

POVERTY, DEPRIVATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN WORKING CLASS COMMUNITIES

**Report of the conference held in Govan
22 November 2004**



Govan Community Council

*Published by
Govan Community Council with
financial support from the
Greater Govan Community Forum.*

*Copies are available to organisations
outside Govan at price £3 from
Dick Carabine, Chair GCC,
813 Govan Road, Glasgow G51.*

January 2005

Preface

Govan Community Council convened the 22 November conference with the aim of bringing together representatives of working class communities across Scotland facing similar problems of poverty and deprivation. The Community Council had taken these issues to the Scottish Parliament's Public Petitions Committee at a hearing in June 2004.

We are very grateful to the speakers for providing transcripts of their contributions and also to the delegates who ensured that the conference was successful.

It was agreed at the end of the conference to make it the first of a series of conferences that would be held two or three times a year in different centres. The next would be in Partick in Spring 2005.

The aim of the conference was not simply to examine the problems we face in common but also to consider the wider issues of policy which might address these problems. In the responses from discussion groups a number of proposals were made for wider policy changes. We hope that future conferences will be able to amplify and develop these proposals.

It was the current estimation of those at the conference that, despite the social inclusion remit of the Scottish Executive, problems of poverty and exclusion are getting worse rather than better - as much as anything because of wider economic policies and trends at British and European level.

Dick Carabine
Chair Govan Community Council

Content

1. Housing policies and community deprivation in Scotland <i>Mike Dailly</i>	3
2. Economic Development and Local Communities <i>Mike Danson</i>	8
3. Community Reports: Partick, Greenock, Govan <i>Kait Laughlin, Marie Pearce and Jet Gallacher, John Flanagan</i>	12
4. A Conservation Plan for Govan <i>David Robertson and Pat Cassidy</i>	
5. Redevelopment and Community partnership <i>John McAllion</i>	13
6. Community Participation and Urban Regeneration <i>Chik Collins</i>	
7. Discussion group proposals	
8. Concluding Responses <i>Dave Moxham, John Flanagan, Dick Carabine</i>	
9. List of participants	

Housing policies and community deprivation in Scotland

Mike Dailly, Principal Solicitor, Govan Law Centre

THE SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE'S *Guide to the Planning System in Scotland* asks, why do we have a planning system? The answer given is that:

"Constructing new buildings and other changes on the way land is used are essential to help the economy grow and meet the need for homes, shops, leisure and mobility. The nature, quality and location of these new developments are important. Poorly designed developments in unsuitable places can damage the quality of life in a community. It is not easy or cheap to put mistakes right".

In the context of traditional working class communities in Scotland we need to question: firstly, are the needs for 'homes, shops & leisure' being adequately met? And, secondly, how fairly does the current planning system balance competing and conflicting interests?

In Glasgow, several geographical areas (and by default many communities) have been designated by the planning authority as 'Core Economic Development Areas' (CEDAs). I would suggest that it is this designation which has resulted in economic consideration taking primacy over the needs of communities. How does this impact on local communities in Glasgow?

- In Govan, which is a key Glasgow CEDA, the population has decreased by 20% from 1991 to 2001, while industrial development has flourished.
- 51% of all adults in Govan are unemployed or workless - double the Glasgow average.

- Large residential areas cleared of social rented housing, such as Teucharhill and Moorpark, have been rezoned for industrial and business use.

Yet if one walks anywhere in central Govan the most striking feature is the large number of empty shops and empty industrial units. I would respectfully suggest that the current planning system has and is failing working class communities.

When we talk of housing policies and working class communities we are often talking about policies which consist of little or nothing - the principal activity appears to be numerous officials measuring and recording the decline of communities. While research and analysis is important it is no substitute for policies which can prevent the decline of fragile communities.

Population decline can occur because housing and social needs are not being met. People who have a modest or good income can vote with their feet and leave an area in perceived decline. Population decline in working class communities impacts upon the sustainability of those communities - the number of shops, schools and local services in an area is all dependent upon the ability of a community to sustain those services. Significantly, population decline also impacts upon the level and concentration of poverty in a community.

Glasgow Housing Association's 2004 Baseline Tenant Survey confirms that:

- 81% of GHA tenants are unemployed or workless
- one third of GHA tenants are classified as permanently sick or disabled, and
- 60% of GHA tenants are single person households.

These stark statistics should be ringing alarm bells in the planning department. What working class communities need are positive and pro-active housing policies which can free up unused & derelict industrial land and vacant land, and attract developers and registered social landlords who can supply a mix of high quality affordable housing for rent or purchase.

