Manchester Metropolitan University

Research Institute for Health and Social Change

Hulme wall mural (part): image from Strategic Development Framework document

**Birley Fields Development:
Impact on the Local Community: Health and Wellbeing**

Working Paper 1: Context Setting

Carolyn Kagan and Karen Duggan
June 2010

Contact:
Carolyn Kagan c.kagan@mmu.ac.uk
Karen Duggan k.duggan@mmu.ac.uk

Birley Fields Development
Impact on the Local Community: Health and Wellbeing
Working Paper 1: Context Setting

June 2010

Manchester Metropolitan University

Carolyn Kagan and Karen Duggan

RIHSC: Research Institute for Health & Social Change

RIHSC: Research Institute for Health and Social Change:

RIHSC is a centre of international excellence and innovation in critical research and consultancy on social change, social inclusion, community participation, well-being, work and leisure, health and social care practices and policies, and behavioural and forensic sciences.

Birley Fields: Impact on Local Community: Health and Wellbeing. Context setting

Executive Summary

This report refers to the context framing the period December 2008—June 2010.

Introduction

This report is the first to be produced as part of one of two longitudinal studies accompanying the development of Manchester Metropolitan University's (MMU) development of a new campus on Birley Fields, in Hulme, Manchester. The longitudinal study aims to explore and understand the experiences of local residents and workers as well as university staff of the processes of moving to and developing the Birley Fields campus and its impact over time.

The focus of the report is an examination of the context of the development, and contributes to the first strand of the study: to monitor the process of change in order to provide a record of the development; better understand the initiative; inform decisions concerning the development; and promote awareness of achievements. This phase was designed to contribute to new understandings of people-place initiatives, particularly regarding urban regeneration, and of university-community engagement.

Sources of information included documents and reports, academic papers, interviews and conversations with key personnel involved in the development and with staff and students who are working in Hulme and Moss Side and with residents, observations of events and activities, social networking site discussion threads, archive film and press cuttings.

Key Issues

MMU has long been based in Hulme but has had little deliberative penetration into or from the area.

MMU has an increasingly solid commitment to public and community engagement both in terms of what it can offer local

communities but also how local communities can contribute to the culture and work of the University.

Birley Fields provides opportunities to work in ways that push the boundaries of the types of engagement MMU has been used to.

Manchester has delivered transformative urban regeneration, through the *Manchester model* which is one of arms length partnership with corporate and institutional interests with some degrees of community consultation.

The history of Hulme is complex with successive waves of regeneration that has led to transformation in the physical and social character of the area. Residents have taken active interests in the area collaborating with some of the developments of the past, campaigning for and resisting others: the influence they have wielded has been patchy.

There is a rich deposit of urban design, environmental and cultural expertise in the area with longstanding and strong commitments to the neighbourhood. There are also residents with little interest in and voice in change.

Reports produced in the early planning stages of the development highlight the deficits and needs of the area in economic, social and educational terms. An assets based approach might enable greater collaborative work with local people and be more productive in the long term in terms of MMU and local people working together to improve health and wellbeing.

An assets based approach would be consistent with the core values that underpin MMU and its commitment to public engagement and civic responsibilities.

Birley Fields: Impact on Local Community: Health and Wellbeing. Context setting

Contents

Introduction

This report refers to the period December 2008 - June 2010.

It is the first to be produced as part of one of two longitudinal studies accompanying the development of Manchester Metropolitan University's (MMU) development of a new campus on Birley Fields, in Hulme, Manchester. The longitudinal study aims to explore and understand the experiences of local residents and workers as well as university staff of the processes of moving to and developing the Birley Fields campus and its impact over time. This report examines the context of the development and contributes to the first strand of the study: to monitor the process of change in order to provide a record of the development; better understand the initiative; inform decisions concerning the development; and promote awareness of achievements. This phase was designed to contribute to new understandings of people-place initiatives, particularly regarding urban regeneration, and of university-community engagement.

Sources of information underpinning this report are documents and reports, academic papers, interviews and conversations with key personnel involved in the development and with staff and students who are working in Hulme and Moss Side and with residents, observations of events and activities, social networking site discussion threads, archive film and press cuttings.

The Birley Fields Development

A reduction in the number of Faculty sites within MMU has been part of successive Strategic Plans. The moist recent plan includes the consolidation of the MMU estate from 7 to 2 centres (MMU 2007). In pursuit of this objective, during 2007 and 2008 proposals were made to close the Elizabeth Gaskell Campus and relocate the Faculty of Health, Psychology and Social Care to an expanded campus with the Institute of Education at Didsbury. However, the proposals met with some opposition from local residents who were concerned about the increase in the number of students, the height of the new building proposed and general issues such as increased traffic and parking. A number of public meetings were held at which local opposition to the plans were voiced. Both faculties concerned had drawn up detailed requirements about the design and usage of the new spaces, building on a process of wide consultation with staff affected by the move. These plans were changed in early 2009 when the Vice Chancellor made a decision to pursue the possibility of moving to a designated brownfield site close to the All Saints campus, at Birley Fields in Hulme (Brooks, 2009), with the political support of the City Council. The two major advantages of developing a campus at Birley Fields were (i) to aid the achievement of university site consolidation; and (ii) to contribute to the continuing regeneration of the area which had begun in 1992 and was reiterated in 2006 (MCC, 2006).

Thus the Birley Fields development includes the relocation of the Faculty of Health, Psychology and Social Care and the Institute of Education from the existing Elizabeth Gaskell and Didsbury campuses. The relocation will include the building of new teaching and research accommodation, as well as student residences. The plans include commercial and public space. The planned development is different from but commensurate with the objectives of Manchester City Council's (MCC) Birley Fields strategic review (MCC, 2006), which included a Development and Land Use Strategy for the undeveloped brownfield land. As part of the background framing MMU's proposals, MCC noted the ongoing need to develop the site as part of the long term regeneration of Hulme in particular and the city in general:

> *{…}parts of the new development have been slow to market and remain empty or underoccupied with remaining plots of land lying vacant. Taken together, the unoccupied sites and buildings in this area do not create a positive image of Hulme at this prominent and high profile gateway to the city.* (MCC, 2009a:2.2)

The Birley Fields Development Plan (SDF, 2009) was approved by the City Council in June 2009, pending consultation with the community and amendments derived from the consultation.

The plan is for the new campus to be built by 2014. The process of development has begun, although at the time of writing (April 2010) planning approval is still to be obtained and no construction has started.

It is worth noting that the major part of MMU is already located within the Hulme boundary, and although MMU and its predecessor Manchester Polytechnic have always contributed to the City in multiple ways, its penetration into its neighbourhood base has not been an explicit strategic priority until now.

Longitudinal Study

There are ambitious plans for the development of the new campus to be groundbreaking, not just in terms of the buildings to be erected, but also in terms of the sustainability of the project, the processes of engagement to be employed throughout the development and the permeability of the new campus to the public once it is completed. Two longitudinal studies have been designed to: p*rovide a detailed, multidimensional case study of community engagement for universities in the 21st Century University*.

The Research Institute for Health and Social Change at MMU has been commissioned to explore the experiences, over time, of local residents and workers as well as university staff and to examine the development as a case study of university-community engagement1. In the first instance resources were secured for one year to explore activities to date, during the planning stages, and to prioritise an external rather than internal (to MMU) focus.

A focus on urban regeneration

The development of the Birley Fields campus contributes to and builds on the continuing regeneration of Hulme and can be considered a second cycle urban regeneration project. This is supported by one of the explicit benefits anticipated for the development, which is to give '*new momentum to regeneration in the area and neighbouring Moss Side'* (Birley Fields Newsletter, 2009). An important aspect of all contemporary urban regeneration projects is one of sustainability, not only environmental and economic sustainability, but also sustainability in terms of

> *ensuring a strong, healthy and just society. Meeting the diverse needs of all people in existing and future communities, promoting personal wellbeing, social cohesion and inclusion, and creating equal opportunity for all*. (DEFRA, 2005:8; see also Marks et al., 2006; Thompson, 2007).

The human and social dimension to urban regeneration is rarely captured, although there is some evidence that urban regeneration initiatives do make a positive contribution to quality of life (Rogers, Huxley, Evans and Gately, 2008) and to various

---

1 The second longitudinal study, overseen by the Education and Social Research Institute has a focus on education and learning.

facets of wellbeing (Woolrych, Sixsmith and Kagan, 2007). We will build on our experiences of working in other regeneration areas to explore the processes and outcomes of the Hulme development.

