

BRITISH BROADCASTING CORPORATION

RADIO 4

TRANSCRIPT OF "FILE ON 4" – URBAN REGENERATION

CURRENT AFFAIRS GROUP

TRANSMISSION: Tuesday 8th March 2005 2000 - 2040

REPEAT: Sunday 13th March 2005 1700 - 1740

REPORTER: Gerry Northam

PRODUCER: Bill Law

EDITOR: David Ross

PROGRAMME NUMBER: 05VY3010LHO

THE ATTACHED TRANSCRIPT WAS TYPED FROM A RECORDING AND NOT COPIED FROM AN ORIGINAL SCRIPT. BECAUSE OF THE RISK OF MISHEARING AND THE DIFFICULTY IN SOME CASES OF IDENTIFYING INDIVIDUAL SPEAKERS, THE BBC CANNOT VOUCH FOR ITS COMPLETE ACCURACY.

“FILE ON 4”

Transmission: Tuesday 8th March 2005

Repeat: Sunday 13th March 2005

Producer: Bill Law

Reporter: Gerry Northam

Editor: David Ross

NORTHAM: The government is to pump billions of pounds into nine of the most rundown areas of the North and Midlands in the biggest urban regeneration programme for decades. Over the next fifteen years, the plan is to turn dereliction and neglect into prized new communities, where people will flock to buy homes, and the rich will rub shoulders with the poor. It's a slice of visionary Old Labourism, headed by John Prescott and depending on local councils, but with a modern twist - most of the money will come from developers in the private sector. The government promises that it will not repeat the social upheaval of earlier mass slum clearance schemes. But File On 4 has discovered a number of cases where already the success of the Deputy Prime Minister's dream is under threat, as residents discover the harsh reality of implementing it.

SIGNATURE TUNE

LYNNE: The council came and they said there's no houses where I want, so I have to look elsewhere, and their words were, when they were leaving was, 'Right, you have got till end of March, we're taking you to court in April, and after April it only takes a few days and then it's our house.'

NORTHAM: And what will then happen to the house?

LYNNE: Well, they're knocking them all down.

NORTHAM: In a four bedroom, well-maintained stone house in Burnley, East Lancashire, Lynne is facing imminent eviction as the council buys her home from the landlord in order to demolish it.

LYNNE: I want to stay here. My grandchild goes to a school locally, I go to church, my granddaughter goes to church, she goes to brownies, band practice at church. It's all round Burnleywood where she goes. All my granddaughter keeps saying, 'I don't want to change schools, I don't want to change schools,' and it's really really upsetting me. This fifteen year plan, it's no good to us, we want to know what's happening now.

NORTHAM: So what will happen to you?

LYNNE: Well, hopefully friends and they will help out. This community will not see me on the streets.

NORTHAM: Do you mean you will go and stay with friends?

LYNNE: I will stay with friends rather than move out of Burnleywood, yes I will. But I am not moving where I do not want to go, and that's where they're telling me, other side of town. Well, that's not good enough.

ACTUALITY IN BURNLEYWOOD

NORTHAM: Lynne lives here, in Burnleywood, which was once sought-after when the mills and pits were all working. More recently it's seen rows of houses taken down stone by stone, and sold as building materials for more affluent towns. Just outside Lynne's front door, there's a large green open space where past terraces have already gone. Now many more streets are to be flattened under the government's so-called Pathfinder scheme, which is to identify areas of housing market failure - places people don't want to live – with low, even falling, prices, disrepair, boarded-up empty houses.

COOK cont: so on, we're aware of that. However, this is the council working to an agenda that is exercising the most serious power we could ever use in terms of housing – compulsory purchasing housing where people don't want that to happen. I recognise that, but at the end of the day, to repeat, there will be people who will not be, in my terms, winners.

NORTHAM: Demolition can seem to councils to be a radical solution to urban neglect. But Anne Power, Professor of Social Policy at the London School of Economics, fears that this can become a self-fulfilling approach to rundown areas.

POWER: The mistake that is still being made is that in an area that becomes unpopular, but that still, because of neglect and disrepair and social problems, but that is still 70% occupied, which most of the Pathfinder areas are, the declaration of demolition is simply accelerating the process of decline of those very cities and areas that the government is hoping to renew. And I think that that's disastrous. Shops start to close, schools start to lose children, anybody who has got any choice starts to get out, and so you get very heavy drops in population, which then, of course, justifies further the decision to demolish it. An area unravels. The big problem with clearance and the big problem with the Pathfinders, as with all previous slum clearance programmes, is that – I know this isn't officially a slum clearance programme – is that the intervention is a kind of gross intervention. They completely forget that they are totally smashing community interest, and the essential assets of an existing area.

