



All Party Urban Development Group
promoting sustainable development and urban renewal

Building local jobs

Ensuring local communities gain employment from regeneration



A report delivered by the officers

Clive Betts MP

Lord Richard Best

Rt Hon Nick Raynsford MP

Robert Syms MP

On behalf of the All Party Urban Development Group
www.allparty-urbandevelopment.org.uk

About the All Party Urban Development Group

The All Party Urban Development Group (APUDG) is a cross party parliamentary body of MPs and Peers committed to progressing urban renewal and sustainable development in the UK.

The group was formed to raise the profile and understanding within Parliament of the regeneration process and the role that can be played by the private sector, particularly the property investment community. The group's remit is to take a holistic approach in the examination of all constituent elements that bring about truly sustainable communities, and to review policies that will increase the quality and pace of urban renewal and sustainable development nationally.

About this inquiry

This report draws on written and oral evidence received during the inquiry from regional development agencies, urban regeneration companies, local authorities, developers, constructions companies, retailers and other relevant stakeholders. It considers the benefits of using regeneration as a vehicle to deliver jobs for local people, best practice in the field and what the barriers are for such initiatives.

Further information

Any queries can be directed to the clerk of the group, Kurt Mueller, at 0207 802 0128 or kmueller@bpf.org.uk.

Contents

Executive summary	4
Introduction	6
Section 1 Linking property regeneration to employment	8
Section 2 Key prerequisites to ensure that local communities gain employment from regeneration	11
Section 3 Barriers to linking local people to new jobs	21
Section 4 Conclusions and recommendations	26
References	29
Annex	30

Executive summary

Many UK city centres have experienced a facelift in the past two decades, with significant physical renewal in the shape of new offices, homes and shops. Whilst this physical renewal has often been accompanied by growing economic prosperity, many of those living near to regeneration zones have not benefited by way of employment. Instead, newly built city centres have been set amidst continued deprivation and worklessness. Given the discussion of 'opportunity for all' and the emphasis placed on employment as a route out of poverty¹, this failure to link up local residents to jobs created by regeneration represents a wasted opportunity.

The current recession and ongoing problems around credit availability have slowed the pace of regeneration in Britain's cities and towns. In this rapidly changing environment, it is difficult to predict how and when large scale regeneration will again be on the agenda. For instance, whilst the Government's decision to bring forward £3 billion in spending on housing, infrastructure and schools² could help to restart regeneration - and, if done right, help local residents into jobs - it will also be followed by a significant public spending squeeze in 2010/11.

This All Party Urban Development Group (APUDG) report asks how regeneration can be better used to deliver job opportunities for local residents. Its findings are nuanced for what can be done now, and what can be used during an upswing.

Evidence submitted to this inquiry suggests that five factors can help link regeneration

to employment opportunities for local people:

- using section 106 planning agreements to secure commitment to local employment objectives;
- building partnerships between local authorities, employment agencies, further education and employers at the pre-development stage;
- forecasting all possible employment opportunities during planning, construction and post-development phases;
- using targeted employment strategies to link training to employer demand; and
- ensuring that regeneration leaves a positive employment legacy by creating long term opportunities, jobs with career prospects, and ongoing support for employees.

The obstacles to linking local people to regeneration jobs include: lack of appreciation of the benefits of using regeneration to get local people into work; the cost of training and recruiting local people; barriers such as the benefits trap that cannot be solved at the local level, or that require a more holistic approach to getting people into work; and the perceived discrimination involved in specifically targeting local residents.

The current economic climate represents a further obstacle. For instance, section 106 agreements are less effective as bargaining tools for local authorities, as developers are currently less keen to be involved in

¹ DWP (2008) No one written off: reforming welfare to reward responsibility. London: Department for Work and Pensions.

² HM Treasury (2008) Facing global challenges: supporting people through difficult times. Pre-Budget Report 2008. London: HM Treasury.

regeneration efforts. In the short run, some of the tools that have been used to commit developers to local employment may be less effective – but will remain critical in the longer term.

With this point in mind, and based on oral and written evidence submitted to the group, this report recommends that:

1. City councils need to do more to use their existing powers to promote local employment around major regeneration projects – together with the new Homes and Communities Agency (HCA).

City councils, the HCA and other public sector agencies (such as NHS trusts) should use section 106 negotiations with developers to agree a joint approach to employing local residents. Councils should also lead by example promoting the use of local labour on their own property development projects, and speeding up planning applications for projects that have the potential to deliver jobs for a significant number of local residents.

In the short run, whilst section 106 is unable to produce the same monetary contribution, local authorities should work with the HCA to identify extra sources of funding for local skills and recruitment initiatives. The devolution of adult skills budgets (see recommendation 3, below) would also help.

2. Employers and cities should work together to promote employment and job retention after physical regeneration of an area is complete.

Joint working should ensure that local residents can capitalise on the employment legacy of regeneration projects by ensuring: training schemes linked to employer demand; focused career advice; exit interview guidance; and monitoring of job starts and retention rates.

3. Central government needs to give cities a greater degree of control over adult skills funding so that regeneration projects deliver local jobs.

As it moves toward statutory city-regional bodies and Employment and Skills Boards, Government should devolve control over adult skills budgets to cities and local employers – who are better placed to link city residents to regeneration jobs through bespoke training programmes in construction, facilities management, housing and retail.

4. The property industry should introduce a new kite mark scheme to recognise developers, construction companies, property owners and occupiers that demonstrate a track record of local hiring.

An independent, recognised kite mark would help city councils and other public bodies to recognise potential development partners and strong planning applications – based on developers' commitments to local employment outcomes.

If enacted, these recommendations would help regeneration to be used as a tool to boost local employment – both during the current recession and the eventual upturn in cities' economic fortunes.

Introduction

Many of Britain's cities and towns have seen extensive physical regeneration and business growth over the past two decades - much of it concentrated in city centres. However, many of the inner city neighbourhoods surrounding these hot spots of growth have not benefited substantially from new development, especially with regard to employment and jobs³.

A good example of this polarisation can be found in Birmingham. Over the last 15 years Birmingham city centre has experienced significant physical and economic renewal with the creation of 50,000 jobs. However, 22 per cent of the working age population (129,000) claim worklessness benefits in Birmingham, and Ladywood, a ward adjacent to the city centre, has the highest child poverty rate in the country⁴.

This failure of regeneration to spread the benefits to nearby communities has recently been reflected in the new Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) Regeneration Framework. This document explicitly mentions the importance of creating jobs and training opportunities for local people before, during and after physical regeneration projects. As it is intended to guide and prioritise all forms of regeneration spending, it demonstrates the increasing importance being placed on getting local people into the jobs created by regeneration. However, it does not offer a practical guide on how this can be achieved.

