

Regional Studies Association Annual International Conference: The Dilemmas of Integration and Competition

Prague, Czech Republic (27th – 29th May 2007)

Gateway K: Employability and Labour Market Strategies in Regional Perspective

Convenors: Colin Lindsay & Lionel Guillemot

Regeneration Fatigue: Tackling Persistent Problems of Local Deprivation

Nigel Berkeley & David Jarvis

Applied Research Centre in Sustainable Regeneration (SURGE),
Futures Institute, 10, Coventry Innovation Village,
Cheetah Road, Coventry. CV1 2TL
Tel: +4424 7679 5758 Email: n.berkeley@coventry.ac.uk
Web: www.coventry.ac.uk/surge

Introduction

Despite numerous government social and economic regeneration initiatives over the past 30 years, and more recent attempts to tackle deprivation at a neighbourhood level, pockets of multiple-deprivation continue to persist in Britain's industrial heartland. Disadvantaged neighbourhoods have typically been adversely affected by processes of economic restructuring and industrial decline, being highly dependent upon jobs in disappearing manufacturing industries. As a consequence they now often suffer from high levels of worklessness, poor job prospects, income deprivation, poor educational attainment and hence employability, fear of crime, a lack of access to affordable mixed housing and a degraded physical environment. The success of modern regeneration initiatives in tackling these issues are potentially hamstrung by residents' distrust of statutory authority intervention. This distrust partly reflects 'regeneration fatigue' with neighbourhoods being subject to numerous renewal initiatives seeking to address persistent and repeated concerns of residents, many of which remain largely unsolved.

These issues are exemplified the findings of recent empirical research undertaken to inform the delivery of a new Regeneration Programme for Canley, a longstanding disadvantaged neighbourhood located within the UK's West Midlands conurbation. Canley, with a population of 5,500, is ranked in the top 20 per cent most deprived neighbourhoods in England and is typical of the disadvantaged neighbourhoods described above, particularly in respect of worklessness. It is also characterised by above average proportions of young and older residents, including a high number of lone parent households. Nash and Christie's 2003 study of Canley for the Institute of Public Policy Research paints a picture of a neighbourhood that is relatively isolated, often overlooked due to its proximity to more prosperous neighbourhoods (one of which is in the top 20% least deprived in the country), suffers from a lack of trust both of neighbours and authority, and a general lack of amenities, particularly those which cater for the interests of young people. It also suffers from a fragmented geography, being characterised by three distinct and inward looking sub-neighbourhoods divided by local roads. Our findings, drawn from a survey of Canley residents in December 2007, reinforce research undertaken previously, and present a significant challenge for policy makers in Coventry trying to convince residents, who have heard it all before, that they can make a difference this time.

The paper is divided into four further sections: the first provides a brief overview of UK policies to tackle deprivation at the neighbourhood level; the second presents the case study of tackling persistent problems of deprivation in Canley, the third provides an overview of the Canley Regeneration Programme designed to alleviate the neighbourhood's problems; and the fourth offers some conclusions and implications for policy.

Tackling deprivation at the neighbourhood level in the UK

With the election of the 'New' Labour Government in 1997 came a renewed commitment to spatial policy in the UK. Such policy can be defined as intervention to achieve specific social, economic and environmental objectives in designated localities, underpinned by strong institutional capacity (Hall, 2003). New Labour spatial policy focuses on three different levels: regions, cities and neighbourhoods. At the neighbourhood level the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) was set-up in 1997 with a remit to tackle the causes of exclusion and develop integrated and sustainable approaches to address problems in the UK's worst and most deprived neighbourhoods regardless of where in the country they are located (Oatley, 2005). This approach differs from post-war Labour spatial policy which sought to redistribute demand from the south of England to the North, Wales and Scotland by means of grants and subsidies. It builds upon the partnership-based approach to urban policy pursued by the Conservative government under John Major in the early 1990s. Multi-agency local partnerships with community involvement were central to schemes such as the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB), though these were criticised for being divisive because of the competitive nature of resource allocation (Hall, 2003).

Spatial policy under New Labour has four key characteristics: a strong emphasis on supply-side intervention; devolved responsibility to regions and neighbourhoods; joined-up government through multi-agency, multi-sector partnerships; and community involvement, under the premise that 'renewal must come from within' (Hall, 2003; Wallace 2001; Oatley, 2000). Policy aimed specifically at the neighbourhood level is designed to address a spiral of decline in many poor neighbourhoods which has seen basic quality of life eroded. Those neighbourhoods which exhibit high crime and unemployment rates gain negative reputations, forcing people, shops and employers to leave. 'As people moved out, high turnover and empty homes created more opportunity for crime, vandalism and drug dealing' (Wallace, 2001; p2164). Reasons for the decline of neighbourhoods are numerous: covering structural factors such as economic restructuring and the collapse of traditional industries which underpinned many neighbourhoods and their communities; societal change, including the fragmentation of communities and the decline in popularity of social housing; and policies which have placed concentrations of the most vulnerable people within the most deprived neighbourhoods (Wallace, 2001). Previous area-based policies have not been able to adequately address the problems of deprived neighbourhoods and the underlying issue of social exclusion (Hall 2003). A range of factors are put forward to explain their lack of success including: the short-term nature of policy; the failure to engage *with* communities; that too much emphasis has been placed on capital projects and not investment in people; that those most in need often experience the poorest level of quality in terms of service provision; and the lack of effective joined-up strategy (Wallace 2001, Hall, 2003).