NORTHAM: The nine Pathfinder regeneration projects, including East Lancashire, all stress that demolition should be a last resort - their preference is for refurbishing and restoring existing properties. But in the early months of the programme, many councils have already reached for the draconian measures of compulsory purchase and clearance.

ACTUALITY OF KNOCK AT DOOR

NORTHAM: Are you Joan?

JOAN: I am, yes.

NORTHAM: How do you do? I'm Gerry.

JOAN: How do you do?

NORTHAM: Pleased to meet you.

JOAN: Right. This is my house, and I've lived here all my life, so you're welcome to come in and look round.

NORTHAM: Were you born here?

JOAN: I was, yes.

NORTHAM: How many years ago?

JOAN: Erm, 71.

NORTHAM: Would you just show us round?

JOAN: Yes, yes, by all means you can look round. Anybody can come in here, love. It's always like that, I don't clean up when anybody's coming, it's always like this!

NORTHAM: In the nearby town of Darwen, Joan Brown lives in and loves her family home in one of the stone terraces near the historic mill just up from the town centre. Joan and her husband Kenneth keep the house in immaculate condition, prettily-decorated and well-furnished. So, when a recent survey for the local council condemned their house and 150 others around it, Joan couldn't understand why.

ACTUALITY IN HOUSE

NORTHAM: And this is your kitchen?

JOAN: Yes.

NORTHAM: It's very nice. It's quite modern.

JOAN: I wouldn't say this was unfit for human habitation, would you?

NORTHAM: That's what the surveyor said?

JOAN: Yes. Everyone got that on their survey round here. Unfit for human habitation.

NORTHAM: The council surveyors apparently consider these some of the worst houses in Britain.

JOAN: Yes, uh-huh. Now there's a lot more in Darwen worse than this, I'll tell you now.

NORTHAM: If you have to move, after living here for your whole life, what will that mean to you?

JOAN: Mean? Oh God, I don't know. I'll be, I don't think I'll be around long, to be quite honest. I'll be so, that'll be me, I'll be absolutely gutted. They'll never get another community like we have, no way. They just don't care a damn.

NORTHAM: The local council, Blackburn with Darwen, rejects the accusation that it has been too eager to demolish people's homes. The Executive Director of Regeneration, Graham Burgess, points to other parts of the borough, including other parts of Darwen, where the council has decided to refurbish greater numbers of properties than it's condemned. The stone terraces just off the town centre of Darwen, Mr Burgess insists, have to go because they're not worth saving.

BURGESS: The surveys showed us that those houses, unfortunately, weren't able to be sustained, and we could not in any way improve them or maintain them. Those houses are virtually unique in the borough, that they are only

NORTHAM cont: relatively inexpensive upkeep - inexpensive compared with the cost of demolishing and rebuilding them.

CLANCY: These properties, give or take a bit on the market, vary between maybe £60,000 and £80,000 or £90,000 in reasonable condition. I have found only one property that requires let's say £10,000 to £15,000 worth of work doing on it. Otherwise the rest only a nominal amount of work relative to their value, probably £5,000 or less.

NORTHAM: The surveyors for the council described this as some of the worst housing in the country. Is that right?

CLANCY: Well, I've looked at housing, in fact I've looked at buildings of all sorts throughout the country, I do not understand how they come to that conclusion. All properties older than, say, 75 years – so let's say from about 1930 back – including such properties as maybe 10 Downing Street and Buckingham Palace, they are all single skin, they've got solid external walls. Now solid external walls are quite structurally sound.

NORTHAM: What does the council mean then by saying that having only one skin of stone in the walls, these properties are unsuitable for block renovation?

CLANCY: I don't know. I don't think there's any serious problem with these properties.

NORTHAM: At the centre of this dispute are the house by house surveys for the council. A large majority of them – the council tell us it's 86% - declare the houses unfit because of their state of repair. They're closely-typed documents, fifteen pages long. The surveyors have filled in boxes or written comments on each room in turn, the house in general, and the opinions of its occupants. Residents like Jeanette Wood have told us that the process didn't seem to involve much detailed inspection of their homes.

WOOD: He just come in, he stood in the doorway of each room and just ticked on a piece of paper.