The 2012 Olympic Games has explicit aims to put this approach into practice. Indeed, one of the key selling points of the bid was that the games would increase employment and prosperity in the stubbornly deprived east end of London both in the short and long term. Several schemes are underway in east London to achieve this aim, but more will need to be done to ensure that there is a positive local employment legacy⁵.

Despite this increasing acknowledgement of the need for regeneration to boost local employment, there are still regeneration projects that go ahead without an explicit aim to increase local employment, or that have good intentions but fail to deliver. Evidence received during this inquiry points to a lack of leadership, poor planning, and funding difficulties as barriers to delivering jobs for local residents.

This failure can be seen as a missed opportunity: large regeneration projects have significant potential for getting locals trained and into work. A report from Westfield and John Lewis found that in 25 town centre retail schemes currently in the development pipeline, there was the potential to create 16,500 jobs for the most disadvantaged areas⁶.

As the Government's fiscal stimulus package brings forward £3 billion in investment in housing, transport, and schools, we need to capitalise on the opportunity to ensure that the next wave of physical development

³ See, for instance, Joseph Rowntree Foundation (1995), *Creating local jobs from construction expenditure*, York: JRF Findings 140

⁴ Information supplied by Birmingham City Council.

⁵ New Economic Foundation, (2008), *Fool's Gold: How the 2012 Olympics is selling East London short, and a 10 point plan for a more positive legacy*.

⁶ Regeneris consulting for Westfield and John Lewis Partnership (September 2008), *Economics and social impacts of town centre retailing*.

is better linked to the delivery of jobs for inner city residents. This report, which reviews the lessons from previous initiatives, should help central and regional agencies to decide which regeneration schemes are best placed to deliver employment benefits to local people.

The report draws on written and oral evidence received during the inquiry from regional development agencies, urban regeneration companies, local authorities, developers, construction companies, retailers and other relevant agencies.

It considers the benefits of using regeneration as a vehicle to deliver jobs for local people, best practice in the field and what the barriers are for such initiatives.

The report is structured as follows:

- section 1 briefly lists the national, local, individual and business benefits that can be gained by linking employment opportunities for local residents to regeneration;
- section 2 sets out the five key prerequisites to delivering local employment opportunities from regeneration;
- section 3 examines the key barriers that explain why regeneration does not always deliver jobs for local residents; and
- section 4 uses the evidence presented in Sections 2 and 3 to propose four recommendations aimed at local authorities, national government, developers and all key regeneration stakeholders.

BOX 1: The definition of regeneration

'Regeneration' is a term that can cause some confusion - for some it simply means physical renewal, for others it includes positive change for communities. The Government defines regeneration as 'a set of activities that reverse economic, social and physical decline in areas where market forces will not do this without support from the government' (taken from the *Review of sub-national economic development and regeneration*, HM Treasury, BERR & CLG, 2007).

In this report the term 'regeneration' is used to refer to a process of urban renewal through property and economic development.

Section 1

Linking property regeneration to employment

“Physical regeneration projects should always have people and place-making at their core. The public sector sees this sort of large scale programme as key to unlocking economic opportunities for disadvantaged residents.”
(Business in the Community, written submission)

“There needs to be a wider recognition from both local and central government of the positive impact of regeneration projects. Urban regeneration projects bring direct and indirect employment, act as a catalyst for wider regeneration, input wealth into local communities and provide local tax revenue.”
(ASDA, written evidence)

It has been widely accepted that getting local residents into work through regeneration can have significant benefits for individuals, as well as for the local and national economy⁷ because:

- individuals receive increases in their personal incomes and should feel more included in change in their locality;
- the city benefits from more money in the local economy to help sustain regeneration, as well as hopefully becoming more equal and inclusive;
- nationally there should be lower levels of worklessness and an increase in skill levels; and
- businesses have better skilled employees and a local consumer market in which to sell goods.

Together, these benefits make a strong argument for the prioritisation of local employment during and after physical renewal.

The question of how to best lower levels of worklessness⁸ has been the subject of many recent policy documents from the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), CLG, the Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS) and HM Treasury⁹. This reflects the difficulty that the Government has faced in getting the hardest to reach into work, even during a period of economic buoyancy. There is significant overlap with the use of regeneration as a tool to get local residents into work and the aims of initiatives such as Employment Zones. Also, the partnership work they require (see next section) is similar to the DWP City Strategies. Given that the average worker in England and Wales lives within five kilometres of the place of work¹⁰, this type of local linkage to work makes more sense, especially for those at entry level positions and with young children. Thus, regeneration can be seen as having the potential to not only rekindle the local economy but to also lower levels of worklessness overall. In this sense, it is an efficient way to target resources.

Using physical renewal as a vehicle to increase local employment is also relevant to the recovery from the current recession. The Government has committed to spending extra capital in the next few years, with plans for building houses, schools, hospitals

7 See Laine, L. (2002) *Business investment in under-served markets: an opportunity for business and communities?*, Business in the Community.

8 Worklessness is defined as all those either actively or not actively seeking work and on benefits - thus this includes both the short and long term unemployed.

9 See for instance, the most recent DWP Welfare Green Paper (2008), *No one written off: reforming welfare to reward responsibility*.

10 Meadows, P. (2008) *Local initiatives to help workless people find and keep paid work*, JRF, used in UCLES submission.

and public infrastructure being bought forward¹¹. As those with lower incomes spend a greater proportion of their income¹², it follows that maximising the employment of entry level workers will help increase the multiplier effect, where there is greater local and national income and consumption created than the initial amount spent. This should help rejuvenate the local and national economy.

Using regeneration to boost local employment not only speaks to worklessness, but also to the growing political and policy interest in raising UK skills. Both the Labour and Conservative parties are keenly aware of the increasing need for skills in order to keep the economy competitive - setting out new plans to boost apprenticeships and linking training programmes to employers' needs. Using the physical renewal of cities to engage the least skilled in training could help to up-skill a portion of the workforce as a whole. In addition, by matching new employment opportunities to training provision, regeneration could help answer Lord Leitch's¹³ calls for a more demand-led system of vocational education.

“Urban regeneration and development projects present unique opportunities to tackle low levels of employment and skills within specific areas.” (UK Commission for Employment and Skills, written evidence)

The up-skilling of local residents also benefits businesses. Evidence received during this inquiry suggests that businesses

often find generic in-class training insufficient. Thus, one of the key reasons that businesses invest in training of their own is to get a more productive and relevantly trained workforce.