There are a number of facets of experience, linked to regeneration, that are relevant and which we will seek to explore, all of which can be understood as aspects of wellbeing in and of the community. These include: quality of life, work-life balance, psychological sense of community, community experience, community safety, social capital, inclusion and social cohesion.

The Birley Fields development project is also a case study in university-community engagement. A recent HEFCE funded university-community engagement project in London (Urban Buzz, 2009) demonstrated that the dimension of '*ensuring a strong, healthy and just society...*' was a fruitful one in examining the impact of the project. Furthermore, the emphasis on sustainable building and environmental aspects of the Birley Fields development may contribute to greater local understanding of sustainable living. In later stages of the study we will endeavour to assess changing attitudes and behaviours to sustainable living and progress towards the realisation of a sustainable community.

Thus, this study aims, over time, to contribute to understanding of urban regeneration, sustainable living and university-community engagement.

A focus on university-community engagement

Universities have been encouraged by the funding body, HEFCE, to increase their capability to work with business and the wider community, leading to economic and social impact, since 1999. Interest in the engaged university has been gaining momentum over the last decade (Percy, Zimpher and Brukardt, 2006; Watson, 2007) and community engagement practice is one part of a wider university-public engagement agenda. HEFCE defines public engagement thus:

> *'Public engagement' involves specialists in higher education listening to, developing their understanding of, and interacting with non-specialists. The 'public' includes individuals and groups who do not currently have a formal relationship with an HEI through teaching, research and knowledge. (HEFCE, 2007).*

Hart, Northmore and Gerhardt (2008:21) suggest public engagement (of which community engagement is a part) activities fall into one of seven dimensions:

- public access to facilities;
- public access to knowledge;
- student engagement;
- staff engagement;
- widening participation;
- encouraging economic regeneration;
- institutional relationships and partnership building.

Some of these dimensions reflect University level activities and some, staff or project level activities. They are all about different ways in which core university activities (and in the case of the first dimension, resources) can be carried out in an engaged way. Three types of academic activity characterise engaged scholarship, often defined as scholarship that "*connect[s] the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic and ethical problems*" (Boyer, 1996:11):

- community based research (such as community based, participatory research and practice based research);
- service learning (such as community based learning, practice based learning and service based learning); and
- community service (such as community service, volunteering, academic professional practice).

Kagan and Duggan (2009:105) link dimensions of engagement with specific indicators of the organisation and impact of individual projects. They go further, though, to suggest ways in which university processes and activities (the institutional context) can be influenced through engagement. They propose 10 elements of an engaged university that underpin effective projects that have an impact on community partners, communities more generally and work within the university.(see Appendix 1). These features of the institutional context are:

- Presence of institutional engagement strategy;
- Mechanisms for monitoring and review;
- Institutional support for expansion of resources for engagement;
- Organisational learning and opportunities for celebration;
- Effective organisational systems;
- Support for transdisciplinary and cross-sectoral working;
- Recognition and reward for staff and staff development opportunities;
- Active gateway to and from the University enabling networking and publicity;
- Explicit engagement mission statement and understanding of types of engagement throughout the organisation; and
- Community involvement in governance.

Taken together these university level elements can help demonstrate the public benefits of the university, particularly in terms of social, cultural, and community, benefits, as outlined in the Wellings (2008) review (see Appendix 2). They can provide a gauge by which effectiveness of engagement with Hulme and Moss Side might be assessed.

The resurgence of interest in the evolving nature of universities was reflected in the Wellings review of intellectual property and the contributions of research activity to society (Wellings, 2008). Universities were invited to develop a series of statements about their social, community, cultural and environmental benefits, MMU reflected what it has already learnt from the Birley Fields and other public engagement projects in the development of its statements (see Working Paper 3).

For a university to be truly engaged, it is not enough to be able to demonstrate the public good that is done by and within the University: it is also necessary to show how the work and working of the University has changed as a result of its engaged activity and relationships with the external world.

Context of the Development

The Birley Fields project is part of an ongoing process of urban renewal and university modernisation and in order to understand the process of development it is necessary to examine key dimensions of the context in which it is taking place. This includes the historical context of MMU as an engaged university; Manchester and regeneration in general and in Hulme in particular; the characteristics of the Hulme neighbourhood; and the policy context in which the development is embedded.

Historical context: MMU and engaged activity

MMU has a long track record of community engagement. In 1983, in partnership with Manchester University and the then Manchester Council for Voluntary Service, the Research Exchange (subsequently Community Exchange) was developed (Kagan, 1985; Saunders and Buckingham-Hatfield, 1992; Annette, 2002). This was effectively a brokerage service between the community and voluntary sector and the resources and expertise of staff and students in the Universities, and was influential in influencing other national HE community engagement developments such as the *Science Shop* movement (Gnaiger and Martin, 2001; Hall, 2005). It was in operation until 2008, overlapping with the emergence of CoMMUni a student volunteering service which fit more neatly into the Government's active citizenship drive (and funding) at the time. After 2006 resources were focused on CoMMUni.

MMU has been at the forefront of higher education policy developments extending outreach (or Third Stream activity) to include a community focus. Marilyn Wedgewood and her team in the then Division of External relations, actively sought discussion in national policy circles about a community impact agenda for HEIs and the kinds of metrics that might support this (see for example, Watson, 2007; Wedgewood, 2006).

Boyer's (1996) criteria for engaged scholarship are reflected in the work of the University. Every faculty and each research institute has supported community based research that is in partnership with local organisations and addresses important social issues. RIHSC, the Community Audit and Evaluation Centre, Arts for Health, the Centre for Social Inclusion at MMU Cheshire, the Centre for Urban Education, the Institute for Place Management in the Business School, are just some of the sites through which participatory research driven by the interests and needs of community partners has taken place over many years.

Service learning is widespread through professional training courses which include student placement activity (for example, health professions, social care, education, community arts, environmental management, business studies, hospitality and tourism, art and design courses, information management and youth and community work). Non professional courses, too, offer students and communities opportunities to work together (for example social change, applied social studies and community psychology courses). The University supports credit bearing units through which local people and those working in the community, voluntary and public sectors can gain recognition for their activities (for example, units in place management; participatory audit and evaluation; action research; and urban regeneration). The cross university CONTACT partnership was a conduit through which workplace training and development could be accredited throughout the 1990s, and many local employers made use of the service. Continuing professional and postgraduate programmes encourage students with a wide range of experience onto courses including Urban Education, Environment management and sustainable development; place management, regeneration, urban education, community psychology.

Community service is exemplified by volunteering activities of staff and students, supported by CoMMUni and the Students' Union. Since 1997 there has been an annual MMU-Moss Side cricket match.

Since 2002 an ad hoc group of people, mostly from within MMU, interested in university-community engagement has met – the Community Group. This has been

supported by the Corporate Development office (and External relations Division before it was disbanded) and has enabled cross-university networking and discussions that have spawned teaching research and enterprise innovations.

Two recent large engagement projects, initiated by the Corporate Development office of the University and inspired by issues that had arisen in the Community Group, have helped focus and extend thinking within the university in terms of the Engaged University. From 2006-2009 MMU was a partner in a large inter-university programme *Urban Regeneration: Making a Difference* (UR-MAD). This project supported 46 projects, all in collaboration and partnership with community organisations, addressing crime, enterprise, health and wellbeing and community cohesion. Many lessons were learnt about not only inter-university collaboration but also about the ingredients of effective community driven collaborative projects and the university level infrastructure needed to support them (Kagan and Duggan, 2009). As the UR-MAD programme was coming to a close, another joint university project, the *Beacons for Public Engagement* (Manchester Beacon) project began. The mission of the Manchester Beacon is to bring about a cultural change in relation to public engagement in Higher Education and to listen and respond to the needs of Manchester and Salford communities by connecting people, places and knowledge. In parallel with the introduction of the Beacon project, and implementing some of the learning from the UR-MAD project, a public engagement strategy within the University was steered through by the Corporate Development office.

MMU adopted a Public Engagement Strategy in 2008. The objectives of the public engagement strategy are shown in Extract 1.

Extract 1: Objectives of MMU's Public Engagement Programme
http://www.mmu.ac.uk/policy/pdf/policy_ref_public_engagement_strategy.pdf#page=

Objectives of our Public Engagement Programme are:

■ To stimulate a wider understanding of Higher Education by enthusing the public about current issues, the creative process, and the aspirations and outcomes of research.

■ To enable researchers to build the capacity and capability to participate in high quality,
effective engagement with the public, and to consider societal implications and public attitudes, alongside others, in the conduct and use of research.

■ To create effective communication channels between MMU and the Public about new
innovative developments, achievements, projects, research and their impacts on the economy and society.