NORTHAM: Ticked what?

WOOD: Well we don't know what they ticked until we got the reports back.

NORTHAM: And how long did it take for the whole survey to be done?

WOOD: Less than ten minutes.

NORTHAM: Less than ten minutes? Are you sure about that?

WOOD: I'm positive.

NORTHAM: He says here, would you like to move in the next twelve months if you had a free choice?

WOOD: No, he didn't ask me that.

NORTHAM: Didn't ask. But the answer here is no.

WOOD: Uh-huh. I would have said no if he'd asked me, because I don't want to move.

NORTHAM: Are you sure you weren't asked?

WOOD: I'm positive.

NORTHAM: What about this question – how satisfied or otherwise are you with the area in which you live? Did he ask that?

WOOD: Well I would have put there 'quite satisfied.'

NORTHAM: It says here, 'quite dissatisfied.'

WOOD: No, well I would have said, 'quite satisfied.'

NORTHAM: Over the past five years, would you say your area has declined, improved or remained the same? What did you answer to that?

WOOD: Didn't answer it. If I did, I would have said, 'just the same.'

NORTHAM: But it says here that your opinion is the area has declined.

WOOD: Yes, but I didn't say that.

NORTHAM: How are these answers on the form if you're saying you didn't give them?

WOOD: No idea.

NORTHAM: We asked the company that conducted the surveys, David Adamson of Scotland, for an explanation. But the management wouldn't be interviewed for File On 4. Nor would they solve another puzzle – how surveys which initially declared houses to be fit for habitation were subsequently altered to show them as unfit. It's a mystery I was able to put to the Executive Director for Regeneration, Graham Burgess.

This is just one house survey, and if you look at the conclusion here, it was originally declared to be fit. That's been crossed out and has been circled as unfit and it's been declared unfit. Why would that, why would someone have changed their mind like that?

BURGESS: We did actually ask, and it was brought to our attention during the process by the tenants, and we asked the surveyors to explain why this might be the case, and what was said was sometimes the surveys were initially done

NORTHAM: And that was before the decision to demolish the houses?

HOLLINGS: Well, we had to come up with options for where the academy might go.

NORTHAM: But in this case the timing is extraordinary, that the council has identified that as its first choice of a site for the academy, and one week later it's decided that these houses are to be demolished.

HOLLINGS: The timing of that article might be unfortunate, but as I say, at that stage, we still did not have approval from the DFES ...

NORTHAM: Well the journalists didn't make this up. They got this from what they call council bosses.

HOLLINGS: Whether or not journalists made it up or not is not a matter for me to comment on.

NORTHAM: In Darwen and in Burnley, residents opposing the Pathfinder plans have told us that the process of local consultation has been a sham. There have been open days, house-to-house leaflets and public meetings, but the complaint is that this has been merely public relations for a decision that's already been made. The councils insist that this isn't so. But politically, the government minister, Lord Rooker, of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, recognises that Pathfinder programmes may be jeopardised if they fail to carry local support.

ROOKER: Let's get it clear. Good consultation, genuine consultation that actually changes people's plans is absolutely vital to the success of these programmes ...

NORTHAM: And if it hasn't happened, if it hasn't happened and people feel that they've been ridden over roughshod, what do you say as a government minister?

ROOKER: Well as a Pathfinder we have to learn the lessons from that. They're dealing with people's lives for a start and there's nothing more sensitive than that, in people's homes. Consultation for new ways of doing things and revitalising those communities is absolutely vital, and if it hasn't happened, there's a failure, we have to learn the lessons, because otherwise we will have a failing Pathfinder, and I am not interested in having failing Pathfinders.

NORTHAM: Among senior management of Pathfinders and local councils we've found a widespread nervousness about the possibility of failure on a grand scale. Officials acknowledge privately that demolitions and the protests they can attract could prove damaging to the survival of the scheme over the coming fifteen years. And there's a fundamental problem identified by one of the founders of the Pathfinder project. Professor Brendan Nevin was a leading member of the academic team which first formulated proposals for housing market renewal in the late nineties. He went on to manage one of the most intractable areas, North Staffordshire. Now a private consultant, he's concerned that the whole plan could be undermined by an insensitive approach from officials.

NEVIN: I think the greatest threat to this programme is dealing with the human costs of regeneration and renewal. Currently we have a skills deficit, we don't have people with the necessary skills in the right numbers to assist the people who are most affected by clearance.

NORTHAM: Where are the people missing from? Is it local councils?