The Government's National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (2001) is designed to address these shortcomings. It focuses on securing better outcomes and hence quality of life for people in England's most deprived areas, as well as, narrowing the gap between these areas and the rest of the country (Social Exclusion Unit, 2001; DCLG & DWP, 2007). The Strategy was backed by additional money for mainstream programmes as well as a non-ring fenced Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF) which was made available to the 88 most deprived authorities in England (Wallace 2001; DCLG, 2008). The National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal focuses on three policy dimensions. Firstly, the Strategy places emphasis on improving quality of life outcomes in five key areas: worklessness, crime, health, education, housing and the physical environment, with the view that mainstream programmes have not, on the whole, performed well in deprived neighbourhoods. Programmes such as New Deal and Sure Start are key components of this policy. 'Floor-targets' have been set which will hold delivery partnerships to account in terms of their performance in deprived neighbourhoods. Secondly, the Strategy emphasises the need to re-build social capital through a range of capacity-building, community empowerment and involvement initiatives designed to ensure that communities have the tools and the confidence to be fully engaged in local renewal initiatives. Finally, the Strategy stresses the need for joined-up working at all levels to address problems of overlap and duplication of effort amongst service providers but also to fully integrate the community. Neighbourhood Management and Local Strategic Partnerships are examples of this new way of working (Wallace 2001; Hall, 2003; Oatley, 2000).

This area-based policy is backed by substantial resources and has a relatively long-term focus (10-20 years) However, it is recognised that deeply embedded problems, prevalent in many deprived neighbourhoods, are complex and multi-faceted and will require very long-term and challenging solutions. Critics such as Oatley (2000) have argued that much of what New Labour is attempting has been tried before, that area-based policies are notoriously unsuccessful in addressing people poverty and that 'until we develop policy approaches that engage with the root causes of poverty, unemployment and disabled and alienated communities we will be destined to relive the policy failures of the past' (p.96). Moreover, Robinson et al (2005) whilst welcoming New Labour's approach to community-led regeneration expressed caution suggesting that 'involving the community in governance [in decision making in local partnerships]...is far from easy, and it generates problems and challenges which need to be tackled' (p.16.). In particular their research, focusing on the New Deal for Communities programme, highlighted numerous barriers and issues affecting community engagement and involvement. These include: limited community capacity, inadequate representation, limited specialist knowledge, the practicalities of being involved i.e. the substantial time demands, friction and a lack of trust of local government and the pressure to achieve quick wins. Involving residents in the governance of regeneration schemes can work 'but in many cases it will need to be carefully nurtured and managed; it needs to be enabled and supported' (p.21).

Seven years on, the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal's 10-20 year time frame might appear to be somewhat challenging. The recently released 2007 Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) indicates that no significant overall progress has been made in terms of narrowing the gap between deprived areas and 'the rest of the country', although there have been success stories on indicators in some key policy areas e.g. health, education, and crime. Recognising that pockets of severe deprivation remain, especially in terms of persistent

worklessness has led the Government to replace the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund with the Working Neighbourhoods Fund (WNF) which places emphasis on getting people back into the labour market as a means of improving their quality of life and tackling poverty (DLCG & DWP, 2007). However, the Fund's eligibility criteria [that a local authority has 20% or more of its lower super output areas in the most deprived decile on the IMD employment domain or the overall deprivation index] means that some 21 local authorities that previously received NRF are not eligible for WNF. Such authorities will receive two years of transitional funding but nothing after 2009/10. This has implications for those local authorities that, by virtue of their improved IMD score, have clearly improved their overall position but that still have pockets of deprivation within their boundaries. An excellent illustration of the problems of persistent deprivation in the context of reduced public sector funding opportunities is provided by Canley in Coventry. The case study presented below highlights the considerable challenges faced by stakeholders in trying to alleviate and overcome such problems.

Tackling Persistent Problems of Local Deprivation: A Case study of Canley (Coventry)

Context

The neighbourhood of Canley, located in Westwood Ward, lies on the south-western edge of Coventry some six miles from the City Centre. According to the 2001 census, Canley has a population of approximately 5,500 living in 2,255 households. It is characterised by above average proportions of young and older residents, with 44.1% of the population either below 17 or above 65 years of age. This compares with 39.1% for the city as a whole. The neighbourhood is also home to a high number of lone parents which comprise approximately 12% of all households. This compares to a figure of 8% across Coventry. In terms of its ethnic profile, Canley is a predominantly White neighbourhood. This group make up over 93% of the population, contrasting with the situation in other priority neighbourhoods in the City where the average is 77%. The census further reveals that compared to the rest of Coventry, Canley has lower rates of economic activity and car ownership and a higher proportion of social or private rented accommodation. The latest Indices of Deprivation (published in 2007 by the Department of Communities and Local Government) shows Canley to be in the top 20% most deprived in England (based on indicators covering: income, employment, health, skills, barriers to services, crime and the living environment) (Coventry City Council, 2007a). These data, whilst highlighting the socio-economic situation facing Canley do not adequately capture the way in which residents experience quality of life in the neighbourhood.

Quality of Life in Canley in 2007

Whilst evidence exists through ethnographic research (e.g. Nash and Christie's 2003 study: *Making Sense of Community*) and residents have for a long time expressed their views on quality of life in Canley through a variety of community meetings and consultation events, a large scale survey had not been undertaken in order to fully evidence detailed quality of life issues. As such, and in order to inform a bottom up approach to regenerating the neighbourhood, Coventry City Council commissioned a face-to-face survey of 300 Canley households (a sample of 14%). The survey, which was undertaken in December 2007¹, captured over 90

¹ Fieldwork was undertaken by BMG Research Ltd.

indicators of quality of life and well being structured around seven key themes: Liveability; Citizenship; Community Safety; Lifestyles; Economic Activity; Transport & Access; and Retail Provision. The following section of the paper presents an overview of findings under each of these headings². Where possible, findings are presented for the three sub-neighbourhoods of Canley (Prior Deram, Canley Central and Western Canley) and comparisons are made with data for all Priority Neighbourhoods in Coventry and the City as a whole, taken from a citywide Household Survey commissioned by Coventry's Local Strategic Partnership to run in parallel with the Canley survey³.

