepare the initial development plans. The outcome of phase one was the residents' strong opposition to the full demolition option. The Save Northwold campaign was then formed fearing that full estate demolition was a likely scenario and decided to organise their resistance. According to the HA, extensive communication was granted to the campaign in order to provide information and answer their questions. A contrary view was expressed by a resident involved in the campaign testifying that "there was a lot of uncertainty, because Guinness was bad at communicating". In addition, it was later admitted by the Guinness Partnership that the favoured option before the consultation outcome was the partial demolition and redevelopment of half the Estate when Save Northwold 'found documents from prospective contractors, predating the consultation, detailing work of that nature' (Gelder, 2018). In the second phase of consultation an Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor, PPCR Ltd, was employed to provide independent advice to residents, following the discourse from the first phase. An online community consultation platform called *Commonplace* was set up to provide confidence amongst the community of a more open and transparent process with all updates and plans available there. A public meeting was held to discuss the consultation findings thus far which summarised the residents' views on the three redevelopment options; partial demolition, full demolition and infill development. Following the residents' feedback the infill option best reflected the people's aspirations for their estate. The last phase involved the final comments collection regarding the preferred infill option. The HA conducted 350 home visits and surveys by households. This led to the final design exhibition, showcasing the residents' choice (NewmanFrancis Ltd, 2018).

In order to make a conclusion on the effectiveness of resident and other stakeholder participation on retaining their homes, the three aforementioned consultation aspects (Table 5.1) will be evaluated. In terms of the first aspect, opportunities for participation, Islington Council facilitated a "transparent and frequent contact with the affected parties from a very early stage", as per the new homes development manager at Islington. Consultation took place at all key stages, i.e. the decision to relocate the school, the planning brief approval, architect selection and plan finalisation. There was also an effective use of different means of participation to cater to different residents' needs, like the arrangement of separate meetings with elderly and non-native English speakers. For Northwold Estate, the Guinness Association also provided multiple opportunities for consultation across the entire planning process, i.e. understanding the residents' concerns and wishes, testing the three options and plans finalisation. The two sides' (HA and residents) views on the transparency and effectiveness of communication differ, with the Save Northwold campaigners

being disappointed at the HA's responsiveness. Notably though, following the residents' opposition and HA's admittance of a predetermined plan, the HA worked on improving the transparency and reliability of its communication.

The second aspect of consultation, the chain of communications, indicates that in both King Square and Northwold consultations, both residents and their representatives (TRA and Resident Steering Group) had immediate contact with the freeholders of the estates, the Council and the HA. In the King Square scheme, the TRA also had the opportunity to participate in the selection of the architect. In the Northwold scheme residents were granted an independent advisor due to the controversial nature of the redevelopment scheme.

The third aspect of consultation evaluation is the degree to which the residents had a say in the final decision making. In both cases the residents' and other stakeholder groups' aspirations were taken into account in every phase of consultation, perhaps with the exception of the first phase of the Northwold redevelopment. Plans and proposals were continuously updated following feedback and then tested again with the respondents, which led to the final outcomes reflecting the views of the vast majority of the estate residents.

6. Conclusion

6.1 Summary of findings

The research aim of this dissertation was to analyse the conditions under which the residents of social housing estates can retain their homes after a planned redevelopment scheme. Chapters four and five have presented the research findings which emerged from the analysis of three aspects of the King Square and Northwold Estates redevelopment; the development components, the planning requirements and the resident and key stakeholder involvement. The conditions that can facilitate council home retention by their residents after a planned redevelopment can be summarised as follows:

1. Development components

When the freeholder of the estate, whether a Council or HA, maintain the buildings to a good standard there is a much lower chance for a demolition proposal to be accepted by the planning authorities or the residents. The alignment of the Borough's resistance to the loss of housing policy with the redevelopment outcomes can be best served when the Council is the developer of the estate, who prioritises the best interests of existing residents and lacks profit maximising agendas. When the Council is the developer and possesses adequate funding to deliver the affordable housing targets, it has more flexibility in choosing the refurbishment and infill option, over demolition.

2. Planning requirements

When the Core Strategy and Development Management policies resisting the loss of affordable housing are in place, they promote the identification of public land to build affordable housing and infill development, over demolition. Area Action Plan policies that designate estates or their wider areas, can prohibit their demolition and promote affordable housing construction on underused land. Section 106 agreement conditions that secure the delivery of affordable housing before the occupation of any private market housing, safeguard the prioritisation of affordable housing over profit maximisation.