NEVIN: Primarily local authorities. They haven't been agents of change over the last thirty years. They have been very much about administering services, and all of a sudden we're asking local authorities to pick up where they stopped in 1975, which is to start to remodel their cities in a very imaginative way, making them fit for purpose. Well, if you've not done it for thirty years, you wouldn't expect the skills to be there in the right numbers immediately, and it is going to take some time to train people up to deliver this programme.

NORTHAM: Why do you say this is potentially the greatest threat to the whole programme?

NEVIN: Because it's a political issue ultimately. If there are large numbers of people that are affected by the renewal programme who are complaining, that obviously feeds through to the politicians. The Pathfinders and the local authorities who are delivering this programme have to ensure that they can hold their heads up and say that they are treating people in a way which is a lot more considered, a lot more generous and a lot more forward-thinking than the way this was done in the 1960s and 1970s, because if it's rebadged 'the 1960s revisited' then it's unlikely to carry the support of people in the medium to long term.

NORTHAM: For the government, Lord Rooker accepts that this is a profound weakness in the programme.

ROOKER: Oh that is true, and indeed with probably Sir John Egan's report on training and skills for sustainable communities some weeks ago, one of the things he highlighted in terms of the lack of skills, leaving aside the hands-on approach of the brickies and the plasterers, was leadership skills and project management. There is a shortage in this country of that, which is why we are setting up the centre for sustainable communities. It's going to be based in Leeds.

NORTHAM: Well that's for the future, that's training for the future, but the project is underway now ...

ROOKER: No, but you asked me if there's a shortage, and yes I'm, yes, there is a shortage of leadership and project management skills across the country.

NORTHAM: And yet the projects are underway now, people are themselves being affected in their homes, which are being demolished, and you are saying that you recognise that there's a shortage of the skills to put this through properly.

ROOKER: Yes, they are underway. Let's face it, at the present time, the latest information I have as we speak of the money that's been allocated in the first tranche, which was the £500 million, £165 million has been spent. That was the figure I gave to the Select Committee. In other words, I'm not negating anything you've just said, but we are very very early days at the present time.

NORTHAM: There's another problem the Pathfinders have to face. However strong their desire for conservation, the realities of government finance and dependence on private developers can make demolition seem the more attractive option.

ACTUALITY IN LIVERPOOL

Some twenty thousand houses are due to be demolished under the Pathfinder programme in Merseyside, fifteen thousand of them in Liverpool. The historic area here is known as Welsh Streets, with names like Powis Street and Gwydir Street, where terraces of small back-to-back houses are due for demolition. As an area, it now looks dilapidated and grim. When residents here were asked their opinions, about half responded and of them a clear majority, 72%, favoured the proposal to pull their streets down and rehouse them. Irene Milson, the tenants' leader, and Mary Huxham, one of the residents, will be happy to see these old houses go.

MILSON: Nothing has ever happened in that area for well over thirty years. I mean, it happened all around, people getting new homes, nice places to live. We've always been known as the grey area, that's what people say, it's the grey area, and they were never given anything.

NORTHAM: So people are happy with it now, are they?

MILSON: They seem to be very happy with it.

HUXHAM: As Irene has said, the houses are 124 years old. A lot of them have gone into disrepair, and there are over thirty houses boarded up in the Welsh Streets.

NORTHAM: What's the state of your house?

HUXHAM: Well, mine is very damp. Even though I've had a damp proof course and full modernisation, you know, there's nothing you can do because it's just rising damp.

ACTUALITY IN KELVIN GROVE

NORTHAM: But on the edge of Welsh Streets, in Kelvin Grove, the homes are more grand. Tall, substantial houses built for the Victorian middle classes stand close to an attractive park. The Pathfinder projects are supposed to concentrate on areas where the housing market has failed, and some residents in these larger houses argue that they're wrongly included in the site for demolition.

ACTUALITY IN HOUSE

EDGE: This is the route up to the room I work in. You'll have seen the lovely wide hallway and the big old doors.

NORTHAM: The house is on how many floors?

EDGE: Well, if you go up those stairs, you come to two further bedrooms. It's a five bedroom house ...

NORTHAM: The artist Nina Edge lives and works in one of these large houses and has evidence that the property market for them is anything but failing. A local estate agent last month valued her house at £145,000 – eight times what she paid for it in 1999. Why then is it threatened with demolition? Local residents and conservationists have formed an action group to protest, and recently took their case to the Parliamentary Select Committee looking into the Pathfinders. Nina Edge concludes that the decision is driven not by the state of the houses themselves, but rather by the value of the land they stand on.