“While an awful lot of training goes on in this sector and a lot of training goes on specifically to help people come off welfare into work, for our part of the industry not very much of that training is relevant to us.” (Val Lowman, Bovis BeOnsite, oral evidence)

Not only do companies get a better quality local workforce, but it has also been found that these employees are more likely to be retained, that there is an improved morale amongst staff and there is an enhanced company image and reputation¹⁴. In addition, when businesses recruit locally it can be construed as a method of giving back to the communities in which they operate, contributing to their corporate social responsibility aims.

“It is our opinion that if you are myopic in terms of the investment in skills and taking the accountability of that, ultimately you will not be competitive... It is our contention that over a longer horizon almost certainly this will be a decision that continues to underscore why we will be the largest growth performer within our sector, and we believe that it will underscore to our customers why we bring a different proposition, and more fundamentally it is actually the right thing to do.” (Tony Douglas, Laing O'Rourke, oral evidence)

11 HM Treasury (2008) *Facing global challenges: supporting people through difficult times. Pre-Budget Report 2008*. London: HM Treasury.

12 Frances M. Magrabi, Young Sook Chung, and Sanghee Sohn Cha (1991) *The Economics of Household Consumption*. New York: Praeger.

13 Leitch Review of Skills (2006) *Prosperity for all in the global economy - world class skills*. London: The Stationery Office.

14 Employee engagement research, *Business in the Community and Research International*, 2006.

Section 1

Perhaps the most important selling point for businesses is that by employing local workers there is money in the local economy that in turn drives local consumer spending. This helps sustain and promote economic prosperity in the area.

“Large scale retail developments are often the catalyst for further investment in associated schemes and office developments. The study reveals that the volume of planning applications across five town centre locations doubled in the year immediately after the opening of a new shopping centre. Current plans for large scale town centre retail schemes in places such as Liverpool, Derby, Bradford and Preston will have a substantial impact on the ability of those city centres to attract future investment.” (John Lewis, written evidence)

Finally, there are social considerations. When regeneration does not include surrounding communities, it can exacerbate levels of social exclusion. Socio-economic polarisation has been found to be connected to higher levels of crime and lower levels of social cohesion¹⁵. These outcomes have a direct impact on the quality of life in a city, and the willingness for businesses to invest in areas¹⁶.

“A failure to engage local people effectively in the regeneration process can create a perception that regeneration is something that is being done to them rather than for and with them.” (Yorkshire Forward, written submission)

“Successful regeneration will strengthen the economy and improve lives, particularly those living in the most deprived areas. It lays the foundations for flourishing, empowered communities, contributing to the Government’s objectives for sustainable development. It will also help deliver national public service agreement targets.” (CLG, *Transforming places; changing lives: A framework for regeneration*, p.11)

Overall, the evidence presented to the group suggests that regeneration is an efficient way to get people into work, and thus its inability to do so represents a market failure. A market failure occurs when the allocation of resources by the free market does not achieve its aims. One key reason for this failure could be that the benefits from training up local residents and linking them to employment are not well known and hence are not taken into account in the selection of delivery partners – instead it is cost that dictates the final choice. The occurrence of a market failure is often used as a rationale for government intervention¹⁷.

The rest of this report considers what factors have allowed regeneration be used as a tool to get inner city residents into work, reasons for failure in delivering this aim, and what can be done to ensure that local employment is at the heart of future regeneration initiatives.

¹⁵ Kearns, A. (2003) ‘Social capital, regeneration and urban policy’ in R. Imrie and M. Raco (eds) *Urban renaissance: New Labour, community and urban policy*, Bristol: The Policy Press, p.37-60.

¹⁶ Communities and Local Government (2006) *The Economies of Deprived Communities*, West Yorkshire, CLG Publications.

¹⁷ Communities and Local Government (2007) *Communities and Local Government Economics Paper 1: A Framework for Intervention*.

Section 2

Key prerequisites to ensure that local communities gain employment from regeneration

Evidence gathered during this inquiry has pointed to five key prerequisites for helping local residents into employment through regeneration. These are not mutually exclusive but complement each other - together they have been shown to provide the necessary infrastructure to link local residents to the jobs generated by physical renewal.

1. Use of section 106

Section 106¹⁸ is fundamental to delivering local employment through regeneration. Firstly, it can be used to secure a commitment from developers to train and employ local residents, and secondly, it can be used as a source of funding to support this objective. Thus, it is a city council's main tool for negotiating local employment objectives with developers and future occupiers. Local authorities must lead these negotiations, and also ensure that developers cannot easily ignore requirements.

Section 106 has been used for some time to ensure that the community benefits from development. It is an opportunity to write in requirements at the inception stage so that developers are committed to delivering specified objectives. All successful initiatives that have local residents have used section 106 as a method to get buy-in from developers. Some local authorities have also used section 106 to gain funds from developers to invest in support to get people trained and ready for work¹⁹.

Using section 106 to provide funding for employee support services and training can be controversial because it takes away money from other local authority priorities, such as increasing the number of affordable homes. However, the Greenwich Local Labour and Business example (see Box 2) demonstrates how useful this money can be in providing flexible funding for employee training and support.

“We also use the section 106 agreement to get a financial contribution which goes to Greenwich Local Labour and Business and effectively creates a flexible pot that they can use, which is unfettered by output requirements and targets imposed upon us. That gives them the means to operate in a very fleet of foot manner to reflect both what employers are asking for and also what the needs of individuals are.” (Trevor Dorling, Greenwich Council, oral evidence)

Since section 106 cannot be used to legally require a certain level of local employment and recruitment, some local authorities are unsure over how to best use it to maximise employment opportunities for locals. Several local authorities, such as Greenwich, have complemented section 106 agreements with other mechanisms, such as an agreement to work in partnership to achieve employment aims (see next subsection) and/or using developer attitudes towards training and employing local residents to judge contracts during the tendering process.

¹⁸ A section 106 agreement is a legal agreement under section 106 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act between a planning authority - the council - and a developer, or undertakings offered by a developer, that ensure that certain extra works related to a development are undertaken.

¹⁹ We did, however, find that there are limits to the use of section 106 - due to legal and political sensitivities around setting targets for local employment.