Liveability

The general level of satisfaction with Canley as a place to live is comparatively low when compared to Coventry as a whole. Moreover the situation appears to have worsened over the last two years (Table 1). This is driven by concerns over: a lack of activities for teenagers, facilities for young people, levels of crime and anti-social behaviour, cleanliness of streets, conditions of roads and pavements, and the provision of local services and facilities generally. These issues appear especially pertinent for residents in Prior Deram and for females. This may reflect a younger more transient population in Prior Deram, including a relatively high number of lone parent households compared to the more established, longstanding community of Western Canley.

Poor standards of liveability in Canley are further evidenced in lower levels of satisfaction with housing quality, tenant services, and the quality and maintenance of parks, open spaces and the general 'streetscene', when compared with Coventry and its Priority Neighbourhoods as a whole (Table 1). Again, these issues are more keenly felt in Prior Deram and amongst females. Perhaps as a consequence of these negative perceptions of liveability, especially in Prior Deram, levels of hopefulness for the future are also lower in Canley than in Coventry as a whole.

As highlighted by the following quotes from residents from 2002 and 2003, these issues are not new:

"Another issue concerns the lack of things to do; 'we are the forgotten end of the city with regard to amenities'...There is no natural hub in Canley to attract people from either end of the locality...As well as the shortage of facilities, there is a larger problem with the quality of the public realm"

"Canley, because of its location away from away from the city centre, presented particular problems, with many local residents reporting that the lack of facilities for teenagers could be one cause of the area's high levels of anti-social behaviour" (Nash and Christie, pp 13 & 28)

"With regards to recreation for people there's a real problem....you've got to go all the way into town to get access to swimming and leisure facilities" (Carpenter et al, 2004; p.22)

² Analysis was undertaken by the Applied Research Centre in Sustainable Regeneration at Coventry University. Findings have since been presented in a report to Coventry City Council as well as in presentations to service providers and residents.

Table 1: Resident perceptions of liveability in Canley

INDICATOR - Proportion of respondents....	CANLEY						COVENTRY	
	TOTAL	PRIOR DERAM	CANLEY CENTRAL	WESTERN CANLEY	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	PRIORITY NEIGHBOURHOODS
Satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live	71.9	63.5	81.8	81.4	79.7	64.2	85.0	82.5
Feeling that quality of life has worsened over the past two years.	29.0	31.9	24.2	25.4	32.4	24.6	19.0	19.0
Reporting that ACTIVITIES FOR TEENAGERS need improving	49.5	53.3	43.9	44.1	43.3	54.3	35.9	39.7
Reporting that LEVELS OF CRIME need improving	46.3	54.9	24.2	44.1	42.5	49.1	20.7	23.3
Reporting that FACILITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE need improving	40.7	45.6	35.8	32.2	32.8	46.8	37.3	36.2
Reporting that CLEANLINESS OF STREETS need improving	31.3	36.3	18.2	30.5	19.4	40.5	38.9	45.0
Reporting that CONDITIONS OF ROADS AND PAVEMENTS need improving	19.9	18.7	16.7	27.1	13.4	24.9	46.3	37.7
Satisfied with local services and facilities	38.7	30.3	62.1	37.6	46.3	32.5	-	-
Hopeful about the future	51.8	47.0	56.5	61.5	59.8	45.6	60.6	54.7
Satisfied with Housing Association/Landlord [where tenants]	75.3	71.2	80.6	88.5	79.0	72.6	77.6	75.0
Satisfied with quality of their home	79.4	74.7	87.9	84.5	82.7	76.9	86.5	82.0
Wanting to move home	34.2	37.5	44.5	13.0	31.7	36.2	23.5	24.1
Satisfied with the QUALITY OF PARKS AND OPEN SPACES IN THEIR NEIGHBOURHOOD	45.6	36.9	58.4	60.0	56.0	38.0	66.5	68.4
Satisfied with STREET CLEANLINESS IN THEIR NEIGHBOURHOOD	46.8	40.1	61.5	51.8	51.0	43.0	46.5	42.9
Satisfied with ROAD MAINTENANCE & REPAIRS IN THEIR NEIGHBOURHOOD	34.8	33.5	40.9	32.2	39.0	31.0	38.0	41.3
Satisfied with MAINTENANCE OF GRASS VERGES AND TREES IN THEIR NEIGHBOURHOOD	42.9	32.6	55.5	61.4	53.0	36.0	59.0	59.0

Citizenship

Survey findings appear to show a degree of apathy amongst Canley residents generally in terms of them getting involved in activities which contribute to improving their neighbourhoods (Table 2). This may reflect distrust of statutory authority intervention based upon ‘regeneration fatigue’ with the neighbourhood being subject to numerous renewal initiatives and perceived ‘broken promises’ in recent decades; a point captured by Nash and Christie (2003)

“Many of the people we spoke to were already involved in efforts to run the neighbourhood around, but...many others in Canley are apathetic, cynical and very hard to engage” (p.12)

Yet for residents many key issues remain largely unsolved. This is reflected further in the relatively low proportion of respondents that have been, or wish to be, involved in the Canley Regeneration Programme itself, and also in a lack of belief that their voices are heard and can influence outcomes in relation to proposals and developments in the neighbourhood. In addition, the survey found comparatively low levels of volunteering activity amongst Canley residents (Table 2).

³ The City-wide household survey was undertaken by MEL Research Ltd. Coventry wide data presented in Tables 1 through 7 are taken from their report.