EDGE: The city council are anxious to perform what they call site assembly and to produce a piece of land at a brown field site for a private developer.

NORTHAM: Brown field meaning?

EDGE: An urban space rather than a green field site in the countryside.

NORTHAM: But flattened?

EDGE: Flattened. A clearance area large enough for a private developer to make a particular amount of profit on.

NORTHAM: And what's wrong with the council or the Pathfinder body trying to prepare a suitable site to attract in investment from a private developer?

EDGE: There is vacant land all over the city, there is no need to pull down heritage assets in order to find a site for a builder to make profit. I don't have a problem with anyone making a living at all, but there is no need to pull down something which cannot be replaced. Houses of this kind will never be built again.

NORTHAM: The Merseyside Pathfinder body, known as New Heartlands, also gave evidence to the recent Select Committee hearings. It made a rather striking admission.

READER IN STUDIO: Demolition has a high priority in the early stages of the New Heartlands programme as we seek to create the essential development opportunities for our partners.

NORTHAM: Nina Edge and her colleagues in the Action Group take this as confirmation that their homes are to be sacrificed in order to help make an attractive site for a developer. But Pauline Davies, the managing director of New Heartlands, maintains that this is a misunderstanding.

DAVIES: We do need to create sites for private developers to build on, but those sites would be, would come together in a combination of ways. There will be some clearance and there will be reclamation of some brown field sites, so ...

NORTHAM: But you've said here the reason for demolition having a high priority is to create those development opportunities.

DAVIES: Well that's correct, because without those development opportunities, you can't provide the choice which people are telling us they want.

NORTHAM: Can you tell me how many of those homes are actually sound, they're just in a place that you think you need to clear in order to create a development site?

DAVIES: I want to make something really really clear. We are not clearing good houses so we can create land for developers to come in and build and sell and make a profit.

NORTHAM: Well that's just what people say you are doing.

DAVIES: We are about radical transformation. This isn't a housing renewal programme, this is a market renewal programme.

NORTHAM: So that does mean that some good houses that you think are in the wrong place will be demolished?

DAVIES: I don't think that we should be afraid of trying to intervene in the market and to restructure it to enable people to have a better quality, better designed, better choice of house.

NORTHAM: Is that the same as saying yes to the question?

DAVIES: [Laughs] Erm, I am saying that we need to intervene in the market and restructure the market to enable the Liverpool area, the Sefton area and the Wirral area to grow and thrive.

NORTHAM: So that's yes.

DAVIES: [Laughs] I'm not going to say yes.

NORTHAM: The Deputy Prime Minister has expressed the government's intentions in regeneration in the most humane way: "Our guiding principle," he says, "is that people must come first. Our policies are based on engaging local people in partnerships." But, whatever residents say they want, Professor Anne Power of the LSE argues that the government's system of funding regeneration too often favours demolition.

POWER: The cost of demolition is wrapped up, it's disguised in the overall funding for these renewal programmes, so nobody is screaming about the fantastically high cost of carrying out these demolitions. The developer won't have to pay them and the local authority will be subsidised to pay them.

NORTHAM: Subsidised by?

POWER: Basically by the government.

NORTHAM: Taxpayers?

POWER: Yes.

NORTHAM: So if a council says it is cheaper to demolish these houses and rebuild them than it would be to restore them, does that make economic sense to you?

POWER: It's cheaper to them because of the way the subsidy system works. To the economy as a whole, if you include all the costs, it's almost certainly not true. The Building Research Establishment, which is our national main

POWER cont: research body responsible for this kind of work with English Heritage, has actually done research showing that it is cheaper, much cheaper than it is to build new, and what's more, the repair costs, the lifetime costs, the long term maintenance costs are all much cheaper, contrary to popular belief.

NORTHAM: In all, the government's regeneration body calculates that at current rates some 167,000 houses will be demolished over the next ten years - a number which, it says, is well below the rate required. It raises the possibility of 400,000 houses going in total. Many are pre-1919, often Victorian terraces. They are deemed too cramped, too unattractive, simply too monolithic to appeal to modern buyers and tenants. But a Pathfinder project thirty miles to the east of Liverpool is taking a very different view of its inherited property - and has run into a further problem with the government.