3. Resident and key stakeholder involvement

Consultation from a very early stage of redevelopment is key in aligning the resident's aspirations for their estate with the redevelopment plans. A mobilised and engaged TRA or other resident group involved in formulating the final plans can be decisive in resisting unwanted proposals and engaging other estate residents. Frequent and inclusive opportunities and varied means for resident and other group participation are significant in engaging residents and reassuring them that they can have a say. The developer has the duty to provide

frequent updates and constantly available information on the progress of the redevelopment, to promote transparency in consultation. The immediate contact of the residents and their representatives with the developer is essential in ensuring that they are considered in decision making. The above processes can ensure that resident aspirations are taken into account in updating the redevelopment proposals and helping shape the final decision.

6.2 Policy recommendations

A very effective policy tool that can help resist estate demolition is Area Action Plans or Neighbourhood Plans. Such local-scale plans contain more detail in their housing and opportunity areas policies than the Borough level Core Strategies or Development Plans. These plans are heavily based on local resident input in order to be written up, like Neighbourhood Forums or other community groups, and thus reflect directly the residents' expectations and needs for their area. As seen in the examined case of King Square Estate, the Area Action Plan allocated the site of the estate and its surrounding area to provide a policy framework that would shape its future development. The policy scope included the redevelopment of underused and low density land and buildings for residential uses and improvements to the exterior of existing estate buildings to integrate the redevelopment into the existing fabric. The provision of refurbishment and infill construction as the legally approved redevelopment strategies safeguarded the site from potential demolition plans. Especially in the case of estates owned by a HA, where demolition can be a possible scenario, a site allocation prohibiting demolition of estate buildings and promoting their refurbishment can be the deciding factor in protecting residents from displacement.

A second policy recommendation relates to the main controversy that arose in the Northwold Estate redevelopment; the reason for considering its demolition. While the main argument for demolition was the aim to "provide more homes and create mixed communities", a supporting reason was the deteriorated state of the buildings. Despite the HA's allegations of large investments in the estate's maintenance, the residents had opposing views, believing that the buildings were inadequately maintained to make demolition a likely option. Residents also asserted that the buildings were far from inhabitable and refurbishments would have been adequate to upgrade its standard. Hence, a stricter policy framework is necessary to monitor whether the maintenance of estates is up to the necessary standard and penalise the owner by enforcing the buildings' refurbishment instead of approving demolition. This could be an effective way to avoid demolitions of well-maintained buildings and remove any uncertainties regarding what constitutes a fit-for-purpose building.

A final significant consideration relates to the Council's ability to remain the freehold owner and developer of housing estates. Funding sources are a major Council concern. Some options to raise funds for a new housing development are through the sale of private homes – which can only raise funds to an extent due to tenure split considerations, through Section 106 funds – which in some Councils can be minimal due to low development levels, or through 1-4-1 RTB receipts – which are precluded if part of the development is funded by the Home and Communities Agency or a Greater London Authority grant. Following the recent removal of the House Rent Allowance cap removal, Councils have more capacity to borrow and the effect of this measure will show in the following years.