Table2: Citizenship in Canley

INDICATOR - Proportion of respondents....	CANLEY						COVENTRY	
	TOTAL	PRIOR DERAM	CANLEY CENTRAL	WESTERN CANLEY	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	PRIORITY NEIGHBOURHOODS
Satisfied that their views are sought for proposals/developments in their neighbourhoods	25.9	15.3	63.4	15.5	34.5	19.7	44.7	45.4
Feeling able to influence decisions affecting their neighbourhood	11.3	8.7	22.4	7.4	10.8	11.6	17.1	11.6
Actively involved in working toards improving their neighbourhood	3.6	3.9	4.7	1.7	5.3	2.3	14.2	9.3
Attending public meetings about Canley regeneration project	16.1	12.2	23.1	20.7	13.7	17.9	-	-
Involved in FORMAL volunteering work	5.5	4.9	9.1	3.4	5.2	5.8	10.8	8.0
Involved in INFORMAL volunteering work	17.9	7.1	59.1	5.1	19.4	16.8	22.5	19.5

Community Safety

Feelings of safety in the home in Canley are relatively high both in comparison to all Priority Neighbourhoods and the wider City. This is especially the case in Prior Deram. On the surface this is a positive finding. However, it may also reflect the fact that perceptions of safety in the Canley neighbourhood, especially during the night, are relatively low, causing people to focus inwards on their home security and well being. These issues are particularly pertinent to women participants in the survey and to residents of Prior Deram (Table 3).

Concerns over personal safety within Canley, and especially Prior Deram, are influenced strongly by perceptions of ‘people hanging around on the street’ as well as that crime in the neighbourhood is increasing. Moreover, the survey found that Canley residents are less satisfied with key aspects of the criminal justice system e.g. protection from offenders, a factor that may reflect fear of reprisals and hence lead to under-reporting of criminal activity (Table 3).

Anti-social behaviour is a particular concern in the area. Again this is felt most keenly in Prior Deram and by women. Of particular concern in Prior Deram are issues of noisy neighbours and loud parties, and to a lesser degree drunk and rowdy behaviour; rubbish and litter; vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property; drugs; and people hanging around on the street. As highlighted in Table 3, these perceptions may be linked in part to a belief that parents, particularly in Prior Deram and Western Canley, are not taking responsibility for the behaviour of their children.

Car parking emerges as an anti social behaviour issue in Western Canley. This is triangulated by relatively low satisfaction with parking provision and high levels of concern over vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles in this area.

Table 3: Residents perceptions of community safety in Canley

INDICATOR - Proportion of respondents...	CANLEY						COVENTRY	
	TOTAL	PRIOR DERAM	CANLEY CENTRAL	WESTERN CANLEY	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	PRIORITY NEIGHBOURHOODS
Feeling 'very safe' at home during the day	59.6	69.2	42.4	49.2	46.2	47.6	46.8	42.3
Feeling 'very safe' at home at night	54.7	62.6	37.9	49.2	32.8	31	31.9	23.6
Feeling unsafe in the neighbourhood at night	49.7	54.7	39.4	44.8	24.8	44.4	34.1	37.2
Reporting that 'Crime in my neighbourhood has increased over the past twelve months'	34.3	39.4	34.6	18.4	25.6	33	29.2	30.6
Identifying Anti Social Behaviour as a major problem [British Crime Survey ASB Indicators]	21.2	31.3	6.5	4.5	16.4	24.8	-	-
Identifying noisy neighbours and loud parties as problematic	23.1	35.1	4.5	6.8	16.5	14.8	15.5	21
Identifying vandalism, graffiti and other damage to property or vehicles as a problem	58.3	63.2	34.9	69.5	42	43	42.6	45.3
Disagreeing that 'parents in the neighbourhood take responsibility for the behaviour of their children'	57.8	65.7	28.2	68.5	24.5	24.6	24.5	27.3
Who are satisfied with victim/witness care	19.5	15.3	26.5	23.3	49.9	52.1	50.9	51.9
Who are dissatisfied with protection from offenders	25.6	32.9	9.1	23.2	8.4	13.4	10.8	11.2

Again, these issues reported in the 2007 survey are longstanding; a point illustrated in Nash and Christie's study in 2003 (p.13):

"Boarded-up shops, litter and graffiti are off-putting; this is not a high-quality public environment in which people will feel comfortable lingering or mixing, so people are even less likely to step outside their front doors. The effect of the housing layout and design is to make the neighbourhood feel insecure...there are too few people around to act as a natural deterrent to crime."

"Canley is not a reassuring neighbourhood...the area does suffer from high levels of anti-social behaviour, even by the very young. People complained that some kids were 'totally out of control...nobody cares where they are or what they are doing'. Others suggested that there was just nothing for kids to do locally, and even those just hanging around...tended to be seen as a threat"

Residents clearly see a connection between the level of anti-social behaviour and the lack of amenities and facilities in the neighbourhood:

"There is a lot of anti-social behaviour...but a lot of it is down to the fact that they haven't got a lot to do" (Carpenter, et al 2004, p.36).

Lifestyles

Findings from the survey reveal Canley residents are more likely to smoke and less likely to partake in routine physical activity (or indeed more active sport) on a regular basis when compared to those in the Coventry and city's Priority Neighbourhoods generally (Table 4). A lack of facilities for children and young people in the Canley neighbourhood may partly influence relatively low participation rates in physical activity and sport amongst young respondents, especially in Western Canley. Canley residents are also shown to engage less in cultural activities such as visiting museums or art galleries.

Table 4: Lifestyles in Canley

INDICATOR - Proportion of respondents....	CANLEY							COVENTRY	
	TOTAL	PRIOR DERAM	CANLEY CENTRAL	WESTERN CANLEY	16-24	25-54	55+	TOTAL	PRIORITY N'HOODS
Eating at least five portions of fruit and vegetables	18.0	18.9	31.3	0.0	18.6	19.7	15.2	20.1	18.1
Who are smokers	39.0	41.2	43.9	26.3	28.9	48.1	30.2	28.7	35.1
Taking part in physical activity [brisk walking] at least three times per week	49.4	46.7	78.8	24.1	53.4	54.6	39.7	67.1	69.8
Taking part in active sport at least monthly	21.7	17.2	48.5	5.1	42.2	22.6	11.3	51.4	50.9
Visiting a museum at least 2x a year	12.3	10.4	22.3	8.5	8.9	14.7	10.6	19.5	15.8
Visiting an art gallery at least 2x a year	11.3	7.7	24.7	8.5	11.4	11.4	8.6	20.0	16.2

Economic Activity

A relatively low proportion of Canley residents, and particularly those in Prior Deram, are economically active (Table 5). For those that are in paid work, many are employed in lower skilled, lower paid jobs. This may help to explain the relatively high proportion of respondents in Prior Deram who worry about being able to make ends meet on a regular basis. Economic inactivity, and resultant benefit dependency, is perhaps reflected in a significant proportion of working age households in Canley without an earned income. This is exemplified by a relatively high proportion of single parent households, where the respondent is 'at home not seeking employment'.