ACTUALITY IN SALFORD

NORTHAM: Here in the Langworthy estate in Salford is a grid of derelict streets with four hundred boarded up terraced houses, which look to be in considerably worse condition than anything we've seen in Burnley, Darwen or Liverpool. Back-to-back red brick houses now boarded up and prey to vandals. Many have already had their roof tiles stolen and the timbers burnt. Initially, this whole area was scheduled for demolition, but the Pathfinder here was persuaded to have these properties restored and transformed by a developer specialising in conservation, Urban Splash. The Development Director, Nick Johnson, sees real potential here.

JOHNSON: A lot of people start their housing life in terraced houses. They are incredibly robust in terms of their ability to be transformed and reworked to suit a certain generation, and we think that the terraced houses that are here are no different. They are Victorian terraced houses that can be reworked to make them appropriate for the next generation.

NORTHAM: And what would they look like inside?

JOHNSON: Inside, white walls, timber floors, top light from roof lights, opening up the roof space at first floor level, so that the space that was traditionally boarded out would be opened up and the roof timbers expressed. So the kind of thing that you might see in a loft style would be brought to the terraced house.

NORTHAM: But Urban Splash has come up against a stark example of unjoined-up government. The company may want to keep these Victorian houses intact, and that may be in line with the conservation principles of the Deputy Prime Minister. But the hard economic fact is that, while new building is zero-rated by the Treasury, restoration incurs VAT at 17.5%. To avoid this substantial tax, Nick Johnson will have to tear down most of each house to qualify as new building.

JOHNSON: In order to creatively explore the VAT problem, we have now looked at a proposal which keeps only the façade of the properties. So basically we have to now build new party walls, new internal floors in order that we don't incur the VAT issue, and these can be deemed new build rather than refurbishment.

NORTHAM: But it's not what you would have as your first option.

JOHNSON: Our first option has always been and is always to try and keep as much as we possibly can. The VAT rules favour demolition rather than refurbishment.

NORTHAM: And what sense does that make to you?

JOHNSON: Well, very little.

NORTHAM: The government minister, Lord Rooker, is an advocate of Urban Splash's conservation. But, to his apparent frustration, he's not yet persuaded the Treasury to relax the rules on VAT.

ROOKER: Look, I quite agree, there are some paradoxes in the tax system whereby our intention and our policy objective is to make sure we use secondhand buildings for new houses in this country, new dwellings. That's a matter that

ROOKER cont: we are, if I can put it this way, in constant discussion with our colleagues in the Treasury about, over the long term.

NORTHAM: And what are you telling the Chancellor about the VAT that's charged on refurbishing houses, but not on building new ones?

ROOKER: Nothing that the Treasury doesn't already know. But this is a matter, it's early days for us at the present time with the Pathfinder programme.

NORTHAM: Do you expect this VAT ruling to change?

ROOKER: ... but we're only one year into what is a ten to fifteen year, maybe even a twenty year programme. I can't forecast that, whether the VAT rules will change, because that would be quite ludicrous for me to sit here and say I expect them to change, because people then make economic decisions on the basis of what I've said, and I've no authority for saying that. And that is ...

NORTHAM: And this is something you've expressed to the Treasury?

ROOKER: That is a matter that has been taken up with the highest levels and the finance and policy people in the offices of the Prime Minister and other representations with our colleagues in the Treasury.

NORTHAM: There's no mistaking the scale and ambition of the Pathfinder project. An estimated £20 billion is to be spent over the next fifteen years, with £5 billion or £6 billion coming from the government, the rest from private developers. We've met nobody who disputes either the urgency of the task or the principle of renewing areas where the housing market is failing. But if subsidies and the VAT rules continue to favour demolitions, and complaints grow that regeneration is hurting some of the very people it's supposed to benefit - the people John Prescott says must come first - then one of the founders of Pathfinder, Professor Brendan Nevin, fears that the consequence will be a profound sense of disillusion.

NEVIN: This is our last chance to get this approach right, the approach for regeneration right, and there's a lot of money that's been put forward to support it. I don't believe that in another ten years we will get another forty years' worth of resources, so people have to understand the importance of this programme. It has to be delivered.

NORTHAM: And if it isn't done properly, what's the consequence?

NEVIN: Well, I think the Treasury and the public and the politicians will all lose faith in the public sector's ability to produce transformation and to better people's lives with intervention. We've got everything to lose by not doing this well.

NORTHAM: This is the last chance, is it?

NEVIN: I think this is absolutely the last chance to get what we call regeneration right in the UK.

SIGNATURE TUNE