That is what we need in Glasgow, however, please allow me to summarise what we currently have, drawing upon my experience in Govan over the last 5 years.

The Govan Community Council took part in a planning inquiry when it opposed the rezoning of residential land in Teucharhill. Govan Law Centre represented the community council, while the City Council was represented by Queens Counsel. The experience from that inquiry exposed substantive inadequacies in the Scottish Executive's Reporters Service. Please allow me to qualify this assertion. In the sheriff court or any tribunal, the judge or chairperson will hear evidence and make 'findings-in-fact'. That is the lynch-pin of the civil justice system because without findings-in-fact you cannot tell if the court or tribunal has omitted or ignored important evidence; you cannot tell what evidence has been accepted as credible.

In the Reporter's decision on the Teucharhill case huge swathes of important evidence was absent or not referred to in the Reporter's decision. Govan Law Centre obtained Counsel's Opinion with the support of the local MSP which confirmed that the Community Council had reasonable prospects of success for an appeal to the Court of Session. However, there is no civil legal aid available for community councils, and an appeal would have had to be taken in the community council's name. Thus in practice the local community were denied access to justice. They were only allowed to participate so far in a planning process which ultimately is not robust and lacks judicial impartiality and basic quality.

Last week the Scottish Executive announced it will not introduce a third party right of appeal with respect to planning law, however we can only hope that it will improve the quality of a decision making process which is supposed to balance the needs and interests of local communities with commerce. You can't grow the local economy if you don't have a strong local community.

In the Teucharhill inquiry, for example, the Reporter failed to consider evidence on the GHA Ltd's stated business plan to demolish 14,000 houses in Glasgow. This figure increased this month to 19,000 when the GHA published its 30 year business plan. Many of these demolitions will take place in Govan - likely including many of the dozen or so high rise flats in the Ibrox area. Where will these displaced residents be rehoused? They could have been re-housed in Teucharhill.

It could be argued that there is a housing crisis in Glasgow at present. Many tenants living in multi-storey flats are living in conditions not reasonably fit for human habitation. We know this because the law centre has around 50 current cases and independent architects who have surveyed many of these properties in Govan have confirmed that accommodation is prejudicial and dangerous to the health of adults and children because of the effects of dampness, mould growth and spores, water penetration, a lack of heating, poor quality water, and very high levels of house dust mite. GHA Ltd has yet to decide when it may demolish these properties. It has formally stated that it might be anytime within the next 10 years. It has formally stated that no major repairs will be carried out to these properties.

While we will be using the law on behalf of tenants to pursue this untenable legal position the fact remains that there is a major demand for affordable housing construction in Govan right now. But with no reasonable policy on housing will peoples' needs and aspirations ever be met?

The failure to address housing need is intrinsically linked to communities falling into decline and the creation of 'sink estates', which is in turn linked to increased vandalism, abject poverty, ill-health, anti-social behaviour, mental illness and crime. Without a progressive housing policy and planning system all of these problems cannot be resolved.

What then of the future?

Two issues stand out. Firstly, with the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003, social inclusion partnerships will be phased out and incorporated as part of new local 'Community Planning Partnerships'. These should be fully operational next year. Statutory guidance on community planning from the Scottish Executive provides that 'community need' must be the central focus of the new CPPs. We can only hope with this new model of local community planning the needs of the local community will have a greater opportunity of being met?

Secondly, there is a major problem surrounding the affordability of socially rented housing. A typical monthly rent in Scotland is around £240 to £260 per month. Meeting that rent is not an issue if a person is in full receipt of housing benefit, but for those only part entitled to HB, and in low, part-time, or modestly paid work it can be very difficult to meet these levels of rent. As a comparison it can be noted that tenants who have exercised a right to buy will typically be paying a monthly mortgage of £150 per month. For those in low paid work, not being able to afford their rent can result in family poverty, and ultimately eviction.

In the case of *Angus Housing Association v. Fraser* 2004 Hous LR (Scottish housing law reports) 83 a tenant with rent arrears of £1,448.60 was evicted along with her 14 year old daughter. From the court report the tenant seemed to have went in and out of low paid employment due to ill-health and child care problems. That resulted in housing benefit delays and overpayments of housing benefit. However, this case highlights the issue of affordability of rent.

Mrs Fraser's monthly rent was £240 per month. When in employment she earned £240 net per month, thus leaving her with £27 per week family tax credit and £16 per week child benefit to maintain herself and her 14 year old daughter - a total of £43 per week to meet living costs, and to pay for water and sewerage charges etc.,. Those in low paid work simply can't afford the relatively high levels of rent in the social rented sector - we need to start a debate on this issue.