The economic status profile amongst Canley residents may be skewed by a relatively large student population within the neighbourhood (*Canley is very close to the University of Warwick*). This group also has the effect of inflating the academic qualification profile of the neighbourhood's population, particularly with regard to high level qualifications (Table 5).

Table 5: Employment and education in Canley

INDICATOR - Proportion of respondents....	CANLEY				COVENTRY	
	TOTAL	PRIOR DERAM	CANLEY CENTRAL	WESTERN CANLEY	TOTAL	PRIORITY NEIGHBOURHOODS
Who worry about being able to make ends meet [quite often or always]	21.7	26.5	19.7	8.6	19.0	21.0
In full time paid work	29.7	25	38.2	37.2	48.7	47.8
In part-time paid work	13.9	13.6	14.7	14	14.1	11.8
Who are self employed	3.8	4.5	2.9	2.3	4.1	3.1
Living in a households where nobody has an earned income	35.9	37.1	32.6	35.3	15.9	20.9
With five or more GCSEs (Grades A-C) [includes O levels and CSE Grade 1]	32.6	-	-	-	41.7	29.7
With at least one A Level	18.1	-	-	-	28.5	23
With a Degree	12.3	-	-	-	14.4	10.8

[Data related to those respondents aged 16-64 only]

Transport & Access

The Canley neighbourhood is relatively isolated being situated on the periphery of the City and suffers from relatively poor transport links to key employment sites, the City Centre and public services. This is evidenced by the fact that a greater proportion of Canley residents than elsewhere in the City identify specific journeys that they would like to make by bus but cannot do so due to the lack of appropriate routes. This is especially the case for residents of Canley Central. Moreover, non-users of the bus service are often deterred by infrequency, unreliability and lack of punctuality (Table 6).

Car ownership levels within Canley are lower than for Coventry as a whole, and as such residents are more dependent upon a reliable and efficient public transport service. However, findings reveal very high levels of dissatisfaction with the bus service overall and especially the condition of bus stops, the frequency and punctuality of buses and the provision of information about services. Perhaps as a consequence Canley residents are more likely to undertake a range of different types of journey by foot than are their counterparts across the City as a whole. Yet dissatisfaction with conditions for walking is comparatively high (Table 6).

Dissatisfaction with bus services is not a new problem as highlighted by these comments from Canley residents in 2004:

“It [the bus service] used to be good but now it’s expensive and they do not run on time”

“There are very poor transport links as well in the area...you can’t even get a bus from Canley to Tile Hill [the closest neighbourhood]. You’ve got to go all the way into town to get a bus all the way back again” (Carpenter et al, 2004).

Table 6: Issues of transport and access in Canley

INDICATOR - Proportion of respondents....	CANLEY				COVENTRY	
	TOTAL	PRIOR DERAM	CANLEY CENTRAL	WESTERN CANLEY	TOTAL	PRIORITY NEIGHBOURHOODS
Dissatisfied with conditions for walking	22.3	23.9	4.2	36.8	10.9	7.9
That would like to make by specific journeys by bus but cannot due to inappropriate services	13.5	12	30.6	0	8.5	8.1
Who are non-users of the bus service and are deterred by infrequency	28.3	33	21.2	22	18.7	19.7
Who are non-users of the bus service and are deterred by lack of reliability	27.4	31.3	21.2	22	14.6	14.3
Who are non-users of the bus service and are deterred by lack of punctuality	25.7	29.7	16.7	23.7	19.2	22.7
Dissatisfied with the frequency of local bus services	49.8	61.3	25.5	43.7	21.9	19.9
Dissatisfied with the punctuality of local bus services	50.2	61	22.2	50	21.7	20.3
Dissatisfied with the state of local bus stops	43.8	53.2	20.7	41.7	15	18.1
Dissatisfied with the bus service as a whole	43.6	51.4	20	47.9	14	14.6
Dissatisfied with the provision of information regarding local bus services	39.2	44.3	22.2	43.4	15.3	13.8

Retail Provision

The economic profile of the Canley neighbourhood, combined with its relative isolation, means that local shops are especially important to residents. However, the economic viability of expanded local retail provision within the neighbourhood is constrained by the proximity of a large district shopping centre at nearby Cannon Park. This is evidenced by the fact that 80% of residents in the survey shop there at least once each week, primarily for grocery shopping at the Tesco superstore. At the same time, evidence suggests that satisfaction with shopping facilities, especially at Prior Deram and for groceries, is relatively low, indicating the need to improve the quality and variety of existing provision (Table 7).

Table 7: Satisfaction with local retail provision

INDICATOR - Proportion of respondents...	CANLEY					
	TOTAL	PRIOR DERAM	CANLEY CENTRAL	WESTERN CANLEY	MALE	FEMALE
Satisfied with PRIORS DERAM shops	43.4	47.2	29.2	47.0	47.0	40.3
Satisfied with CHARTER AVENUE shops	57.6	54.3	41.1	69.7	65.6	50.1

These data reinforce findings from qualitative research carried out with residents in 2004:

“There isn’t any fruit and vegetable shop...Also there is no butchers shop. There’s Cannon Park but it’s quite expensive [and], a lot of the elderly and young people alike cannot get there”

“It’s a long walk over to Cannon Park...a lot of people would like to just drop down to the [local] shops and get their weekly [groceries]” (Carpenter et al, 2004)

Understanding persistent deprivation in Canley

The findings of this recent survey serve to reinforce longstanding negative perceptions of the area (Nash and Christie, 2003; Carpenter et al, 2004). Canley emerges as an area starved of services and facilities, most adequately reflected in terms of activities for young people, poor retail provision and public transport access. The area is blighted by anti-social behaviour and a degraded physical environment, reflected in poor levels of satisfaction with housing (both quality and availability) and the general streetscene. Rates of economic inactivity are relatively high, evidenced in a culture of benefit dependency and reflected in poor lifestyle choices. Residents are reluctant to get involved in neighbourhood activities feeling let down by the local authority and other service providers. As highlighted by Nash and Christie (2003) ‘there seems to be a real deficit of social capital in the area and this makes progress difficult’. How this depressing situation has come about?