Section 2

“As a city, and as partners, we have an agreement of targets with Government of what we are seeking in terms of getting local people into work. We cannot force a company to take on a fixed number of individuals from that local area. What we do is put mechanisms in place to encourage it.”
(Waheed Nazir, Birmingham City Council, oral evidence)

“We established contact with the developer Retail Property Holding pre-procurement in order to gain commitment to our objective and to ensure that the appropriate clauses were included in tender documents and contracts. Before contracts were awarded we met with those tendering to identify likely labour needs in the scheme and developed with them an approach to meeting these needs.” (Glasgow South West Regeneration Agency, written evidence)

As well as the legal obstacles, there are other barriers to using section 106 to formalise employment objectives with developers. For instance, the process of sub-contracting, which developers and construction companies heavily use, often leads to employment opportunities bypassing local people. In addition, despite initial agreements, employers can argue that the required skilled labour was unavailable locally. This is why a commitment to employ local labour on its own will not necessarily result in higher employment from deprived areas. Section 106 must also be used to secure training requirements, and efforts must be made to address other factors that make employers cautious, such as the cost of training employees (box 2).

Cities across Britain should learn from strong section 106 performers – such as in Greenwich. Guidance and clarity on the best approach to the use of section 106 could considerably improve the performance of regeneration initiatives to deliver jobs for locals.

2. Build partnerships

“It is important to get partners involved at an early stage to enable them to take ownership of the initiative and have a real stake in ensuring it is successful.”
(Yorkshire Forward, written evidence)

“Employers control access to the job market, and it is therefore their attitudes and practices which must be understood if programmes are to successfully link local people to employment.” (Ian Lindsay, Network Rail, oral evidence)

The creation of consortia of relevant agencies, training providers and employers at the inception stage of regeneration initiatives has been fundamental to the success of schemes to boost local employment in surrounding areas (see Box 3). These help to focus efforts and provide a forum in which to agree targets and implementation plans. Employer input in particular is necessary if the local Jobcentre Plus is to plan programmes to get people into work, to provide training to up-skill local residents in line with employer demands, and to ensure that jobs are locally advertised.

Developers and private businesses provided evidence to the inquiry that stressed the

BOX 2: Greenwich Local Labour and Business (GLLaB)

Aim: GLLaB was set up in 1996 by Greenwich Council to help local people and businesses benefit from the development activities on Greenwich Peninsula.

What makes it work? A clause is written into section 106 that states:

“The developer covenants with the council that: in carrying out any of the development it will fully participate in GLLaB and use its reasonable endeavours to promote and recruit employees contractors and sub-contractors from the area of the London Borough of Greenwich required for and during the construction of the development...”

Thus, through the use of section 106, employers, developers and their contractors are committed to use GLLaB services as a single point of access for local recruitment and employer engagement. To facilitate this relationship a GLLaB centre is placed on site, making it much easier for employers to access their services. GLLaB works closely with developers such as the American Entertainment Group (AEG) to build long-lasting partnerships and ensure that developments such as the O2 have an employment legacy beyond the construction phase.

What has it achieved? GLLaB has supported over 8000 local residents into employment, including the most disadvantaged such as lone parents and ethnic minorities. GLLaB has also delivered over 7,500 qualification outcomes to help enhance local residents employability. GLLaB was key to Greenwich Council gaining Beacon Status for Removing Barriers to Work for the period 2003 to 2004 and its work also contributed to the council achieving Beacon Status - Promoting Sustainable Tourism during 2004 to 2005. GLLaB has received a Charter Mark for best practice in a number of areas including partnership working and for promoting access and choice for all local residents.

importance of having a designated body that they could use as a point of contact, and one person in particular who acted as a liaison officer to bring together the various players involved.

“It is very difficult to set up a local construction scheme or a local labour scheme from scratch. It is important that the infrastructure for that already exists, that it is being marketed through Jobcentre

Section 2

Plus to local communities and that it is employer-led is important to get the right skills and so forth.” (Ian Lindsay, Network Rail, oral evidence)

As stated in evidence provided by ASDA and John Lewis, it is important to include community representatives in regeneration consortia – their inclusion could not only help to make local communities feel more involved, but could also offer important insights into the barriers to work local residents can have.

“It is also important that local communities have a voice on the management boards of large scale redevelopments – so they are linked into inner city communities. This, in our experience, can be achieved by working with local community groups and representatives.” (ASDA, written evidence)

“When we build new shops, we work closely several years before the opening, with local authorities, developers and community groups to find out the views of local people from the time of choosing the site to the shops opening, ensuring we integrate shopping with the town or city and maximise its attractiveness to residents and visitors.” (John Lewis Partnership, written evidence)

Again there are obstacles and pitfalls that need to be overcome to achieve successful partnerships. It is important that these partnerships represent all key stakeholders including local employment programme providers. One employment provider highlighted how their clients could benefit significantly from new jobs on construction

sites and post-construction jobs, but that they are not always included in initial discussions.

“More transparency and communication between recruiters and providers would facilitate more effective matching between job seekers and job vacancies.” (Work Directions, written evidence)

“I think one of the obstacles we have found is that there are a number of agencies involved and their interests do not necessarily coincide with what we are trying to achieve.” (Steve Howlett, Peabody Trust, oral evidence)

A common problem with all cross partnership working is a difference in objectives. Stakeholders expressed the need to build a consensus to agree a common set of skills and employment objectives at the beginning of a physical regeneration scheme. It is also possible that local employment is more likely if partners are persuaded of the benefits early on.

3. Taking stock of all employment opportunities before, during and after physical renewal

To ensure that the number of local residents finding work is maximised, and that there is a positive employment legacy from regeneration, during the planning stages of the development there must be an audit of all jobs likely to be created through regeneration. Such information can inform both recruitment strategies and training programmes aimed at local residents.

BOX 3: Greater Pollok Working partnership, Glasgow

Aim: The Greater Pollok Accord was created by the Glasgow South West Development Agency to maximise the jobs created for local people as a result of regeneration projects. The Accord was a partnership agreement with principal contractors that set out delivery targets in terms of jobs, apprenticeships and training. It also established Greater Pollok Working (GPW) as a recruitment partner of choice.

What made it work? GPW was set up one year in advance of the development, allowing early planning of Linking Opportunity and Need (LOAN) activities. These included the new local employment services, the identification and delivery of necessary training, and activities to raise awareness about the opportunities brought about by the development. These services were provided using different streams of public funding at no cost to employers.

Chaired by the local MP and backed by a strong political commitment, GPW managed to secure a high level commitment with Retail Property Holdings (RPH), the developer. RPH gave the partnership credibility when looking to engage with other stakeholders. Along with the developer, representatives from construction and end-use employers and from Jobcentre Plus sat on the GPW's strategy group, enabling quick decision making.

Established after an extensive consultation, GPW took a constructive approach and was prepared to learn from previous LOAN interventions and resolve problems with agility.