References

- Barratt, L. (2017). 'Housing campaigner Emily Jost: I won't let Northwold estate go without a fight'. [online] *Hackney Post*. Available at: <http://hackneypost.co.uk/emily-jost-i-wont-let-estate-go-without-fight/> [Accessed 8 Jul. 2019].
- Gelder, S. (2018). 'Northwold Estate: Upper Clapton campaigners score major victory in 18-month battle to save homes from demolition'. [online] *Hackney Gazette*. Available at: <https://www.hackneygazette.co.uk/news/northwold-estate-upper-clapton-campaigners-score-major-victory-in-18-month-battle-to-save-homes-from-demolition-1-5386612> [Accessed 1 Jul. 2019].
- Gray, M. and Barford, A. (2018), 'The depths of the cuts: the uneven geography of local government austerity', *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 11 (30).
- Greater London Authority (2018), 'The Mayor's Good Practice Guide to Estate Regeneration', [online] *Greater London Authority*. Available at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/better-homes-for-local-people-the-mayors-good-practice-guide-to-estate-regeneration.pdf> [Accessed 29 Jun. 2019].
- Hall, S. (2007), 'Housing, Regeneration and Change in the UK: Estate Regeneration in Tower Hamlets, East London', [online] *Blackwell Publishing*. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9780470757871.ch11> [Accessed 18 Jun. 2019].
- Lees, L. and Ferreri M., (2016), 'Resisting gentrification on its final frontiers: Learning from the Heygate Estate in London (1974–2013)', *Elsevier Ltd*.
- Lees, L., London Tenants Federation, Just Space and Southwark Notes Archive Group (2014). 'Staying Put: An Anti-Gentrification Handbook for Council Estates in London'. [ebook] London: *Just Space*. Available at: <https://southwarknotes.files.wordpress.com/2014/06/staying-put-web-version-low.pdf> [Accessed 7 Jun. 2019].
- Lees, L. (2014), 'The Urban Injustices of New Labour's "New Urban Renewal": The Case of the Aylesbury Estate in London', *Antipode*, 46 (4).
- Pawson, H. (2007), 'Restructuring England's Social Housing Sector Since 1989: Undermining or Underpinning the Fundamentals of Public Housing?', [online] *Routledge*. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02673030600807720> [Accessed 15 Aug. 2019].
- Snaith, E. (2018). 'Success for Northwold Estate residents as Guinness Partnership scraps demolition plans'. [online] *Hackney Citizen*. Available at: <https://www.hackneycitizen.co.uk/2018/02/13/northwold-estate-demolition-plans-scrapped-guinness-partnership/> [Accessed 31 Jun. 2019].
- UCL Urban Lab and Engineering Exchange (2015), 'Refurbishment and Demolition Community Toolkit', [online] *Urban Lab*. Available at: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/engineering-exchange/sites/engineering-exchange/files/ucl150_a4-demolition-toolkit_v4_online.pdf [Accessed 25 Jul. 2019].
- Watt, P. (2009 b), 'Social housing and regeneration in London', in: R. Imrie, L. Lees and M. Raco (Eds.), 'Regenerating London'. London: *Routledge*.
- Watt, P. (2009 a), 'Housing stock transfers, regeneration and state-led gentrification in London'. In: *Urban Policy and Research*, 27 (3).
- Watt, P. (2013), 'It's not for us: regeneration, the 2012 Olympics and the gentrification of East London', *City* 17(1).

Policy Documents

Hackney Council (2010), 'Hackney's strategic planning policies for 2010-2025', [online] *Hackney Council*. Available at: <https://www.hackney.gov.uk/media/6826/Hackney-core-strategy-development-plan-document-December-2010-/pdf/Adopted-LDF-Core-Strategy-final-incchaptimagescov-Dec2010-low-res> [Accessed on 4 Aug. 2019].

Hackney Council (2015), 'Development Management Local Plan', [online] *Hackney Council*. Available at: <https://www.hackney.gov.uk/media/3188/Development-management-local-plan-submission-version-December-2013-/pdf/DMLP-publication-version> [Accessed on 4 Aug. 2019].

Hackney Council (2016), 'Towards a Stamford Hill Plan', [online] *Hackney Council*. Available at: <https://hackney.gov.uk/media/8277/Towards-a-Stamford-Hill-Plan/pdf/SHAAP-Towards-a-Plan.pdf?m=636221529828530000> [Accessed on 4 Aug. 2019].

Islington Council (2011), 'Islington's Core Strategy', [online] *Islington Council*. Available at: <https://www.islington.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/islington-local-plan/core-strategy> [Accessed on 4 Aug. 2019].

Islington Council (2012), 'Planning Brief for the Moreland Primary School and adjoining sites on the King Square Estate', *Islington Council*.

Islington Council (2013), 'Finsbury Local Plan Area Action Plan for Bunhill & Clerkenwell', [online] *Islington Council*. Available at: <https://www.islington.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/islington-local-plan/finsbury-local-plan> [Accessed on 4 Aug. 2019].

Islington Council (2013), 'Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies', [online] *Islington Council*. Available at: <https://www.islington.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/islington-local-plan/development-management-policies> [Accessed on 4 Aug. 2019].

Islington Council (2015), 'Letter In The Form Of A Section 106 Agreement For Use Where Council Is The Landowner', *Islington Council*.

Executive Member for Housing and Development (2017), 'Contract Award For The Construction Of 93 New Homes, Community Facilities And Associated Improvements For The King Square Estate: Development Phase Two, Ec1v', *Islington Council*.

NewmanFrancis Ltd (2018), 'Statement Of Community Involvement', *NewmanFrancis Ltd*.

Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects (2013), 'King Square Estate - Planning Review', *Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects*.

Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects (2014), 'King Square Estate Pre App Meeting', *Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects*.