■ To promote the presence of our students in the city as a positive force for good, fully unlocking and making transparent the benefits students bring to our towns and cities, and preparing them for global citizenship.

■ To measure the successful delivery of the Strategy and Action Plan.

Historical context: MCC and urban regeneration

Manchester has experienced rapid decline in its industrial base since the 1950's and is in the process of transition into a new economy of knowledge, technology, financial and cultural industries. Peck and Ward (2002) note the continuing process of change and regeneration in the city.

> [Manchester] has been in an almost perpetual state of restructuring, right back to its early stirrings as the crucible of industrial capitalism. … While the narrative of success (in recent transformation) is certainly the dominant one in the city, only its most zealous advocates would claim that the work is done, that the deep-seated processes of decline have been arrested and reversed. In essence, the regeneration and restructuring of Manchester remains a work in progress. (Peck and Ward, 2002:1,3)

Robson (2002) draws attention to two elements of MCC's regeneration strategy of relevance to the current development and the regeneration of Hulme. The first element is what has become known as the Manchester model of regeneration, piloted in the City Challenge programme in Hulme in 1992, and extended to deliver other major regeneration programmes (such as the rebuilding of the bomb-damaged City centre and the New East Manchester regeneration programme). The characteristics of the model include:

- A delivery body with a semi autonomous, arms length relationship with the local authority;
- Servicing of the delivery body by a dedicated team of officers seconded from Council departments;
- Short lines of decision making facilitated by involvement on the central board of key senior politicians and local authority officers
- Incorporation of key players from relevant agencies to deliver elements of the regeneration programme within a delivery body that of itself owns no assets;
- A commercial ethos through which private sector interests and contributions can be pulled into the regeneration process;

In relation to Hulme, Robson argues that this model enabled progress to be made, breaking a long standing stalemate.

> …for some two decades the future of Hulme was stalled against a background of an unholy triangular battle played out between the City Council, the then DoE and local resident groups. The advent of the government's City Challenge programme and the use of the model as the City Council's targeted delivery mechanism helped to square the circle and to ensure the redevelopment was achieved … with support from all three parties… (Robson, 2002: 39).

The second relevant element of regeneration is the clear strategy adopted by MCC to roll out regeneration progressively from one area to another. With the hope that claims to preferential treatment for particular areas can be avoided. Robson suggests that this has enabled schemes to be relatively big and thus address the needs of deprived areas across a range of policy domains, including for example, housing, job creation, skills, education and crime. (as evidenced in Hulme by the successive schemes covering Hulme and Moss Side - see Table 1).

A third element characterising regeneration in Manchester has been the emphasis on partnership working. The influx of ethnic groups with entrepreneurial spirits has contributed to economic vibrancy in the City alongside members of the Chamber of

Commerce and other professional and business networks. Robson (2002: 44-5) notes that whilst until recently universities have played a minor role in such partnerships, key members of some of the professions (such as law, accountancy, insurance, journalism, medicine) have played important roles:

> …in providing the nodes in the series of interlocking networks from which the civic life of the City draws strength… All of these networks have provided strands within the matrix through which key individuals have transacted informal business and have helped to embed businesses and individuals into a heightened sense of the conjointness of their interests with those of the locality and region. [It is through these networks that key people have transacted .

Manchester's successes in economic revival, particularly linked to the renewal of the City Centre, with its emphasis on bringing people in, particularly outsiders such as tourists, overseas visitors, business people and those using the clubs and bars (Bell, 2007) has not achieved the anticipated trickle down benefits to the surrounding areas, and has not reached the urban poor (Mackay and Davie, 2006). Robson again:

> …for the city, the core conundrum remains whether it is possible to privilege the economically driven entrepreneurial agenda and yet address the growing problems of social exclusion that are linked to joblessness, poverty, poor health, low educational attainment and the social malaise associated with deprivation… The major challenge now is to link whatever economic success the city can achieve to the fortunes of the poor and deprived who live just beyond the booming residential housing markets of its core…Whether the City Council is able to translate such concerns into its new rounds of regeneration programmes … will be a key test of the plausibility of linking social and economic concerns into programmes for the reinvention of cities. (Robson, 2002: 49).

As part of his analysis, Robson notes that although the City Council facilitated the development of arms length delivery models, control and authority remained in the hands of the local authority, which remained 'impatient' with resident opposition to its plans. Furthermore, he notes that community development has not featured strongly in the City Council's priorities.

Diamond, also notes the limited approach to community involvement in regeneration schemes in Manchester and he puts this down to an increasing managerialist approach. This approach differs from that in other localities.

> [In Manchester there has been a] History of neighbourhood organisation of services and tenant participation, but always within a paternalistic City administration. With the advent of the managerialism in public services in the 1980's [. this...] resulted in a retreat from community development by the local authority. In effect a 'community development approach' was abandoned by the local authority only to reappear later under the official (and required) sponsorship of City Challenge.. (Diamond 2004:181)

There is wide, though contested, recognition that the City Challenge programme in Hulme included considerable amounts of resident consultation and involvement, albeit this was patchy (URBED, nd). Whilst this was in part due to the requirement imposed from above, the City Council also recognised that to achieve anything would require participation by all relevant parties (Shapley, 2008). The space for residents to control

and determine the course of developments within a Government determined programme is, however, limited.

> *SRB, NDC and the recent Neighbourhood Renewal Initiative are all developments which have been centrally determined and are centrally funded. The 'success' of these projects is dependent upon meeting externally fixed outcomes. The actual 'space' for local negotiation or variation is limited. The extent, therefore, to which local community groups can propose an alternative set of priorities is small.(Diamond, 2004:180)*

As we have seen, the reference point for regeneration within Manchester was the partnership, not the locality or the community. In the case of Hulme, too, Diamond notes that the impetus for regeneration at the outset came from the Local Authority and was not driven by demand from residents as it was in other cities.

> *the pace and type of change [in Hulme] were not open to negotiation, rather local residents were being told what was happening. …[local residents] were coopted and contained from the start...the development of community involvement in Manchester was one that largely depended upon facilitators managed from within the regeneration partnership. ..they are working <u>within</u> the requirements of the partnership as it has been defined (Diamond, 2004: 185, 187)*

This suggests that even though there was an active Tenants Alliance during the last wave of regeneration in Hulme, the distribution of power has never been in favour of the residents - a point that might have some relevance in understanding some of the reactions to the Birley Fields development.

Historical context: Hulme, regeneration and local voices

The district of Hulme has undergone successive waves of regeneration and housing renewal since the 1960's. URBED (nd:16) describe the 1930's Hulme, prior to redevelopment, as a *poor but lively district with 130,000 residents and almost 1,000 shops.* In the late 1960's the area was redeveloped with six system built deck access estates, including the Crescents which were begun in 1971. The Crescents were four crescent shaped 'streets in the sky': deck access blocks modelled on the Georgian crescents in Bath (and named after Georgian architects), each a quarter of a mile long and containing 1000 households. Although originally designed for families, poor construction and high maintenance costs, made it difficult for families to remain, and after the death of a child falling from one of the walkways, from the mid 1970's families began to be moved out. URBED (2006:4) describes what then happened:

> *To keep the estate occupied the large flats were let to young, single people and large numbers of students from the nearby university. Over the years the community developed into one of the most lively and unorthodox in the city. Apartments were converted to cafes, rehearsal rooms and studios for artists, musicians, sculptors and poets. For much of the 1980s Hulme was Manchester's Christania or Kreuzberg – a place apart and a magnet for people looking for an alternative way of life.*

A decision was made in the late 1980's to redevelop the estate, initially through a Housing Action Trust which was fought off by tenants (URBED, nd:16) and then through City Challenge. Mackay and Davey (2006:10) trace the different stages, linking developments from 1992 onwards to new urbanism, wherein neighbourhoods

were characterised by '*permeability and openness, encouraging a throughput of people whose presence will, in turn, help reduce crime'* .

Mackay and Davey summarise the different sources of funding for regeneration and linked activities in Hulme from 1992-2000 (Table 1).