What did it achieve? The partnership was key to securing 338 jobs for local people, 26 apprenticeships on site (plus five in adjacent sites), 150 work experience placements, and adult learning opportunities for 200 people. 78 per cent of the clients managed to stay in employment for more than six months.

Section 2

“For example, at King’s Cross we have a section 106 agreement, which we signed up to as the landowner. It required us to ensure that at least ten percent of the jobs on site go to local people, that we contribute to the construction training centre on site in terms of the capital and revenue, and indeed that we go through things like local procurement, because it is not just about local jobs on the site. It is also about working alongside local small businesses and making sure that as many as possible of the contracts can go to local people.” (Ian Lindsay, Network Rail, oral evidence)

Several stakeholders noted that there is often a focus on short term construction jobs and apprenticeships for young people. This ignores not only the jobs created by the occupiers later on, but also those created in the wider locality such as those in new coffee shops, administrative jobs in new offices, caretaker roles, as well as those created by the growth in local businesses.

“... too often this [large scale regeneration] is narrowly focused on construction jobs in the development and construction phase, rather than the more sustainable opportunities that will be afforded by new tenant retailers and service industry occupants who trade there in the long term.” (Business in the Community, written submission)

Planning for the jobs that will be created as an outcome of physical renewal is difficult when occupiers are not secured early on in the planning process. In addition, urban

regeneration projects bring both direct and indirect employment. These points, along with the possibility that existing businesses may be displaced by new businesses, means that it is hard to predict the overall job growth. However, in the absence of specific knowledge of occupiers it may be enough to have a good idea of the sectoral composition of new developments (e.g. 50 per cent retail, 50 per cent new offices) to start to plan training needs.

4. Matching training to labour market needs and using a targeted recruitment strategy

Knowledge of the types of jobs that are going to be created helps to overcome problems of preference hiring, because local individuals can be trained up to meet the job specification and hence be in a much stronger position to compete.

“One of the things that we do is work on the ground with local people. We are close to the local people so we try to do is tailor the training needs and the job opportunities to those individuals. We act between the contractor, the local authority and the training agencies because we have a special relationship with our residents, and with local people, and can introduce and tailor a scheme to fit their needs.” (Steve Howlett, Peabody Trust, oral evidence)

“The model presented by the Sector Skills Councils for the built environment is to create a Skills Academy centred on each major project and develop the skill base on site.

This is more likely to result in local communities gaining direct training support. Such an approach also ensures that the skills training is focused around the immediate project.” (Richard Beamish, Asset Skills Council, written submission)

Targeted recruitment requires singling out groups of residents most in need (e.g. the low skilled), informing these residents of opportunities and giving them support to access training and support services. Targeted recruitment has had most success where the recruitment centre is placed at the heart of the deprived community, such as with the St Stephen’s development in Hull (see Box 5).

“Skills training must be delivered consistently, flexibly and in sufficient time so that all can assess the programmes and their impact.” (John Lewis Partnership, written evidence)

“Linking apprenticeships to the employment opportunities to be created by developments is a positive idea. Organisations such as Jobcentre Plus and other training providers need to engage with employers to ensure training is tailored to the jobs that are to be created...Developers should certainly have a say in how funding is spent. It is important that training is focused on developing the skills necessary for the jobs to be created by the development. A joined up approach, between all parties, is required so funding is targeted where it is most effective in delivering employment and regeneration to inner city communities.” (ASDA, written evidence)

The timeliness of this targeted recruitment and training is also extremely important if workless residents are to be ready for interviews. This potential problem can be overcome if the partnership strategy is used as a way to get early insight into the proposed jobs so that appropriate strategies are developed early on in the process (as discussed in the earlier sub-section).

5. Ensuring a positive employment legacy

Too often jobs linked to regeneration projects for inner city residents have been short term, or entry level with very little chance of progression. This has resulted in a ‘low pay, no pay’ cycle, meaning that many of those encouraged into the labour force may quickly fall out again. The jobs have not always gone to those furthest from the labour market such as the long term unemployed and lone parents. For a real long term positive employment legacy to be achieved, much more time, effort, as well as resources need to be provided. This is the challenge to those organising the 2012 Olympic Games, and to all those involved in regenerating cities.

“Many Work Directions clients have a physical health issue which means manual work is not possible for them. Others are not interested in the construction industry because they perceive the work to be irregular, and are hesitant to risk their stable benefit income without guarantee of ongoing permanent work. In this case, employers should look equally to recruit locally for non-entry level and non-manual work where possible, to ensure diversity across their job profiles.” (Work Directions, written evidence)

Section 2

BOX 4: Westfield Centre’s development, London

Aim: The White City Works partnership was created to help local workless people access the 7,000 new jobs that have been created at Westfield’s Shopping Centre. Members include the Westfield group, the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, West London Working, Jobcentre Plus, Ealing, Hammersmith and West London college, Tendis (a local employment group), and co-funding partners, Learning and Skills Council and the London Development Agency.

How does it work? The partnership provides pre- and post-employment training along with employer support for recruitment and employee development (i.e. coordination of apprenticeships and work placements).

What has it achieved? In the run up to the opening, some 2,300, 2,300 people had already received pre-employment training and 3,000 were expected to have done it by the opening day at the end of October. The management of the centre itself has employed 40 per cent of its staff from key west London boroughs but figures on other employers’ local uptake are still unavailable.

To give those furthest from the labour market more choice and opportunity, a wider consideration of available jobs is necessary. Once in employment these residents must continue to receive guidance and support, especially if their job is just short term and they will soon need to find other employment. One witness saw this type of fluidity, where individuals start in one job and are supported into other roles, as fundamental to the progress of individuals.

“The point is that retail gave them that first starting step that might lead them to either stay in retail, or perhaps go and work in other industries. Part of it is not trying to

limit ourselves and think that a retail job stops with coming in and perhaps being behind a till, but [instead] really looking at using it as a skills interface for a lot of people getting their first job and moving on. What that means is that we have to rethink the concept of training” (Bill Boler, Business in the Community, oral evidence)

“One of the reasons we set up BeOnsite is so that we directly employ people as they move through this transition from welfare into work so we have a very firm handle on that.” (Val Lowman, BeOnsite, oral evidence)

One way that regeneration has left positive legacies is through the establishment of skills academies, such as those in retail, finance and construction. Skills academies are employer-led centres of specialist training aiming to provide skills for both entry-level and more specialist positions. Others have taken this skills legacy one step further by investing in secondary schools and further education colleges (see Box 6). It is this type of long term commitment

that ensures that people in the area continue to benefit from regeneration investment.