Rolfe Judd Planning (2019), 'Supporting Planning Statement', *Rolfe Judd Planning*.

Figures

TM Architects (2019). *Northwold Estate*. [online] TM Architects. Available at: <https://www.tmarchitects.co.uk/portfolio-items/northwold-estate/> [Accessed 15 Aug. 2019].

Pollard Thomas Edwards Architects (2019). *King Square* → *Pollard Thomas Edwards*. [online] Pollard Thomas Edwards. Available at: <https://pollardthomasedwards.co.uk/projects/king-square/> [Accessed 15 Aug. 2019].

Appendix A – Questionnaire sent to Council officers and Guinness Partnership

1. What was/is your role in the redevelopment scheme?
2. What were the reasons for the redevelopment?
3. What is the estate ownership structure after the redevelopment?
4. What are the streams of funding for the developer?
5. Was the resident consultation process effective?
6. Have the buildings been maintained to a good standard prior to redevelopment?
7. What are your views on the outcome of the redevelopment?

Appendix B – Questions prepared for resident interviews

1. What was/is your involvement in the consultation with the developer?
2. Were you given enough opportunities to participate in the creation of the final plans?
3. Who contacted you for consultation? How often?
4. Do you feel your/other residents' involvement have shaped the final outcome?
5. What do you think of the final outcome?

Appendix C – Interview/Questionnaire invites and responses

1. Hackney Council: Neil Cleary, Affordable Housing Project Manager – completed questionnaire
2. Hackney Councillors
 - a. Caroline Woodley – no reply
 - b. Anthony McMahon – reluctant to answer questions
 - c. Sam Pallis – no reply
3. Guinness Housing Association Ltd: Development manager – completed questionnaire
4. Save Northwold Campaign – 2 interviews with residents (both on 17/8/2019)
5. Islington Council: New Homes Development Manager – completed questionnaire
6. Islington Councillors
 - a. Claudia Webbe – no reply
 - b. Richard Watts – no reply
 - c. Phil Graham – on annual leave
7. King Square Estate TRA – 1 interview with a resident (on 13/8/2019)

Appendix D – Risk Assessment Form

EMERGENCIES

Where emergencies may arise use space below to identify and assess any risks

e.g. fire, accidents

Examples of risk: loss of property, loss of life

NO

CONTROL MEASURES

Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk

- participants have registered with LOCATE at <http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travel-and-living-abroad/>
- fire fighting equipment is carried on the trip and participants know how to use it
- contact numbers for emergency services are known to all participants
- participants have means of contacting emergency services
- participants have been trained and given all necessary information
- a plan for rescue has been formulated, all parties understand the procedure
- the plan for rescue /emergency has a reciprocal element
- OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

EQUIPMENT

Is equipment used?

NO

If 'No' move to next hazard
If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks

e.g. clothing, outboard motors.

Examples of risk: inappropriate, failure, insufficient training to use or repair, injury. Is the risk high / medium / low ?

CONTROL MEASURES

Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk

- the departmental written Arrangement for equipment is followed
- participants have been provided with any necessary equipment appropriate for the work
- all equipment has been inspected, before issue, by a competent person
- all users have been advised of correct use
- special equipment is only issued to persons trained in its use by a competent person
- OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

LONE WORKING

Is lone working a possibility?

YES

If 'No' move to next hazard
If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks

e.g. alone or in isolation lone interviews.

Examples of risk: difficult to summon help. Is the risk high / medium / low?
Conducted one to one interviews, but chose busy and central public spaces (coffee shops) to conduct them.
Low risk.

CONTROL MEASURES

Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk

- the departmental written Arrangement for lone/out of hours working for field work is followed
- lone or isolated working is not allowed
- location, route and expected time of return of lone workers is logged daily before work commences
- all workers have the means of raising an alarm in the event of an emergency, e.g. phone, flare, whistle
- all workers are fully familiar with emergency procedures
- OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

ILL HEALTH

The possibility of ill health always represents a safety hazard. Use space below to identify and assess any risks associated with this Hazard.

e.g. accident, illness, personal attack, special personal considerations or vulnerabilities.

Examples of risk: injury, asthma, allergies. Is the risk high / medium / low?

NO

CONTROL MEASURES

Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk

- an appropriate number of trained first-aiders and first aid kits are present on the field trip
- all participants have had the necessary inoculations/ carry appropriate prophylactics
- participants have been advised of the physical demands of the trip and are deemed to be physically suited
- participants have been adequate advice on harmful plants, animals and substances they may encounter
- participants who require medication have advised the leader of this and carry sufficient medication for their needs
- OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

TRANSPORT

Will transport be required

NO

YES

X

Move to next hazard

Use space below to identify and assess any risks

e.g. hired vehicles

Examples of risk: accidents arising from lack of maintenance, suitability or training

Is the risk high / medium / low?