Table 1: Regeneration Projects and Initiatives in Hulme *1992-2000 (derived from Mackay and Davey, 2006:11)*

- Hulme City Challenge 1992-1997 £37.5
- Capital Challenge 1997-2000 £11.2m
- EU URBAN community initiative programme in (1994-2000) of £5.3m
- Community Economic Development Princess Road Corridor Programme : (1997-2000) £4m
- ERDF £3.5m for the development and preparation of the Birley Fields site – for the development of local businesses, high quality workspaces, consumer services and facilities and efforts to tackle crime and community safety issues.
- Public sector resources in Hulme and Moss Side of around £24m following the end of City Challenge funding.
- Mini Education Action Zone
- Health Action Zone
- Early Excellence Zone around Martenscroft
- Children's Fund
- Moss Side SRB programmes/Moss Side Millenium Powerhouse
- Safer Cities

It has been argued that success of regeneration in Hulme led to success in attracting other funds for further developments and for rolling out regeneration to Moss Side. By the early years of the 21st Century, considerable transformation of Hulme had taken place but the developments were stalled as anticipated take up of new office accommodation did not materialise. Private contractors were, therefore, reluctant to continue to develop the Birley Fields site. In keeping with new urbanism (see URBED, 2006) a mix of housing types had been built, although there was a predominance of flats rather than houses. A new urban park had been built with consultation with local people. The degree of local involvement in planning, decision making or consultation varied with different parts of the developments. (See for example case studies of different parts of the development with various partners available at ***http://www.cube.org.uk/ftp/City/Tours/cube_tours_hulme.pdf***). The Homes for Change complex, was an innovative and groundbreaking development, driven by members of a cooperative (Fauset, 2000), but involvement was not so great in other parts of the neighbourhood. Whilst Boateng and Moobela (2008) discuss the evolution of community participation in Hulme culminating in the success of participation in the City Challenge process, Baker (URBED, nd:26) suggests this might be overrated. By way of illustration he recalls that in one part of the development, 6 people formed the 'community participation' of 250 homes. In addition, Mills, one of the architects involved in the City Challenge developments (URBED, nd) argues that the public consultation resulted in quite conservative architecture, influenced by contemporary representations in the media, such as the homes shown on Brookside, a popular soap opera of the time.

David Lunts, Chair of MCC Housing Committee from 1988 to 1995, reflected on both the differences within the local community and the involvement of residents who were, themselves, architects and planners):

> *The Community Planning Weekend was intended to set out a vision for Hulme – with all sorts of pontificating and pretentiousness. … [one of the local activists] … was also very vocal about the more middle class activists – "too many Epidemics" as she called them. Hulme was full of these architecture students and tenant activists who started from the premise that we've got to save our homes, but actually became increasingly intrigued by the possibilities of designing a new urban quarter in Manchester. (URBED, nd: 4)*

The active involvement of local urban designers, planners and architects enriched the process, and some of them still work together in the city as URBED a cooperative specialising in urban design, regeneration, sustainability and community involvement (see ***http://www.urbed.com***).

> *Members of URBED were part this second wave [ie 1990's development] as tenant activists, residents and planners. Many of the ideas and principles that underpinned the redevelopment were suggested, championed and challenged by people still working [for URBED in the City] (it is also worth noting that many ideas were also ignored). (URBED, nd:1)*

These activists contributed to the influential blueprint for the development, the Hulme Guide to Development (HRL, 1994), which embodied many of the principles of new urbanism that framed the development with mixed results (URBED, nd).

By 2000 a transformation of the area had taken place, although the redevelopment was not complete. Some of the new offices built near to Homes for Change remained unlet, and it proved difficult to secure development of parts of the area where demolition had taken place but there had been no development of the land – parts of Birley Fields. Furthermore, other large regeneration schemes were underway in the city, most notably in East Manchester. In 2006 another strategic review took place.

Birley Fields Strategic Review (2006).

Manchester City Council developed a new Masterplan for the development of the Birley Fields site. The issues rising from consultation with residents in 2006 presaged the issues arising from the MMU consultation (see Working Paper 2). The report to the Scrutiny Committee in May 2006 (MCC, 2006) included the a number of points about resident interests and an environmental or 'green' agenda (Extract 2).:

Extract 2: Extract from MCC Scrutiny Committee Report (May 2006)

Those issues with most agreement [through the consultation] included
> *• The fact that the framework should include open spaces in all zones (94% either   strongly or tended to agree);*
> *• That each development should be built to eco standards (92%);*
> *• That there should be a zone offering a mix of jobs at different skills levels (90%); and*
> *• There should be a zone for mainly family housing rather than apartments (76%)*

7.3 In terms of the Development and Land Use strategy for the area, the three most important factors were identified as being:
- *Providing jobs for local people;*
- *Providing open green spaces within developments; and*
- *Providing low cost homes.*

7.4 The comments sheets were also analysed. By frequency, the top three additional comments were:
- *Maintain existing green space / more green space (mentioned by 18 people);*
- *No need for more office space / business park (10); and*
- *Support small businesses, local shops, local job opportunities (9). …*

7.6 However, it should be noted that a group of local residents have concerns about the Review and have created the Friends of Birley Fields Group. They are developing their own plans for the Birley Fields area and suggestions to date have included:
- *A City Farm*
- *A green enterprise centre*
- *Sites left as 'wild' open space eg. a nature reserve*
- *Allotments*

7.7 The Hulme Greening Strategy is currently being developed as a Forward Strategy for an ERDF – funded environmental scheme in Hulme. The Strategy has been the subject of extensive public consultation during its development and it will seek to identify key areas for future environmental improvements across Hulme. The Strategy will include actions in relation to the use / creation of open space, street scene, gateways, sustainable transport and energy measures amongst other things.

Activists in Hulme have pursued a green agenda for some time. For example, Hulme remains the only ward in the city to have had a Green Part councillor from 2003-8; there have been two Permaculture design courses in Hulme, the earlier one leading in 1999 to the development of a community garden in Leaf Street that still continues; the and the first organic vegetable box scheme (delivered to home by bicycle), Limited resources, which operated from Homes for Change, itself an innovative and creative cooperative housing and business development on the fringe of Birley Fields. Indeed many of the tenant activists closely involved in the most recent round of regeneration of Hulme still live and work in the area or the City and are important participants in the 'new urbanism' movement (Bennett, 2005; UTF, 1999).

During the summer of 2006, that of the Strategic Review, residents occupied parts of Birley Field in protest at the renewed plans to build on the green spaces left over from earlier demolitions. They expressed frustration at not being listened to and of people from outside the area making decisions about what changes should happen in the area.

> *…as a resident, any ideas, any views, any consultation, any aspirations there might have been are constantly being put down because somebody who doesn't live here has better ideas than us (Captain Cao Os, in Hartnett, 2006)*

Amongst the issues raised in a short film made at the time of the occupation (Hartnett, 2006) were the dislocation of local cooperative employment projects (including the Wesley Furniture project) because they could no longer afford rents, the failure of proposed developments on parts of Birley Fields to materialise, and the removal of the Birley Tree in 1999 against the wishes of many local people. Such frustrations had

been vented before, as this extract from a Manchester Community Networking Newsletter in 1998 shows:

> *The people of Hulme have been battered from every angle over the past decades. The proposals to close our school and destroy our tree are just the latest daylight robberies from the community. Our local shops, our high school with its adult education centre, swimming pool, gym, sports fields, pottery, and workshops, our cinema and many other community resources have been taken from us. Enough is enough. We are fighting back. (Networking Newsletter, 19. August/Sept 1998.*
> **http://www.networkingnewsletter.org.uk/19/hulmetree.html** *)*

Thus the history of regeneration in Hulme is of both failure and success and the role of local people in influencing developments is patchy (see evaluations and reviews of the regeneration process in Hulme, such as Harding, 1997; Jacobs, 1998; Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 1999; Mackay and Davey, 2005; 2006; Makepeace, 1995; URBED, nd; SURF, 2002; Symes and Pauwels, 1999). Throughout, there has been an articulate resident voice arguing consistently for alternative developments on the site with an emphasis on green space. Eamon Boylann, Head of Manchester regeneration at the time claims that over the years MCC has learnt to listen more to its residents.

> *[in previous Hulme re-developments, MCC was learning about consultation] What we were dealing with were in parts of Hulme- was a focused and articulate community which has very distinctive views about what it wanted to say….[what we have learnt is to] start off with basic recognition of what the fundamental demands and requirements of the local community are. (Boylann, in Hartnett, 2006).*

Characteristics of the neighbourhood

As a result of the periods of regeneration the characteristics of Hulme (and of Moss Side) have changed. The *State of the Wards* and the *State of the City* reports give valuable information about the area, alongside information captured through the *Indices of Multiple Deprivation*. Here we will discuss dimensions of experience relevant to quality of life and health and wellbeing agendas. The Impact Study commissioned near the start of the MMU Birley Fields strategy provides a baseline profile of the area beyond which they suggest that changes can be measured over 5, 10 15 year periods as the development takes place (Roger Tym and Partners, 2009). They highlight the merits of the baseline proposal thus:

> *The Baseline Profile looks at deprivation, health, education and economic performance of residents and businesses located in Hulme and Moss Side ward to: provide a starting position for monitoring the MMU Birley Fields Campus project: and to identify need and how the relocation plans will affect this. (Roger Tym and Partners, 2009:56)*

> *In particular the [impact] study will focus on the additional benefits the new campus will bring to the local communities in terms of built spaces, enterprise, employment, up-skilling of the local labour force and improved community services, all of which will raise the quality of life in some of the most deprived communities in the city. (Roger Tym and Partners, 2009:Appendix 1,p1)*

They state explicitly that the profile incorporates the full range of factors that may be affected by relocating the campuses. It may be this stance, of viewing the development as one in which the university will benefit the deprived community that has led to a profile that focuses on deficits and difficulties of the area, rather than on, or including, its assets (Foot and Hopkins, 2010; Marmot et al., 2009).