“The establishment of retail academies should be a vital step in providing one of the key points of contact in raising profile, awareness and encouraging skills development for the retail industry.” (John Lewis, written evidence)

BOX 5: City work initiative in Hull

Aim: The City work initiative was created to link local residents to jobs in the St Stephen’s retail, hospitality and leisure development.

What made it work? Two ‘job shops’ were created. One was placed next to the Jobcentre Plus in Hull City Centre and the other next to the Brunsholme Estate, situated in a super output area ranked in the top three per cent of the most deprived areas in England. These ‘job shops’ acted as simple points of entry for all potential candidates, providing advice, training and support through the application and interview process.

What did it achieve? More than 53 per cent (422/793) of jobs were filled by those from the most deprived super output areas, even though only 32 per cent (2018/6288) of applicants were from these areas. There were also higher rates of success amongst Jobcentre Plus applicants compared to other applicants (13.0 per cent compared to 12.6 per cent).*

*Information taken from Ryan, M. & Nolan, M. (2007) *Future Growth Sectors and Clusters in the Hull and Humber Ports City Region: Opportunities for Addressing Worklessness and Exclusion*, Final Report to Humber Economic Partnership.

Section 2

BOX 6: MediaCityUK, Manchester

Aim: MediaCityUK is a £450 million scheme to deliver a media city that will host 1,150 media and creative business and employment opportunities for 15,500 people. The project is expected to bring £1 billion into the northern economy over the next five years. A public private partnership has been created for the project and several initiatives are underway to make sure local people can access the new jobs and training opportunities.

What initiatives have been taken?

- 1** Getting locals into construction jobs. A construction skills activity has been put in place by Bovis Lend Lease and the Salford Construction Partnership to increase the uptake of employment on site by local people across the Greater Manchester region. The project includes long term employment opportunities for the YouthBuild project, and the sponsorship of a day release construction management degree.
- 2** Skilling young generations for the incoming industry. A city academy focused on media and ICT opened in September 2009, and aims to inspire children and young people to pursue higher education within the creative industries. The BBC Outreach activity is already partnering with secondary schools to provide 14-19 year olds basic industry skills. As well as that, the media group - together with the regional sector skills agency and the Salford City Council - is offering media apprenticeships for local youth. In 2009, Salford will host the BBC's 21st Century Classroom creating a community based learning facility.
- 3** Reaping the benefits of hosting the BBC Philharmonic studio. Salford City Council has formed a partnership with the BBC Philharmonic that will open up new possibilities for young local musicians to develop their skills and aspirations while raising the city's profile nationally and internationally.

BOX 7: Sainsbury's training initiative, UK

Sainsbury's has recently announced a staff training programme open to all employees that leads to basic level qualifications in mathematics and English, as part of a national skills drive. The company offers level one numeracy and literacy qualifications, equivalent to a D grade at GCSE, delivered through an online e-learning programme. This mechanism will allow employees to work at their own pace without the involvement of managers or colleagues. Other training programmes offered include shelf stacking, stock control, retail skills and health and safety qualifications. The first 2,000 to enrol will receive a £50 voucher. In the next five years, the company expects to see 25 per cent of its 150,000 workforce gaining some form of qualification through the programme.

Section 3

Barriers to linking local people to new jobs

There are four broad sets of obstacles to linking local people to jobs created by regeneration projects: first, the benefits of using regeneration to get local residents into work are not fully appreciated; second, the costs involved in investing in low skilled local residents; third, the wider barriers individuals face in re-entering the workforce that are not addressed by training; and fourth, that a local recruitment focus can be seen as discriminatory, and that this approach can disrupt the healthy functioning of labour markets. These points address the five prerequisites discussed in the previous section, and explain why they do not naturally occur.

1. The lack of awareness and appreciation of the benefits of linking local residents to jobs created by regeneration

One underlying reason why regeneration does not deliver local employment is that that the benefits to individuals, the local and national economy, as well as to businesses of training and getting local residents into work (as discussed in section 2), are not always fully understood or appreciated by some or all stakeholders. This results in a lack of focus on local training and employment delivery from the inception of regeneration projects. This is especially the case if local authorities, who

Section 3

lead negotiations on training and employment outcomes during the planning process and decide on who wins planning contracts, are not convinced of the need to emphasise local skills and employment objectives. This taints the selection process so that it can become purely driven by cost, sidelining the training and employment opportunities for local residents.

“I think everybody knows that you need to go into a town centre, everybody knows you need to have sustainable design; it would nice to think that everybody knew that the investment was supposed to bring benefits to local people... ” (Bill Boler, Business in the Community, oral evidence).

Several stakeholders felt that the lack of central government leadership on this subject, which could be best demonstrated by the inconsistent attention paid to such local employment objectives during the procurement of public infrastructure, was key to understanding this lack of awareness and emphasis. However, others suggested that the practicalities of adopting a local employment approach, such as the cost and time as well as the difficulties of building a consensus on objectives with all relevant partners, mean that the benefits do not always seem to outweigh the costs. One way to overcome this is through more incentives, although there were divisions over what form this should take (see next sub section).

“If there was some way to recognise and encourage people who do what Laing O’Rourke and others I have heard about can

do and find a way to give incentives, whether it is the time to get approval cut from seven and a half years to six and a half years, there are ways to provide incentives and have the system recognise the people who do good things. Also I think you need to find incentives for local authorities to enable them to put these partnerships together. It is very time consuming and they need to be encouraged to do that. It is great to have the leadership of Birmingham but they all do not have the same sort of working infrastructure.” (Bill Boler, Business in the Community, oral evidence).

2. Investment in local residents is too expensive

In line with the lack of appreciation of the benefits of using regeneration to get local residents into work, some businesses argue that it is simply too expensive to train and employ locals. Some stakeholders suggested that Government tax breaks such as business rates relief or contractual bonuses for those recruiting heavily from the local community, should be introduced. Others suggested that, instead of direct financial incentives, more funding should be channelled towards training provisions. This is because businesses can find it difficult to justify big investment in training if there are already suitable individuals ready to work in the wider labour pool.

“You are absolutely right, we are not a charity; we are a commercial organisation and all the profits that we make are then reinvested into the rail network so it is

important for us to make as much profit as possible so that we can put that money back into our infrastructure. There is not a limitless pot out there of resources to make that happen, and if we are going to invest in affordable housing and we are going to invest in local labour and construction as part of these, we will need some help with that.” (Ian Lindsay, Network Rail, oral evidence)

“In our view, funding for employability and skills training schemes is a more relevant lever than fiscal incentives.” (John Lewis, written evidence)

However, it can be argued that by giving financial rewards the local authority ends up paying for what employers would, or at least should, be doing anyway. In this sense giving financial aid could be seen as an inefficient way to spend money. This is particularly problematic in the current economic climate, given the ongoing drive for greater spending efficiency and the pressure on public sector budgets caused by the downturn.