Like many deprived neighbourhoods Canley has been adversely affected by processes of economic restructuring, being dependent upon jobs in disappearing manufacturing industries, especially the automotive industry. These processes are difficult to reverse in the face of continued globalisation of production, especially given that the effects of employment restructuring are most keenly felt in those communities where worklessness is already concentrated (Oatley, 2000). However, area-based policies can make a difference to

the quality of life and well being of residents in deprived neighbourhoods, even if the process of decline can not be fully reversed without a radical change in political ideology. Yet, for Canley historic focus on indicators of deprivation at the Ward level meant that decades of decline were largely masked by Canley's proximity to more prosperous neighbourhoods within the same Ward. Canley is situated in Westwood Ward which exhibits levels of polarisation not found anywhere else in the city. For example, in 2007, three of the top ten areas⁴ in Coventry in terms of household income are found in Westwood. At the same time, two of the ten lowest income areas are also found in Westwood; where average household incomes are 3.5 times lower. In Canley itself, mean household incomes are 85% of the city average, whilst for Westwood as a whole they are 99.9%. A similar situation is apparent in respect of house prices, with Westwood containing a number of both the highest and lowest priced housing areas in the city in 2006. Average house prices in Canley are 78% of the city average, whilst in Westwood they are 102% (Coventry City Council, 2007b).

This situation meant that to a large extent Canley has been largely overlooked by assistance programmes. It was eligible for some transitional European Regional Development Fund due to the magnitude of manufacturing decline in the area, but for example, was not designated part of the Coventry and Nuneaton Regeneration Zone that has benefited from substantial funding from the Regional Development Agency (Advantage West Midlands). This point has not been lost on the area's residents. The outlook for Canley did improve to a degree in the late 1990s when government policy through New Labour shifted to the neighbourhood level in order to tackle the 'multi-faceted problems of deprived neighbourhoods' (Oatley, 2000). Coventry was awarded Neighbourhood Renewal Funding (NRF) and subsequently Canley, on the basis of the Index of Multiple Deprivation at the time, was designated a 'Priority Neighbourhood' by the Local Authority thus qualifying it to access funding. Residents were involved early on with the neighbourhood's Area Co-ordination team in helping to shape Neighbourhood Plans which would provide a vision for Canley. Their priorities, focusing on 'clean and safe streets' and 'things for young people to do' were not especially aspirational. A £1m regeneration plan was earmarked for the area but it has taken a number of years to gain consensus and bring plans (such as the amalgamated primary school and new leisure centre – see details below) forward. This only serves to lose momentum within the community. Generally, with the notable exception of some relatively small scale environmental projects (e.g. Litter Rangers) NRF projects have not really delivered to expectations in Canley. The reasons for this exemplify the difficulties in making real progress. Firstly, there is a lack of premises within Canley from which to deliver large scale projects. There is no dedicated community building. This point was perfectly illustrated when a recent stakeholders meeting (April 2008) to discuss the new Regeneration Programme for Canley had to be held in the city centre due to a lack appropriate facilities locally. Moreover, attempts to locate a Community Enterprise Pod in the neighbourhood, funded through the Local Enterprise Growth Initiative (LEGI), were stymied by a lack of available premises. Secondly, as described above, there is a lack of social capital in Canley. Compared to other areas in the city there is a dearth of community-led organisations such as Resident Groups or Neighbourhood Watch. Moreover, residents generally do not wish to join together with public agencies and officials (Nash and Christie, 2003). Those that have been involved tend to feel let down. For example, during the first round of NRF residents were encouraged to play an active role in the process of funding allocations and project evaluations. However, this process does not appear to

⁴ Statistical 'Output Areas' typically covering 100-500 households

have been carried through to the same degree in subsequent rounds, thereby potentially disenfranchising residents further. Indeed, residents have suggested that '[we are] very disillusioned from having got heavily involved and then to be seemingly hurt... [we] can't do anything about change so why be part of it' (Carpenter, et al, 2004). As a consequence, whilst there is much latent capacity amongst residents to engage, few residents remain active or interested in being active. This can result in the situation described by Robinson et al (2005) where demands on time for those few community members actively involved become suffocating. Finally, the fact that Canley residents have suffered greatly from the processes of economic restructuring means that they are less likely to be in paid work. This in itself adds to feelings of vulnerability, isolation and exclusion and will inevitably contribute to a situation of apathy (Nash and Christie, 2003).

The issue of trust appears central to Canley's ongoing difficulties. As suggested by Nash and Christie (2003, p62) 'places where internal and external bonds are weak and untrusting are highly vulnerable to a spiral of decline'. Canley suffers from a lack of trust of neighbours as well as authority. This situation is not helped by the area's fragmented geography, being characterised by three distinct and inward looking sub-neighbourhoods (Prior Deram, Canley Central and Western Canley) running from East to West and divided by local roads. These comprise initial pre-Second World War owner-occupier developments in Prior Deram and then Canley Central, and later post-war accommodation in Western Canley built primarily for families working in the local car factories such as the Standard-Triumph. Much of this later housing is low density social housing and is of concrete and steel construction, set back from the road in closed estates. This fragmentation has a negative effect on community vibrancy with residents from either end of Canley tending not to mix with each other. The spatial separation of primary schools, which until recently characterised the neighbourhood, fuelled the problem by not encouraging children (and indeed their parents) from different parts of Canley to interact. Levels of community engagement and trust are further diminished by a high level of transience amongst social housing tenants; whilst a high student population further adds to a complex social mix. Moreover, the fear of crime and levels of anti-social behaviour serves to reduce levels of trust between residents, especially the old and the young. The young can be perceived as threatening even if they are merely 'hanging around' (Nash and Christie, 2003).