One example where we can see that this stance has led to a partial profile, is in the consideration of 'Local Facilities'. The distribution of some of the key local health and educational facilities serving the area is outlined. No mention is made of the 91 projects (61 in Hulme) that are listed on the One Central Place, Manchester Directory supporting the Third Sector (see Appendix 3). Nor is mention made of the informal networks and linkages that people have and through which they share knowledge, skills, products and time. Without an understanding that many of these groups and networks also benefit health and wellbeing, education and quality of life, a narrow and uni-directional (university to community) view of the potential and impact of the university move is presented. If assets were profiled as well as or instead of needs, the different ways in which the move might have an impact on the university might also have been anticipated.

We present some of the features of Hulme that point to its potential not its deficits, but urge that an assets approach, beginning with collaborative asset mapping is seen as the way forward.

Key baseline dimensions of health, wellbeing and sense of community.

Table 2 shows rates of different dimensions of behaviour and experience over time for both Moss Side and Hulme derived from different sources as outlined in the table, giving a useful baseline understanding of the area (including both Hulme and neighbouring Moss Side).

Table 2: Dimensions of Health and Wellbeing related dimensions over time (Hulme and Moss Side: Percentage rates unless otherwise stated) Sources as indicated.

Factor	Source	Hulme 2005-6	Hulme 2008/9	Moss Side 2005/6	Moss Side 2008/9
Smoking rate	Mcr Stop Smoking Service	53.5%	39.9%	48.6%	35.9%

Factor	Source	Hulme 2001-3	Hulme 2004-6	Moss Side 2001-3	Moss Side 2004-6
Conception rate 15-17 yr olds per 1000	ONS	153	116.3	93.4	90.4

Factor	Source	Hulme 2003-05	Hulme 2005-7	Moss Side 2003-5	Moss Side 2005-7
Standardised mortality	ONS	986.2	837.0	635.2	681.8

Factor	Source	Hulme Feb 08	Hulme Feb 09	Moss Side Feb 08	Moss Side Feb 09
Working age population on benefits	Nomis	17.1	18.3	27.5	28.5
Lone parent claimants	Nomis	3.2	2.7	7.1	6.7

Factor		Hulme 2007-8	Hulme 2008/9	Moss Side 2007-8	Moss Side 2008/9
Think people from different backgrounds get on well together	MCC Place Survey	79%	73%	82%	75%
Feel they can influence decisions	MCC Place Survey	39%	28%	54%	39%

Factor		Hulme 2006-7	Hulme 2008/9	Moss Side 2006-7	Moss Side 2008/9
Satisfied with neighbourhood	MCC Place Survey	65	83	59	56
18-19 yr olds entering HE	UCAS	25	30	45	45
16-18 yr olds NEET	Connexions	11.3 (Sept 07)	9.7 (Sept 08)	6.4 (Sept 07)	7.8 (Sept 08)

We can see that many of the dimensions of health and wellbeing are improving although they still fall short of the national profile. These aggregate statistics disguise differences that exist within the neighbourhoods, and improvements are not uniform. Of particular interest for the current baseline picture is the worsening perceptions in both Hulme and Moss Side of community cohesion, characterised by thoughts that people from different backgrounds get on well together and people's feelings they can influence decisions. MCC has identified priorities for the area, taking account of some of these facts, and these are available on the Ward Coordinator's website (see Appendix 4). The challenge for the Birley Fields development in terms of impact on health and wellbeing will be to understand and facilitate further improvements in wellbeing, health and life opportunities, and to address perceived local schisms between people and the ability to influence decisions. Following Marmot et al., (2009) it is an assets based approach that will help movement in this direction and the university could be a full partner in this.

Type of Neighbourhood

The Department of Communities and Local Government has developed a typology to describe the worst fifth Super Output Areas in terms of the indices of multiple deprivation. This *functional roles of deprived neighbourhoods* typology describes neighbourhoods in terms of population mobility - that is closely linked to wealth and the ability to be mobile (Robson, Lymperopoulou and Rae, 2009) . The recent Independent Economic Review for Manchester has used this typology in preparing a case study of Hulme (MIER, 2008). The Manchester Place Survey also uses this typology as well as a postcode classification (Acron typology) that classifies residents in terms of economic prosperity, health, housing tenure. Table 3 summarises the two typologies.

Table 3: Neighbourhood Typologies (after MIER, 2008; Robson et al., 2009, Manchester Place Survey, MCC 2009d)

Acorn classification	Functional roles of deprived neighbourhoods typology
Wealthy Achievers: some of the most wealthy and affluent people in the UK. Well established and at the top of the social ladder	**Isolate:** deprived areas in which people from deprived backgrounds live or move in. This results in a degree of entrapment for poor households that are unable to break the cycle of living in a deprived area

Urban Prosperity: Well educated and mostly prosperous and living in urban areas. Cosmopolitan outlook	**Transit:** deprived areas to which young people and first time buyers live or move to because of a limited personal budget
Comfortably off: much of 'middle of the road' Britain. Few major financial worries, mostly home owning	**Escalator:** Areas that people from more deprived areas move to as part of their progression through the property and rsocial ladders
Moderate means: Modest lifestyles but able to get by, living in old industrial heartlands	**Gentrifier:** Areas that people from more affluent neighbourhoods move to or live, resulting in local residents moving to areas similar or more deprived than the original community.
Hard-pressed: poorest area of the UK with unemployment above the national average. Experience difficult social and economic conditions.	

The Independent Economic Review recognised that Hulme falls below the City and National averages for levels of worklessness, education, health, crime and house prices, although as Table 2 indicates, the trend is of improvement. The review analysed Hulme in terms of the neighbourhood typology:

> *The neighbourhood typology identifies Hulme as an area experiencing significant transition owing to the gradual introduction, from less deprived areas, of a young population characterised by social and economic mobility. This process which sees the original population displaced to nearby areas of greater deprivation, reflects the economic forces at work in gentrifier and transit areas, causing property affordability in areas such as Hulme to decrease as demand and competition for properties increases. (MIER, 2008, Sustainable Communities report, Appendix 9).*

The Manchester Place Survey demonstrated the complex nature of the community, with concentrations of 'hard pressed' as well as 'urban prosperity' residents (MCC, 2009:9). Other parts of Manchester (notably in the far south, north and east) are populated by residents who are *predominantly* 'hard pressed' and of 'moderate means'. We have already glimpsed some of the strengths of networks and readiness to give 'voice' over local issues in our consideration of the history of regeneration in Hulme and we will see in later sections of the report that Hulme is full of talent, experience, expertise, skills and passions, all of which offer possibilities for collaboration and move away from top down development processes, as yet unrealised. As Ruth Hussey, NW Regional Director of Public Health makes the case in relation to health:

> *For too long we have concentrated on the deficits and problems within communities and it is time for a different approach. Assessing and building the strengths of individuals and the assets of a community open the door to new ways of thinking about and improving health and of responding to ill-health. It has the potential to change the way practitioners engage with individuals and the way planners design places and services. It is an opportunity for real dialogue between local people and practitioners on the basis of each having something to offer. It can mobilise social capacity and action and more meaningful and appropriate services. (Foot and Hopkins, 2010: Introduction).*

It is in the context of the history of Hulme and its residents in relation to regeneration and to its current character as a neighbourhood, that the MMU Birley Fields Development must be understood. Social policies influenced by and influencing urban

regeneration are fluid and the policy context of the Birley Fields development differs from that of earlier waves of regeneration.

Policy context

The policy context of the Birley Fields development is complex, and different partners in the development have varying degrees of responsibility for delivering policy related outcomes. Sometimes these are hierarchical responsibilities (as, for example in Regional Development Agency's (RDA) economic priorities which are then passed to the University or the City Council (or the Birley Fields partnership) to deliver through the strategic plan of the development; or HEFCE widening participation priorities which are then passed to the University to deliver). Some are horizontal responsibilities with each partner having its own objectives (as, for example in employment and employability policies, where the RDA, MCC and MMU all have their own interlinked priorities and emphases). Some are singular with one of the partners having the major responsibility for delivering (as, for example MCC responsibility to enhance the quality of life of Manchester people; or MMU's responsibility for recruitment and retention of students).