If local government incur the full costs of targeted recruitment and training initiatives it can prove too much of a financial burden. This is why some choose to use section 106 to accumulate funds (see box 2). However, section 106 is more difficult to use in this manner during a downturn. In the short term, local authorities are likely to lower requirements in order to get developers and investors on board. Longer term, however, the importance of section 106 as a lever to

link regeneration and local employment will continue to grow.

If the cost of paying benefits in the long run, or paying providers to deliver programmes such as the new Flexible New Deal are taken into account it may be cost neutral, or in fact more cost effective to invest in these schemes. Unfortunately, as local authorities do not control adult skills and benefit funding, they are less likely to weigh up the costs in this way.

“Employers working with Jobcentre Plus to recruit long term unemployed need both financial support for the additional investment required at the assessment and training stages, and also a package of support for residents to help with childcare or provide other benefits.” (Trevor Dorling, Greenwich Council, oral evidence)

“St. Modwen does not believe that fiscal incentives are required to persuade regeneration investors to get local people into jobs. It is far more important for prospective trainees and employees to be work ready, and that may require fiscal investment or incentives at a pre-work stage. Employer based on the job training has been proven to provide better outcomes than classroom based training. This does therefore require trainees to be equipped to participate in work based training, which may require a greater proportion of public sector funding for training to be targeted in this direction, and developers, contractors and post-regeneration employers should be involved in the design of the training aimed

Section 3

at their sector.” (St Modwen Properties PLC, written evidence)

3. Initiatives linking local residents to new regeneration jobs cannot tackle wider barriers to work

“Constraints on the employability of residents in inner city areas relate closely to social exclusion in such areas, meaning that benefits and tax implications, childcare, language barriers, wider social problems and infrastructure must all be addressed alongside education and skills.” (English RDAs, written evidence)

The areas worst affected by economic exclusion have congregations of those from disadvantaged backgrounds, such as ethnic minorities, lone parents, low skilled workers and ex-offenders. These groups have multiple barriers to work that can be compounded by living in social housing, or in areas with others in a similar position, because of poor employment networks and low aspirations.²⁰ Deprived areas can also be poorly connected to the city centre, requiring new transport infrastructure if people are to find it easy to get to work.

“Our experience in Leicester was that four excellent candidates who were offered permanent, flexible positions at John Lewis could not accept because the costs of travelling, childcare and availability of nursery places were prohibitive.” (John Lewis, written evidence)

The benefits trap is a national barrier to stronger local employment outcomes on the back of regeneration projects. Witnesses argued that lack of affordable housing, childcare and transport can mean that there is very little financial gain in taking up work, especially entry level positions, traineeships, and apprenticeships. Several witnesses thought this could be overcome by a ‘transition period’, where individuals continued to receive benefits even though they had started work.

“The full journey of somebody into work has to be looked at, not just getting them into their first job. It is a huge step once somebody gets into employment and some of the simplest things on a day-to-day basis mean that somebody will drop out of work straightaway. One of the things we are exploring particularly in Birmingham is a transitional period of people coming off benefit. We are looking at if somebody gets a job today they do not lose all their benefits but there is a transition with personalised support that helps somebody into sustainable employment beyond their first job into their second and their third.” (Waheed Nazir, Birmingham City Council, oral evidence)

The national welfare framework can also be problematic because it restricts those on benefits to training for no more than 16 hours per week. Several stakeholders noted that this was a significant barrier to in-work training, and to greater local linking of residents to jobs created by major regeneration projects.

²⁰These barriers can be captured in the idea of neighbourhood effects, where the neighbourhood is a factor in determining the lived experience of residents beyond their own individual or household circumstances.

In short, individual barriers such as childcare costs, poor transport links, the benefits trap and intergenerational worklessness which leads to a lack of role models and a culture of benefit dependency, cannot be overcome simply by targeted recruitment and training. Instead, more attention needs to be paid to the wider barriers. For instance, local authorities can incentivise bus companies to create new transport routes to link deprived areas to newly regenerated city centres, or nurseries can be supported through childrens' services budgets and employment support schemes.

"The Retail Academy's 'joined-up' creative approach and a willingness to see the bigger picture were real strengths. Walsall Council, for example, looked at how public transport links and timetables could be changed to tie in with shift patterns for the store to help local people to access jobs." (Walsall Regeneration Company, written evidence)

4. A local focus on recruitment is discriminatory

Finally, it can be argued that by explicitly targeting inner city residents, businesses are discriminating against those ready and willing to work, including migrant labour. Such discriminatory practices are not only

unfair, but because of the way it distorts the competitive process between individuals it can undermine the healthy functioning of labour markets.

"Arguments usually presented included - 'it will cost more'; 'it will lose time on the job'; 'it is against equal opportunities.' Each of these were dismissed - there is no cost passed on to the contractor or developer because our commitment was to find the people and pay for all the training; if people were not available or could not be found in time we promised to let employers know immediately in order that they could recruit elsewhere; we did not tell employers who to employ, they still had free selection, but we made sure that selection includes local people who have been trained and were appropriate for the job." (Glasgow South West Regeneration Agency, written evidence)

This is where the arguments made in section 1 again become important - targeted recruitment is necessary to help sustain regeneration investments and build inclusive cities. In response to the argument that local hiring can disrupt the healthy functioning of labour markets, if local residents are trained to meet employer specifications employment standards will not be lowered.

Section 4

Conclusions and recommendations

“I think there are a lot of organisations that are very willing to do this, and it is up to those of us that are engaging developers and contractors to use those people who step up to the plate and provide the opportunities.” (Steve Howlett, Peabody Trust, oral evidence)

The evidence submitted to this inquiry overwhelming suggests that successful regeneration occurs when physical renewal goes hand in hand with increased employment for local residents. Whilst it is not the case that jobs created by regeneration have always translated into higher employment amongst residents of nearby deprived areas, written and oral evidence received during this inquiry has shown that there are a considerable number of successful initiatives and commitments in this field.

This inquiry has suggested that a core principle of any regeneration initiative must be to get local people into jobs created by physical redevelopment. It is only then that regeneration will meet the objectives set out in the Government’s Regeneration Framework, as well as the broader expectations of local people in Britain’s cities.

The previous section has highlighted where change is needed to encourage better links between regeneration and employment schemes. In light of its findings, the All Party Urban Development Group has identified four key recommendations that would help regeneration projects - both during

the downturn and the next major wave regeneration - to deliver stronger local employment outcomes.