Mike Dailly
Principal Solicitor
Govan Law Centre
Glasgow
22 November 2004



Key Features of Community Planning Partnerships

- Community need is central focus.
- Main Community Planning partnership at LA level. Community plan or similar to set out responsibilities and key outcomes.
- Linked with themed partnerships e.g. Health Improvement.
- Supported by local or neighbourhood partnership structures where required.
- Supported by regional strategic partnerships and national partnership approaches where required.
- Issues of a European or International context also a consideration - *not shown in diagram.*

See further:

SE Guide to the Planning System in Scotland –

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/planning/guides/gtps-00.asp>

Local Government in Scotland 2003 Statutory Guidance -

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library5/localgov/cpsg-00.asp>

Economic Development And Local Communities

*Professor Mike Danson,
Business School, Paisley University*

When I came to Glasgow in the 1970s, I settled in its East End. At that point something like 100,000 jobs had disappeared over the previous decade. But the basic industries that had defined the economies of Glasgow, Clydeside and Scotland from the early part of 19th century - coal, steel shipbuilding, heavy engineering and textiles - were still dominant. And at that time in the 1970s there were plans for future. A massive integrated steel plant around Ravenscraig, new coal mines, a deep water harbour on Clyde with petrochemical works and oil refineries, innovative ships, steel and concrete oil rigs. It was a time of hope as well as change.

What was it like in those days – thirty years ago ? Housing in the old industrial areas of those days tended to be based on the traditional family. The man/father at work. The woman/mother looking after home and family and children. And all lived in council housing. Usually there was one adult working in each family once the first child had been born. There were little opportunities for savings because these industries were highly cyclical, owner occupation was exceptional and there was no spare money - no collateral for loans to start new lives.

Within just ten years, by the late 1980s, there was a very different picture. All the deep mines had gone, only one steel works was left, most engineering was in decline and hardly any textiles remained. Unlike previous recessions these industries were now gone for good. It was an unprecedented collapse of industries, and of the communities they depended on and which depended on them, over a very short period. These were *dominated* economies: one industry towns and villages and neighbourhoods. Once the jobs in these industries had been taken away, there were often no local alternative jobs. Large areas of land were left derelict by this - with half of the 1985 derelict land still unrecovered in 2004.

This decline was achieved through redundancies - mass job losses, with thousands at a time being told they were no longer needed, their skills rendered useless. Men and women were thrown on the scrapheap. And so were their communities.

I dwell on this because it is important that we do not forget how we ended up with poverty and deprivation on such a scale in so many Scottish communities and why it is we have high and rising levels of inequality.

History and context need to be stressed. First, because we need to learn. At this moment on the other side of the European Union Silesia in Poland faces just the same kind of de-industrialisation. But more importantly for today's discussion those who make policy and implement programmes must remember what has caused the problems we face today. If they do not recognise and remember how we got here, they are in danger of blaming the victim.

Too often they forget that the individual who is on incapacity benefit used to be a worker with highly prized skills, someone with the dignity of creating much of the wealth on which our generation depends. These are the people too often blamed for lacking enterprise, being dependent on the welfare state and not getting on their bike and leaving the community in which they grew up and in which they worked. The path we followed to get here is important.

The past 25 years have seen many initiatives to address the impacts of this deindustrialisation and worklessness. They started in my own area of the East End in 1976 with GEAR – the Glasgow Eastern Area Renewal - to tackle the worst mass poverty in Western Europe. Twenty-eight years later we have lower life expectancy in Shettleston than in 1976. Death rates for men are no better than some of the former republics of the Soviet Union such as Moldova. If there is no other statistic which should make us demand a reappraisal of redevelopment efforts, then it should be that one.

Today we have greater segregation within society than ever before. We have single class estates. There are job rich and job poor households and communities, areas of multiple deprivation where poverty is endemic. Glasgow has six times the levels of poverty that exists in Scotland as a whole (as measured by the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation SIMD).

This is totally different in kind from where these communities were twenty years ago. There are now concentrations of people and families with problems in particular communities – in peripheral housing estates, mining and fishing villages, old inner city communities. Each has its own characteristics, histories and difficulties. Old communities such as Govan, Gorbals, Springburn and the east end of Glasgow tend to have an ageing population, with particular problems and needs different from the peripheral estates and poor areas elsewhere.