Policy clusters around which all the Birley Field partners are linked include those of sustainable development, health and wellbeing, worklessness and employment, and public involvement, each with associated policy drivers. These clusters can be summarised as follows:

- sustainable development, sustainable communities (including for example, urban regeneration, housing, environment, energy, social (in)equality, community cohesion);
- health, wellbeing and quality of life (including for example, prevention of ill health, maintenance and enhancement of wellbeing, education and development opportunities over the life course including HE, support for families and children, long term conditions and carer wellbeing, environmental protection, place based and 'think family' commissioning of public services);
- worklessness, training and employability (including for example, widening participation in HE and raising educational attainment and aspirations more generally);
- public involvement (including for example, civil participation, public involvement in public services, public and community engagement in HE).

These policy clusters present drivers that at times are consistent with each other and at other times at variance. Nevertheless, each institutional partner it the development faces them in different ways and many of the outcomes and deliverables linked to the sources of funding for the development stress the policy clusters differentially. Not only is it important to understand some of the tensions that the different policy priorities create, but they can be used to create indicators against which the effectiveness of the development on both the University the local area and the city can be gauged .

Conclusion

MMU has long been based in Hulme but has had little deliberative penetration into or from the area.

MMU has an increasingly solid commitment to public and community engagement both in terms of what it can offer local communities but also how local communities can contribute to the culture and work of the University.

Birley Fields provides opportunities to work in ways that push the boundaries of the types of engagement MMU has been used to.

Manchester has delivered transformative urban regeneration, through the *Manchester model* which is one of arms length partnership with corporate and institutional interests with some degrees of community consultation.

The history of Hulme is complex with successive waves of regeneration that has led to transformation in the physical and social character of the area. Residents have taken active interests in the area collaborating with some of the developments of the past, campaigning for and resisting others: the influence they have wielded has been patchy.

There is a rich deposit of urban design, environmental and cultural expertise in the area with longstanding and strong commitments to the neighbourhood. There are also residents with little interest in and voice in change.

Reports produced in the early planning stages of the development highlight the deficits and needs of the area in economic, social and educational terms. An assets based approach might enable greater collaborative work with local people and be more productive in the long term in terms of MMU and local people working together to improve health and wellbeing.

An assets based approach would be consistent with the core values that underpin MMU and its commitment to public engagement and civic responsibilities.

References

Annette, J. (2002). Service learning in an international context. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 8*, 83-93.

Bell, D. (2007). Hospitality and Urban regeneration. In C. Lashley, P. Lynch and A. Morrison (eds). *Hospitality: A social lens.* Oxford, Elsevier.

Bennett, J. (Ed.) (2005). *Towards a strong urban renaissance.* Urban task Force. **http://www.urbantaskforce.org/UTF_final_report.pdf**

Birley Fields Newsletter, (2009). *Joint Newsletter for Hulme and Moss Side*, Issue 1. Manchester, MMU and Manchester City Council. Manchester

Boateng, I. and Moobela, C (2008). Sustainable Participatory Approaches in Urban Regeneration Processes: from Portsmouth Harbour and Inner-City Hulme, Manchester: Proceedings of the *Federation of International Surveyors Working Week 2008- Integrating Generations*, Stockholm, 14-19 June 2008. **http://www.fig.net/pub/fig2008/papers/ts01b/ts01b_03_boateng_moobela_3049.pdf**

Boyer, E.L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 1*(1), 11-20.

Brooks, J. (2009). *A Eureka Moment: Go Local.* Times Higher Education. 7 May 2009.

DEFRA (2005). *One Future, Different Paths. The UK's shared framework for sustainable development.* London, DEFRA.

Diamond, J. (2004). Local regeneration initiatives and capacity building: Whose 'capacity' and 'building' for what? *Community Development Journal, 39* (2), 177-189.

Fauset, P.G. (2000). The Hulme Estate and the 'Homes for Change' Development. Britains First Major Sustainable Housing Project. *In* K. Williams, E. Burton, and M. Jenks (eds) *Achieving Sustainable Urban Form.* London, E and NF Spon. Pp303-319.

Foot, J. with Hopkins, T. (2010*). A glass half-full: how an asset approach can improve community health and well-being.* London, I&DeA, Healthy Communities Programme. **www.idea.gov.uk**

Gnaiger, A. and Martin, E. (2001). *Science Shops: Operational options. SCIPAS Report No.1*. Utrecht, Utrecht University.

Hall, D.E. (2005). Community Engagement and Research: Science Shops. *Higher Education Community Engagement Conference,* November 2005. Manchester. **http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/about/community/communityhub/conference/**

Harding, A. (1997*). Hulme City Challenge Did it Work*? Liverpool, European Institute for Urban Affairs.

Hart, A., Northmore, S. and Gerhardt, C. (2008).*Auditing, benchmarking and evaluating university public engagement. Briefing paper commissioned by The National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement.***http://api.ning.com/files/E0NMvXZhVmrt56q8xOpAbwu*3IVkWh9vg mByCeU04LERBA0x6Oxs8QvVtxn8v5KtBz- pgPLwuELF3hTatHtsYfijg6FUnpzj/ResearchBriefingv1022JulywithAppendixWor d2007.doc** retrieved 5.2.09

Hartnett, C. (2006). *Hurley Birley Fields.* Locally Produced film made in 2006 (produced November) when some residents were in occupation of Birley Fields in protest against plans for development.

HEFCE (2007). *Bridging the gap between higher education and the public.* *http://www.hefce.ac.uk/news/hefce/2007/beacons.asp* retrieved 3.4.08

HRL (1994). *Rebuilding the City: A guide to development in Hulme.* Manchester, Hume regeneration Limited and MCC. Available from: *http://www.urbed.coop/journal_docs/Hulme%20Guide%20to%20development.pdf*

Jacobs, K. (1998).Revisiting Hulme, *Town and County Planning,* 67, 10, 338-339

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (1994). *Housing Summary 5: Lessons from Hulme,*York,Joseph Rowntree Foundation *www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/housing/H5.asp*

Kagan. C (1985). *The Research Exchange: Evaluation of the first year.* Manchester, MCVS, research and Development Committee.

Kagan, C. and Duggan, K. (2009). *Breaking down barriers: Universities and communities working together. Community Cohesion Thematic Report* UR-MAD project. Manchester, RIHSC.

Mackay, L. and Davey, C. (2005). *Shopping and Crime in Manchester.* Vivacity 2020. Secure Urban Environments by Design. *www.vivacity2020.eu/vivacity.../retail-shopping-and-crime-manchester*

Mackay, L. and Davey, C. (2006). *Evaluation of the regeneration of Hulme.* Vivacity 2020, Secure Urban Environments by Design. *www.vivacity2020.eu/.../WP3%20Hulme%20Report%20-%20Case%20Study.doc*

Makepeace, C. (1995). *Looking Back at Hulme, Moss Side, Chorlton on Medlock and Ardwick.* Manchester, Willow Publishing.

Marks, N., Thompson, S., Eckersley, R., Jackson, T. and Kasser, T. (2006). *Sustainable development and well-being: relationships, challenges and policy implications.* London, DEFRA.

Marmot, M., Allen, J., Goldblatt, P., Boyce, T., McNeish, D. Grady, M. and Geddes, I. (2009). *Fair Society, Healthy Lives. The Marmot review: Strategic Review of Health Inequalities in England post 2010.* Final Report and Executive Summary. *www.ucl.ac.uk/marmotreview* .

MCC (2006). *Birley Fields Strategic Review. Community regeneration and overview Scrutiny Committee*, 24 May 2006. *www.manchester.gov.uk/egov_downloads/report)19_91_pdf*

MCC (2009a). *Manchester Metropolitan University Campus Development at Birley Fields, Hulme.* Report to Executive. *www.manchester.gov.uk/egov_downloads/mmuBirleyFields.pdf*

MCC (2009b). *Population fact sheet A26t: Hulme. www.manchester.gov.uk*

MCC (2009c). *Manchester's State of the City Report, 2008-9.* Manchester City Council, Manchester Partnership. *www.manchesterpartnership.org.uk/page/23/* retrieved 29.4.10

MCC (2009d). *Manchester's State of the Wards Report, 2008-9. Issue 3, July 2009.* Manchester City Council, Manchester Partnership. *www.manchesterpartnership.org.uk/page/23/* retrieved 29.4.10

MIER (2008). *Manchester Independent Economic review. Reviews' Report, Sustainable Communities Report, Annexe 9.* Manchester, MCC

MMU (2007). *The 2020 Vision: Institutional Strategic Plan.* *www.mmu.ac.uk/about/strategic-plan/all.html*

Peck, J. and Ward, K. (2002). Placing Manchester. *In* J. Peck and K. Ward (Eds). *City of revolution: Restructuring Manchester.* Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Percy, S.L. Zimpher, N.L. and Brukardt, M.J. (2006). *Creating a New Kind of University: Institutionalizing Community-University Engagement.* Bolton MA, Anker.