1. City councils need to do more to use their existing powers to promote local employment around major regeneration projects - working together with the newly-launched Homes and Communities Agency.

Evidence presented here has demonstrated the importance of using section 106 negotiations with developers to agree a joint approach to employing local residents. In particular, councils, the HCA, and other public sector agencies (such as NHS Trusts) should lead by example, and use the procurement stage to promote use of local labour on their own property development projects.

To demonstrate their focus on local jobs, and to incentivise developers to include local employment objectives in both tenders and planning submissions, councils should prioritise and speed up planning applications for projects that will deliver jobs for a significant number of local residents.

In the short run, whilst section 106 is unable to produce the same monetary contribution, local authorities should work with the HCA to identify extra sources of funding for local skills and recruitment initiatives. The devolution of adult skills budgets would also help (see recommendation 3, below).

2. Employers and cities should work together to promote sustainable

employment and retention after the physical regeneration of an area is complete.

As discussed in section 2, regeneration is not just about short term construction jobs. Many projects will have a longer term employment legacy on site, and offer routes into the labour market for local residents. For local people to take advantage of these opportunities, they will require:

- training linked to employer demand - e.g. giving local people the skills needed to access new jobs, such as those in retail and the service sector;
- focused career advice;
- for those whose jobs are short term, exit interviews and signposting to other local opportunities; and
- monitoring of job starts and retention rates by employers following completion of a regeneration project.

3. Central government needs to give cities a greater degree of control over adult skills funding so that regeneration projects deliver jobs for local residents.

The planned National Skills Funding Agency cannot connect city residents to regeneration jobs from the centre. As it moves toward statutory city-regional bodies and Employment and Skills Boards, the Government should devolve control over adult skills budgets to cities and local employers - allowing

greater flexibility at the local level to respond to employer needs, both during the current downturn and in a period of economic recovery.

Cities are better placed to respond to employer demand for skills during both the construction and legacy phases of regeneration. Greater financial flexibility would enable cities and employers to build bespoke training programmes that enable local people to access the jobs created by regeneration projects - not just in construction, but also facilities management, retail and the housing sector.

4. Private sector industry bodies should introduce a new kite mark scheme to recognise developers, construction companies, property owners and occupiers that demonstrate a track record of local hiring.

Evidence received from developers, construction companies and occupiers during this inquiry has suggested that companies want some kind of recognition for the work they do training and recruiting local residents. An independent, recognised kite mark would not only give developers and construction companies an opportunity to receive formal recognition, but would also allow city councils and other public bodies to:

- evaluate potential development partners for their own projects, based on their commitment to local employment;
- assess a planning application's potential to spark employment in a regenerating area; and

Section 4

- build up trust with private sector developers and ensure the delivery of employment commitments.

Thus, a kite mark scheme should act as an incentive for developers and construction companies to engage in activities that result in greater local employment.

The evidence presented in this report points to one clear conclusion: regeneration has

enormous potential to be used as a tool to help city residents get back to work, and to give them an economic stake in the future of their cities. Given the contribution employment makes to individual, business and local economic success, as well as to the UK economy as a whole, it is time to re-evaluate the experience to date, and ensure that the next wave of regeneration helps cities to deliver more local jobs.

References

Business in the Community and Research International (2006) *Employee Engagement Research*.

Communities and Local Government (2006) *The Economies of Deprived Communities*. West Yorkshire: CLG Publications.

Communities and Local Government (2007) *Communities and Local Government Economics Paper 1: A Framework for Intervention*.

Department for Work and Pensions (2008) *No one written off: reforming welfare to reward responsibility*. London: Department for Work and Pensions.

Magrabi, F.M., Chung, Y. S., Cha, S.S., Yang, S. (1991) *The economics of household consumption*. New York: Praeger.

HM Treasury (2008) *Facing global challenges: supporting people through difficult times. Pre-Budget Report 2008*. London: HM Treasury.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (1995), *Creating local jobs from construction expenditure*, York: JRF Findings 140.

Laine, L. (2002) *Business investment in under-served markets: an opportunity for business and communities?*. Business in the Community.

Leitch Review of Skills (2006) *Prosperity for all in the global economy - world class skills*. London: The Stationery Office.

Meadows, P. (2008) *Local initiatives to help workless people find and keep paid work*. JRF, used in UCLES submission.

New Economic Foundation, (2008), *Fool's Gold: How the 2012 Olympics is selling East London short, and a 10 point plan for a more positive legacy*.

Regeneris consulting for Westfield and John Lewis Partnership (September 2008), *Economics and social impacts of town centre retailing*.

HM Treasury (2008) *Facing global challenges: supporting people through difficult times. Pre-Budget Report 2008*. London: HM Treasury.

Kearns, A. (2003) 'Social capital, regeneration and urban policy' in R. Imrie and M. Raco (eds) *Urban renaissance: New Labour, community and urban policy*. Bristol: The Policy Press, p.37-60.

Annex

Acknowledgements

The All Party Urban Development Group would like to thank Faiza Shaheen and Adam Marshall at the Centre for Cities, as well as Kurt Mueller and Michael Chambers at the British Property Federation, for their work in compiling this report. Thanks are also due to the individuals and organisations that testified at the Group's inquiry session on 20 October 2008, and those that submitted written evidence for consideration. These groups are listed below.

Witnesses at APUDG inquiry session, House of Commons, 20 October 2008

Richard Beamish
Chief Executive, Asset Skills Council

Bill Boler
Director of Underserved Markets Division
Business in the Community

Trevor Dorling
Head of Economic Development
Greenwich Council

Tony Douglas
Chief Operating Officer
Laing O'Rourke

Steve Howlett
Chief Executive
Peabody Trust

Ian Lindsay
Head of Commercial Development
Network Rail

Val Lowman
Managing Director
BeOnsite (Bovis Lendlease)

Waheed Nazir
Assistant Director of Development
Planning and Regeneration
Birmingham City Council

Written submissions were received from:

ASDA
Asset Skills
Accessible Retail
Business in the Community
Central Salford Urban Regeneration Company
Creation
English Regional Development Agencies
Glasgow South West Regeneration Agency
Hull City Council
John Lewis
Liverpool One
St Modwen
Tees Valley Regeneration
UK Commission for Employment and Skills
Walsall Regeneration Company
Wates
Westfield
Work2Work
Work Directions
Yorkshire Forward



Printed on recycled paper

© Copyright All Party Urban Development Group 2008

www.allparty-urbandevelopment.org.uk