Another key factor in Canley's persistent deprivation appears to be the lack of amenities and facilities in the neighbourhood, an issue clearly highlighted by the survey. In particular, those facilities which cater for the interests of young people were shown to be most lacking. Canley's isolation from Coventry City Centre means that 'things for young people to do locally' are particularly important. Moreover, for residents there appears to be a link between this lack of amenities and the level of anti-social behaviour. Arguably, many residents who reported that 'the neighbourhood needs more things for young people to do', did so in the hope that if something was done then the 'problem' of 'hanging around' might diminish. Good local services might also help to give young people a sense of pride and hence greater attachment to their area. In addition, the lack of neighbourhood amenities in the form of shops and services is also more starkly emphasised in areas like Canley where levels of income and car ownership are lower. Again Canley's isolation from the city centre, coupled with poor public transport provision serve to exacerbate the problem. At the same time, such problems are not easy to rectify. The economic viability of local shops is clearly questionable in an area that is relatively

income deprived and where grocery expenditure often leaks out to nearby district centres. This process inevitably leads to a cycle of decline making the situation even more difficult to reverse.

Interestingly, and typical of national surveys, issues such as 'cleanliness of streets' and 'conditions of roads and pavements' persistently emerge in the top five things that need most improving in Canley. Moreover, the quality and maintenance of greenspace and the streetscene generally and remain major concerns. This partly reflects the fact that whilst greenspace in Canley is abundant much of it is in the form of woodland, wasteland and nature reserves which are seen as less safe to use than public parks and are poorly maintained. A poor living environment can also be linked to a lack of attachment to the area. As observed by Nash and Christie (2003) people who are attached to an area are more likely to be proud of it and maintain it and this will encourage others to do so. Where attachment is less strong, and certainly in parts of Canley this is the case, the reverse is true with a degraded physical environment leading to the feeling that no-one is looking after the area and hence why should I bother? This can create a snowball of neglect and can encourage crime and anti-social behaviour. Attachment to an area is shown to be highest in places with strong social networks, where people have lived in an area longer. High levels of transience can undermine social networks, further erode trust and increase vulnerability (Livingston et al, 2008).

That residents put issues of liveability and access to amenities consistently ahead of the economy, health and education when it comes to priorities for their local neighbourhood reflects the fact that these concerns are highly visible to residents on a day-to-day basis. They could offer relatively quick wins for local authorities, but are often overlooked. That they are often overlooked only fuels residents sense of frustration and apathy.

It is clear, therefore, that the socio-economic problems that blight Canley are deeply ingrained being the product of many years of decline. As such, they are also not easily remedied, but will require sustained commitment and investment by both local service providers and the community. The remainder of this paper presents an overview of the Regeneration Programme which has recently been developed as a long-term solution to attempt to reverse Canley's decline. It has been formulated by service providers, master planners and the community working together in partnership to address and overcome persistent problems of deprivation.

The Canley Regeneration Programme⁵

The Canley Regeneration Programme incorporating a regeneration framework and benefits plan was formally adopted by Coventry City Council in March 2007 following a master planning exercise which involved an extensive period of consultation with residents. The programme is a community regeneration scheme designed to deliver a balanced package of physical, social, economic and service improvements to the area, and ultimately "*renew Canley as a successful, vibrant, effective working community with good and well used public services and amenities where people positively choose to live*" (Coventry City Council, 2008b). The package of benefits for residents is intended to include:-

⁵ (Source: Coventry City Council 2007c; 2008a; 2008b)

- Physical change: additional homes, improved public space, new facilities - within the "masterplan" framework
- Economic benefits: improved access to jobs, training and enterprise
- Social benefits: improved range and quality of services, support for young people, older people, families, and others

The Canley Regeneration Programme has been founded upon two core elements: the priorities of residents and evidence of need. Local residents have been centrally involved in the master planning process [led by David Lock Associates] and have ultimately helped to shape, influence and refine the regeneration framework and benefits plan. The consultation process included: stakeholder discussion groups, public events (master planning workshops and 'About Canley Regeneration Project' forums), a series of visioning events to inform the draft regeneration framework; subsequently, a public exhibition, targeted events for young people, older residents and local businesses and a residents' questionnaire. This extensive process has proved vital in gaining consensus, providing a platform of trust for the continued involvement of residents through the implementation process. Data from the 2007 Canley Household Survey showed that 16% of respondents had attended meetings about the Regeneration Programme, whilst a further 17% reported that they would like to get involved with the Programme. A successful regeneration plan is also evidence-led. To this end the consultation exercise and official statistics on quality of life in the neighbourhood have now been complemented by the large scale household survey reported on above. This extensive evidence base can mean that resources can be prioritised and targeted most effectively.

The Programme itself is intended to deliver an extensive package of benefits (worth some £13 million) for residents over a 5-10 year period. These, closely aligned to the issues described in the previous section, include: 700 new homes of mixed tenure; public realm and greenspace improvements (including a new improved park and new playgrounds); improved transport links and residents parking schemes; an employment and enterprise project to tackle worklessness; improvements to local shops, especially at Prior Deram; anti-crime initiatives; more facilities for young people; and a Community Hub which will contain a library, GP practice, community meeting rooms and Council services. This is in addition to the new amalgamated primary school which is located in the heart of Canley and should help significantly to address the problems of trust, social mix and community vibrancy described above. Moreover, a newly built Sports and Leisure Centre will open in summer 2008 and will greatly improve the range of facilities on offer for residents of all ages. It is important though that the Centre is accessible to residents in terms of its affordability.