Robson, B. (2002). Mancunian Ways: the politics of regeneration. *In* J. Peck and K. Ward (Eds). *City of revolution: Restructuring Manchester.* Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Robson, B., Lymperopoulou, K. and Rae, A. (2009). *A typology of the fundctional roles of deprived neighbourhoods.* London, DCLG.

Roger Tym and Partners (2009*). MMU Birley Fields in Hulme Campus Impact assessment.* Manchester, MMU and Manchester City Council. ***http://www.mmu.ac.uk/hulme/hulme-community.php***

Rogers, A., Huxley, P., Evans, S. and Gately, C. (2008). More than jobs and houses: mental health, quality of life and the perceptions of locality in an area undergoing urban regeneration. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 43*, 364-372.

Saunders, D. and Buckingham-Hatfield, S. (1992). Community Enterprise and Higher Education. *Journal for Further and Higher Education, 16* (2), 10-59.

SDF (2009). *Birley Fields, Hulme. Strategic Development Framework.* Manchester, John McAslan and Partners. http://www.mmu.ac.uk/hulme/Strategic_Framework_Document.pdf

Shapley, P. (2008). *Social Housing and Tenant Participation. History and Policy.* ***http://www.historyandpolicy.org/papers/policy-paper-71.html***

SURF (2002). *Hulme, Ten Years On: Draft Final Report to Manchester City Council, Manchester.* Salford, University of Salford, Centre for Sustainable Urban and Regional Futures.

Symes, M. and Pauwels, S. (1999). The Diffusion of Innovations in Urban Design: The Case of Sustainability in the Hulme Development Guide, *Journal of Urban Design*, 4, 1, 97-117

Thompson, S. (2007). Do good lives have to cost the earth? Some thoughts on well-being and sustainability. *In* Haworth, J., Lawthom, R., Mountian, I. and Sixsmith, J.(eds). *Well-being and sustainable living.* Manchester, RIHSC.

Urban Buzz (2009). Building sustainable communities. London, UCL.

URBED (nd). *Hulme: What happened next? Urban Scrawl Issue No. 2*. Manchester, URBED ***http://www.urbed.coop/urbanscrawl.php***

URBED (2006). *Understanding the Mistake: A Story of two English Estates.* ***http://www.urbed.coop/journal_docs/The%20Worlds%20Longest%20Mistake.pdf***

UTF (1999). *Towards an Urban Renaissance.* London, Urban Task Force, Spon Press.

Watson, D. (2007). *Managing Civic and Community Engagement.* Maidenhead, Open University Press.

Wedgewood, M. (2006). Mainstreaming the Third Stream. *In* I. McNay (ed) *Beyond Mass Higher Education: Building on Expansion.* Maidenhead, Open University Press.

Wellings, P. (2008). *Intellectual Property and Research Benefits.* London, UK Government DBIS ***www.dius.gov.uk/higher_education/shape_and_structure/he_debate/intellectual_ property***

Woolrych, R., Sixsmith, J. and Kagan, C. (2007).*The Impact Of Regeneration On Health And Well-Being Of Local Residents: The Case Of East Manchester*. Manchester, RIHSC

Appendices

Appendix 1: Quality Assurance Domains: University-community engagement (Kagan and Duggan, 2009: 106)

Project level	Institutional context
Project Impact	
Quality of Life This domain is project-specific. It addresses the impact that each project makes on quality of life and the social good. Includes: Progress towards aims and objectives; assessed indicators of change; Policy impact Dissemination Impacts clear, including unintended impacts Stakeholder perspectives and reflections on relationships Conflict resolution	Mission and values embrace community engagement. Gateway to the University, publicity and marketing
Benefit to HEI and engaged academic practice This domain is project specific and makes explicit what has changed within HEI as a result of project: curriculum developments; teaching and learning; research; Third Stream activities; public involvement	Public engagement strategy aligned with other operational strategies Clear typology of different kinds of engagement activity congruent with mission and values Recognition and reward
Appropriateness and efficacy of activities What worked, how and why? What might have been done differently? Gaps in expertise and understanding Individual and organisational learning	Mechanisms for organisational learning
Sustainability of change, activities and relationships Added value Leverage of resources Continuation of relationships Broadening of access to University for community groups or to community groups for University Broadening the academic base	Involvement and governance (Involvement of community partners in governance at all levels in University and in relation to all activities)
Nature of partnership Number of groups involved and diversity across the sectors History of partnership New opportunities arising for this partnership Nature of the innovation – research; teaching and learning; specific project Reciprocity, trust and shared values	Monitoring and review mechanisms in place
Organisational processes	
Project Management Planning and project design Resource procurement Governance arrangements (reciprocal involvement of university and Effective monitoring systems in place ensuring accountability Appropriate reporting Financial monitoring Mechanisms for organisational learning (University and Community) Personnel support and development Dissemination	Good practice guidelines in place Mechanisms for organisational learning in place Effective organisational systems e.g. financial and academic accountability
Knowledge and skills Adequacy and relevance of interdisciplinary knowledge and skill base Skills for project management (planning and evaluation – general) and delivery (project specific)	Support and commitment to trans-disciplinary and cross sectoral activity Staff development and training

Generation and utilisation of appropriate skills Skills development	Active networking across HEIs

Resources Adequacy of financial and human resources Mechanisms for resource enhancement Physical resources Reciprocal use of resources between University and community	Support for resource procurement Mechanisms for recognition and reward

Relevance and Accessibility Appropriate partnerships formed Values – visibility and clarity, restricted or open access to project Access broadened to both University and Community University information available to community clear Points of contact to both university and community groups clear Shared dissemination Publicity	Gateway or portal for community projects to contact University properly resourced: effective sign posting and intelligence held about expertise within University and in relation to community interests

Evaluation Clarity of internal and external drivers linked to project Formative and summative evaluation planned from the outset Approach to evaluation clear and properly executed Relevant participation and dissemination of evaluation findings	Celebration of achievements

Appendix 2: Typology of wider benefits of HE to society after (HEFCE 2009)

Activity	Purpose	Example
Supporting society to debate and use critical methods of problem-solving (including use of HE knowledge, evidence and methods) to come to resolution on matters of importance to local communities, the wider public or society in general	Purpose: With a view to supporting societies that respect diversity in all its forms and are functioning (solve the problems that matter) and harmonious (make difficult decisions but maintain respect).	Public dialogues, public discussion spaces, café scientifique. Supporting fora or events of the public, local/national politicians, civil society bodies, faith organisation etc to come together and debate, use evidence and rational problem-solving techniques, to resolve matters of importance to their societies. The role of the academic as a commentator or public intellectual to inform public debates, including through the media. Giving access to HE knowledge assets, expertise or methods to inform or support debates (for example, helping community groups with evaluation or research techniques to help them with evidence to inform
Opening up the knowledge, assets and expertise of HE to wider access of local communities, wider public or society	With a view to supporting societies that appreciate and interrogate knowledge; are creative; preserve and understand their heritage; and live long and well	Making HE spaces into public spaces with a view to society having a greater stake in and use of these knowledge assets The cultural contribution - inviting the public into HE museums, galleries; opening up theatre and performing arts including rare works; supporting festivals and offering lectures and other means to help the public critically engage with culture and knowledge; with a view to inspiring and engaging people and maintaining the country's intellectual and cultural heritage for the long term. Also engagement with science, science centres and work with communities and schools. Offering sporting facilities and professional and expert support for the development of physical health and wellbeing in our society; also community medicine, law and other professional and practice areas and facilities.
Catalysing or stimulating economic or social development	With a view to supporting societies that create common wealth in all its forms.	Making a difference in the social and economic development of the HE's 'place', widely conceived (locally to globally) Regeneration projects. Science cities. Development of the knowledge and expertise of local professionals and professions. Participation in and expert support for city, regional and local partnerships. Support for local public services. Development of knowledge and expertise of civil society or community bodies or groups to contribute to change. Supporting open innovation models and public space functions bringing together businesses, local public services