LOW

CONTROL MEASURES

Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk

- only public transport will be used
- the vehicle will be hired from a reputable supplier
- transport must be properly maintained in compliance with relevant national regulations
- drivers comply with UCL Policy on Drivers http://www.ucl.ac.uk/hr/docs/college_drivers.php
- drivers have been trained and hold the appropriate licence
- there will be more than one driver to prevent driver/operator fatigue, and there will be adequate rest periods
- sufficient spare parts carried to meet foreseeable emergencies
- OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

DEALING WITH THE PUBLIC

Will people be dealing with public

YES

If 'No' move to next hazard

If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks

e.g. interviews, observing

Examples of risk: personal attack, causing offence, being misinterpreted. Is the risk high / medium / low?
Low risk.

CONTROL MEASURES

Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk

- all participants are trained in interviewing techniques
- interviews are contracted out to a third party
- advice and support from local groups has been sought
- participants do not wear clothes that might cause offence or attract unwanted attention
- interviews are conducted at neutral locations or where neither party could be at risk
- OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

WORKING ON OR NEAR WATER

Will people work on or near water?

NO

If 'No' move to next hazard

If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks

e.g. rivers, marshland, sea.

Examples of risk: drowning, malaria, hepatitis A, parasites. Is the risk high / medium / low?

CONTROL MEASURES

Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk

- lone working on or near water will not be allowed
- coastguard information is understood; all work takes place outside those times when tides could prove a threat
- all participants are competent swimmers
- participants always wear adequate protective equipment, e.g. buoyancy aids, wellingtons
- boat is operated by a competent person
- all boats are equipped with an alternative means of propulsion e.g. oars
- participants have received any appropriate inoculations
- OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

MANUAL HANDLING (MH)

Do MH activities take place?

NO

If 'No' move to next hazard

If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks

e.g. lifting, carrying, moving large or heavy equipment, physical unsuitability for the task.

Examples of risk: strain, cuts, broken bones. Is the risk high / medium / low?

CONTROL MEASURES

Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk

- the departmental written Arrangement for MH is followed
- the supervisor has attended a MH risk assessment course
- all tasks are within reasonable limits, persons physically unsuited to the MH task are prohibited from such activities
- all persons performing MH tasks are adequately trained
- equipment components will be assembled on site
- any MH task outside the competence of staff will be done by contractors
- OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

SUBSTANCES

Will participants work with substances

NO

If 'No' move to next hazard
If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks

e.g. plants, chemical, biohazard, waste

Examples of risk: ill health - poisoning, infection, illness, burns, cuts. Is the risk high / medium / low?

CONTROL MEASURES

Indicate which procedures are in place to control the identified risk

- the departmental written Arrangements for dealing with hazardous substances and waste are followed
- all participants are given information, training and protective equipment for hazardous substances they may encounter
- participants who have allergies have advised the leader of this and carry sufficient medication for their needs
- waste is disposed of in a responsible manner
- suitable containers are provided for hazardous waste
- OTHER CONTROL MEASURES: please specify any other control measures you have implemented:

OTHER HAZARDS

Have you identified any other hazards?

NO

If 'No' move to next section
If 'Yes' use space below to identify and assess any risks

i.e. any other hazards must be noted and assessed here.

Hazard: _____
Risk: is the

CONTROL MEASURES

Give details of control measures in place to control the identified risks

Have you identified any risks that are not NO X Move to Declaration

adequately controlled?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
YES	<input type="checkbox"/>

Use space below to identify the risk and what action was taken

Is this project subject to the UCL requirements on the ethics of Non-NHS Human Research?

If yes, please state your Project ID Number

For more information, please refer to: <http://ethics.grad.ucl.ac.uk/>

DECLARATION

The work will be reassessed whenever there is a significant change and at least annually. Those participating in the work have read the assessment.

Select the appropriate statement:

- I the undersigned have assessed the activity and associated risks and declare that there is no significant residual risk
- I the undersigned have assessed the activity and associated risks and declare that the risk will be controlled by the method(s) listed above

NAME OF SUPERVISOR Claire Colomb

**** SUPERVISOR APPROVAL TO BE CONFIRMED VIA E-MAIL ****