In order to drive the regeneration programme forward a delivery structure has been put in place which provides a central role for residents. This is critical in a long-term plan in order to ensure that trust and momentum are maintained. Key components of the delivery structure include: a *stakeholder board* which includes community representatives; a *delivery team* which will lead and manage the regeneration programme ensuring that is balanced, integrated, resourced and sustainable; a *benefits group*, to drive forward the benefits programme ensuring that the package responds to community priorities and is evidenced by need; a *finance and procurement group*; a *regeneration network*, which will provide a regular forum for everyone involved in the

project; and a *community involvement and communications group*, whose role is to ensure that the regeneration programme is truly community focused throughout its lifetime, enabling local people to continue to shape, influence and contribute to developments affecting their neighbourhood. As an example, this group holds a monthly Regeneration Forum for residents.

In addition to the regeneration programme being community and evidence-led, the key to its successful implementation, and ultimately the renewal of Canley, is to secure planning permissions and initiate land sales for the housing developments that will allow resources for the wider benefits package to be unlocked. The City Council have agreed that all proceeds from land sales and Section 106 agreements will be ring-fenced and reinvested in Canley. This represents a huge investment in the areas by the City Council, and will be crucial given the imminent loss of neighbourhood renewal funding. The key is to sell the land at the right time and the right price. Moreover, it is vital that the 'benefits package' is aligned closely to the release of resources to ensure that the scale and pace of delivery can be maintained. To this end key priorities for 2008 have been to design the Community Hub and agree the mix of services and community facilities that will be located there, and to produce a green space plan for environmental improvements and new play areas. This programming of benefits needs to be maintained over time in order to sustain momentum and community trust in the long-term and sit alongside ongoing dialogue between residents, other local stakeholders, elected members, planners and service providers.

Conclusions

This paper has highlighted how problems prevalent in many deprived neighbourhoods are complex and multi-faceted and will require very long-term and challenging solutions. Government policy since 1997 has supported neighbourhood renewal through an area based approach to tackling deprivation and narrowing the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of the country. The cornerstone of this approach has been the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal which places emphasis on improving quality of life outcomes in areas such as worklessness, crime, education, housing and the physical environment, underpinned by a joined-up community-led approach to renewal initiatives. New Labour's approach has been criticised for re-hashing old policies that are destined to fail because they can not adequately tackle 'people poverty'. Moreover, the heavy emphasis community engagement and involvement also comes with a health warning given the numerous barriers that exist, not least around community capacity. In addition, the short-term nature of funding programmes and shifts in focus can often leave local authorities without access to funds that they previously depended upon.

However, the paper demonstrated that area-based policies can realistically make a difference to the quality of life and well being of residents in deprived neighbourhoods, even if the process of decline can not be fully reversed without a radical change in political ideology. Through a case study of Canley in Coventry it highlighted firstly, the extensive nature of neighbourhood level deprivation; secondly, the complex structural, physical, social, economic and political factors which underpin persistent deprivation; and thirdly, the difficulties of re-engaging communities that have 'heard it all before', and are somewhat pessimistic that their views will be heard and things will be different this time around. Despite this, the City Council has embarked on an

ambitious regeneration programme that is both evidence-based and community-led and is designed to renew Canley from within, tackling the long-term problems that have blighted the area for several decades. The programme is freed from the short-termism of central government funding programmes in that it is backed by the release of potentially substantial resources from land sales. However, whilst this approach has removed one set of risks it has introduced another in that the outcomes of the regeneration programme are dependent upon macro-economic forces enabling maximum return on land sales. As such, successful regeneration of Canley will require the long-term commitment of residents, service providers, elected members and planners working together.

References

Applied Research Centre in Sustainable Regeneration (2008) *Canley Regeneration Project Household Survey: Final Report to Coventry City Council*, Coventry University.

Carpenter, M., Berkeley, N. and Skene A. (2004) *Making our Voices Heard in Coventry: Communities in Profile Report – Canley*, University of Warwick, Coventry University and Coventry Partnership.

Coventry City Council (2007a) *Research & Strategy Newsletter*, Issue No 87, August 2007, Coventry City Council.

Coventry City Council (2007b) *Regenerating Canley*, March 2007 Newsletter, Coventry City Council.

Coventry City Council (2008a) *Canley Regeneration Programme: Context and Delivery Structure, Briefing Note*, Coventry City Council.

Coventry City Council (2008b) *Regenerating Canley*, Spring 2008 Newsletter, Coventry City Council.

Department for Communities and Local Government & Department for Work and Pensions (2007) *The Working Neighbourhoods Fund*, DCLG, London.

Department for Communities and Local Government (2008) *Neighbourhood Renewal Fund* [online] Available from www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/page.asp?id=611

Hall, S. (2003) The 'Third Way' Revisited: 'New' Labour, Spatial Policy and the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, *Planning, Practice and Policy Research*, Vol. 18, No.4, pp265-267.

Livingston, M., Bailey, N. and Kearns, A. (2008) *People's Attachment to Place: the Influence of Neighbourhood Deprivation*, Chartered Institute of Housing, Coventry, for Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

MEL Research Ltd (2008) *Coventry Partnership Household Survey: Strategic Overview [DRAFT]*, MEL for Coventry Partnership.

Nash, V. and Christie I. (2003) *Making Sense of Community*, Institute for Public Policy Research, London.

Oatley, N. (2000) New Labour's Approach to Age-old Problems: Renewing and revitalising poor neighbourhoods-the national strategy for neighbourhood renewal, *Local Economy*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 86-97.

Robinson, F., Shaw, K. and Davidson, G. (2005) On the Side of the Angels: Community Involvement in the Governance of Neighbourhood Renewal', *Local Economy*, Vol. 20, No.3, pp.13-26.

Social Exclusion Unit (2001) *A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal: National Strategy Action Plan*, The Cabinet Office, London

Wallace, M. (2001) A New Approach to Neighbourhood Renewal in England, *Urban Studies*, Vol. 38, No.12, pp. 2163-2166.