		and third and community sectors.
Supporting public policy	With a view to supporting societies that make good decisions on what matters most to all; and effective in how they achieve those matters	Participating in public-policy making at all levels and in all forms. Advice to government, select committees etc. Public intellectual role and work in the media to inform public debate and discussion on policy. Supporting public engagement in public policy; supporting the citizen; and supporting civil society and civil society bodies. Helping to improve public services through public engagement (such as citizen's juries).
HE-community research and development	With a view to supporting societies that are comfortable to engage with HE knowledge and expertise and have ideas and will to develop themselves.	Community-based research projects. Using community insights in research.
Inspiring and stimulating the public	With a view to supporting societies that are engaged by thinking and creation, absorb this into their lives generally; and transmit this to subsequent generations.	Public intellectuals. Provocations. Public lectures and talks. Academic and HE presence at festivals of ideas, fairs or exhibitions. The role of the HE designer, artist, creator or innovator. Supporting creative writing and artistic development in communities, as well as access to rare or historic works and their significant and meaning (in history, heritage and culture). Accessible literature and dissemination of research and scholarly findings. Lifelong learning and inspiring love of learning and opening up the possibilities of new knowledge.
Student community-based projects and volunteering.	With a view to supporting societies that develop individuals to play effective public and community roles; and transmit those values over time and generations	Community-based research projects. Knowledge-based and accredited volunteering schemes. Work with schools and young people, such as through youth groups and mentoring.

Appendix 3: Voluntary Sector Groups listed in One Central Place,
Manchester Directory (*www.onecentralplace.org* accessed 25.5.10)

(91 groups 61 of which are in Hulme)

Action for Sustainable Living (AfSL), Hulme

African & Caribbean Care Group for the Elderley, Hulme

African and Caribbean Mental Health Services, Moss Side

Afro-Caribbean Care Group for the Elderly, Hulme

Aisha Childcare Trafford, Hulme

Alcohol Group, Hulme

Anxiety UK, Hulme

Aquarius Community Centre, Hulme

ArcSpace Manchester, Hulme

Arlaadi Somali Community in Manchester, Moss Side

Army Cadet Force, Hulme

asad, Moss Side

Carisma, Moss Side

Chrysalis Project, Moss Side

Chrysalis Project, Moss Side

Citizens Advice Bureau (Hulme), Hulme

Claremont Resource Centre, Hulme

CMMC - Parents Power Group, Hulme

Commitment in Communities (CiC), Hulme

Community Safety Network Manchester (CSN), Hulme

Cranswick Square Residents Group, Moss Side

Creative Hands Foundation, Hulme

DASH (Drug Advice and Sexual Health), Hulme

Deaf Blind Group, Hulme

Depaul Trust, Hulme

Ease Holistic Therapies, Moss Side

Food and Mood, Hulme

Friends of Whitworth Park, Moss Side

goodmoodfood, Hulme

Grace Incorporation Faith Trust (GIFT), Moss Side

Greater Manchester Asbestos Victims Support Group, Moss Side

HARP, Hulme

Health, Advocacy and Resource Project, Hulme

Health, Advocacy and Resource Project, Hulme

Hideaway Youth Project, Moss Side

Hosla Asian Women's Project, Moss Side

Hulme Community Garden Centre (HCGC), Hulme

Hulme in Bloom, Hulme

ICA:UK, Hulme

Indian Head Massage, Hulme

Kath Locke Centre, Hulme

Learning Zone, Hulme

Libralato Engines Ltd., Hulme

Longsight/Moss Side Community Project (Asian Carers' Group), Moss Side

low winter sun, Hulme

Manchester Beacon, Hulme

Manchester BME Network, Moss Side

Manchester Care & Repair Ltd, Hulme

Manchester Ceramics Enterprise, Moss Side

Manchester Family Information Service, Moss Side

Manchester Somali Senior Citizens Care , Moss Side

Manchester Young Lives (MYL), Hulme

MCCR - Manchester Council for Community Relations (Asian Parent Carers), Moss Side

Meditation Classes, Hulme

Moss Side Green Group, Moss Side

Mothers Against Violence, Hulme

Multi Agency for Refugee Integration in Manchester (MARIM), Hulme

New Self Esteem and Assertiveness Course,,Hulme

NUWA, Hulme

OpenSpace Co-op, Hulme

Out There - Supporting Families of Prisoners, Hulme

Partner-s.h.i.p, Moss Side

PUSH- People Understanding Self Harm, Hulme

Quality Living Scheme, Hulme

ReachOut!, Moss Side

Routes Project, Hulme

Sahara Project, Hulme

Self Help Services, Hulme

Senegal Association, Moss Side

Social Skills Programme, Hulme

Somali Carers Forum, Moss Side

Somali Golden Centre of Opportunities, Hulme

South Rusholme Residents Association, Moss Side

Support 4 Progress, Moss Side

Teenbash, Moss Side

Thalassaemia & Sickle Cell Outreach Project, Hulme

The Big Life Company, Moss Side

The Kindling Trust, Moss Side

The Manchester Busker, Hulme

The Manchester Foyer, Hulme*The Somaliland Community Centre*. Moss Side

Therapeutic Services, Moss Side

Upper Space, Hulme

Venture Arts, Hulme

Wesley Community Furniture, Moss Side

Women's Action Forum, Moss Side

Yoga, Hulme

Zion Arts Centre, Hulme

Zi

on Community Resource Centre, Hulme

Zion Depression Group, Hulme

Zion Gay Men's Group, Hulme

N.B. listings are voluntary and not all groups will have uploaded information into the Directory

Reaching full potential in education and employment

Continue to work toward higher achievement in schools

Reduce the number of long-term Incapacity Benefit recipients.

Continue to work with MMU to progress talks around the development of Hulme Community Campus.

Improvements have been made at Key Stage 2, however further work is needed to bring some of the schools up to the Manchester and National average.

Improve school buildings to create a modern educational environment in conjunction with the BSF programme which will focus on Trinity High School in the next round of delivery.

Individual and collective self-esteem/mutual respect

Improve residents' satisfaction with the performance of Manchester City Council.

Encourage sustainable communities within the Ward by providing a broad range of living facilities and services that meet the life demand of existing and new residents.

Promote the Community Guardian Scheme - residents who adopt their local area and take an active interest in working with the Council to ensure that any environmental problems or defects in the area are dealt with promptly.

Neighbourhoods of choice

Reduce parking congestion in the area.

Ensure there is suitable and affordable housing and help deliver sustainable communities where residents are proud of their neighbourhoods and feel safe.

Continue the development of the area with as little disruption to the local residents as possible.

Increase the number of families in the area.

Improve the environment.

Promote the Wards arts and leisure venues and activities to local groups and residents.

Reduce crime within the ward-particularly burglary and vehicle crime.

Develop closer links with residents in the ward and build on existing relationships to improve communication about actual crime in order to help reduce the perception of the area having a high crime rate.

Improve relationships with young people and change the perception of their involvement in crime and anti social behaviour within the ward.

Work towards Green Flag status for Hulme Park.

Community Engagement priorities

General Public - Ensure that we are working to the priorities of Hulme. (The State of the Wards Report 2008/2009 indicates that only 57% of Hulme residents were satisfied with the way that the council runs things.) Engage with the local community through Resident Associations, local community groups, partner organisations, 'Respect' activity and attendance at local events to ensure we know the priorities of local people.

Ensure we are engaging with the newer communities in the Ward. (Hulme is a growing area and has a lot of newcomers.) The gap between satisfaction with

the area and belonging in Hulme is the highest in the City. (89% of people were satisfied with the area whilst only 24% felt they belonged to their immediate area (State of the Wards Report 2008/09).)

Older People - improve communication networks with older people and increase awareness of needs and views and engage them in the decision-making processes. Ensure that they are aware of facilities and networks available to them. Support and promote Health and wellbeing initiatives and support the work of the Valuing Older People Team by the establishment of a Valuing Older People Network jointly with Moss Side. Support intergenerational projects in the Ward.

Young People - improve communication with young people within the ward and improve awareness of needs and views. To involve young people in discussions around provision available and the decision making process. Support intergenerational projects in the Ward.

Ethnicity groups - Data from the State of the Wards report 2008/09 informs us that the population of the ward includes residents from numerous ethnic groups, with recent analysis identifying new Eastern European communities living within the ward. To support these changes and meet the needs of the community we need to gain a better understanding of the ward profile and ensure sections of the community are being represented. Support community cohesion across the ward through intergenerational projects, art and culture events, involve schools and the Sure Start Centre in events such as the Winter Festival in Hulme Park to ensure wide attendance.

£20.00