Amongst working age households across Scotland, 85% of households where no-one works either has someone who is long term sick or disabled, or no-one has qualifications

or they are headed by a lone parent. The old industrial communities such as Govan have many who are on incapacity benefits or lack qualifications, while many older people have no occupational pension scheme and must rely on the old age pension and means tested benefits. SIMD shows how communities like Govan have high concentrations of households facing such difficulties.

But we also know that many of those not in work locally face multiple barriers to getting a job. There are therefore especial reasons for helping these communities in particular to get a fair share of jobs.

What have been the initiatives? They have taken three forms.

There have been actions and activities to change the *image* of the area or the city. The first was the Mr Happy logo Glasgow's Miles Better ~ than it was ? Then there was the Garden Festival - where they literally air-brushed out from the publicity material the communities behind the site itself. Then the City of Culture - only whose culture?

These and similar events along with increased consumer spending on the back of tax cuts for the rich were meant to trickle down to poorer communities and households. Job opportunities were created in retailing, wholesaling, hotels. These were low paying low skill part-time, which would be taken up by the low skilled. But there is no evidence that these schemes worked for the old industrial communities where there were significant numbers of skilled workers. Many of the jobs were taken by women returners to the labour market, students and others looking for such work.

The second approach was to improve the balance of the communities by more housing associations, owner occupied housing and high quality private rented stock. There was some success for this approach in Easterhouse and the East End for instance. But it requires significant and committed efforts to invest in sustainable development and quality houses with sufficient numbers of new build so that isolated ghettos are not created.

The third approach was through what were called 'supply side policies' – training and education for the young people and the unemployed; better infrastructure and workshop and business parks to accommodate new and expanding companies; the creation of more enterprise and new businesses through a whole host of measures. But evidence from various sources is that many of the jobs being created are not open to the long-term unemployed and inactive, those on Income Benefit or lone parents. An academic study was undertaken on job creation programmes in the GEAR area. This found that very few had actually been taken by local people. The estimated total was nine jobs. Many jobs in the new service sector economy are low paid, part-time, insecure, high turnover and without opportunities for progression. They are therefore unattractive to those without jobs in areas like Govan and their casual and temporary character poses big economic barriers to the move from benefit to wages without loss of income. Local people do not have the contacts, the capital or the skills to set up own businesses and so the self employment and enterprise route is not available to most.

Faced with the failure or limitations of this trickle-down approach, we need to be sceptical of promises that Govan people will be beneficiaries of a media and science cluster being established on Clyde. How will local people get access to these jobs when they are competing with the thousands who are already in the labour market? Glasgow has created more jobs since 1995 than any other UK city. The number is up 17 per cent compared with 12 per cent in Great Britain and 10 per cent in Scotland. But 100,000 working age people are not in employment in the city but on Job seekers allowance and other benefits. Govan itself has 51 per cent of its people of working age workless. Many of the new jobs, probably most, have been taken by those commute into the city. These are the people with qualifications and existing relevant job experience. How can local people compete more effectively?

What needs to be done ?

First, there needs to be a more balanced housing strategy. Communities are being adversely affected by stock transfer and by demolition of high flats and multi-storeys – with the construction of new owner-occupier houses being on periphery of the area, facing out and encouraging residents to go along motorway to Braehead, city centre for jobs, shops and other services. Statistically this may result in Govan having a reduced proportion of poor people. But the core remains poor and excluded. So there is a strong case for housing to be re-examined as element for change, and in detail and not in simple aggregates.

Second, supply side policies and programmes need to be managed to ensure that the long term unemployed and those who were directed to the sick and disabled benefits have access to appropriate training, support and jobs. Too often schemes exclude those on income benefit, older workers retired before their time and condemned to poverty before and after pensionable age. A most important consideration is the barrier posed by self esteem/confidence. Attacks on community facilities and environment do not support a positive self image for individuals or the community. The construction of new premises, workshop and business units needs to be considered within an overall economic and social strategy for the community. What businesses will be attracted ? Is there market failure and will companies come anyway? It is likely that among business that do come there will be a high level of displacement from elsewhere in the city so that they will bring their own workforce and probably not recruit many locals. Commercial property market at the lower end has been facing lower occupancy, rents and so returns – does this augur well for local developments? If the new businesses do not come and the development is not sustainable, will the owners be allowed to relax the agreements to promote local residents, to offer appropriate jobs and training etc? Is the heart of the community being neglected in terms of social capital and community facilities – schools, swimming baths and sports grounds, libraries and Pos and halls ? These are the facilities that bind the community together and make it a place where people want to live, play and work. The theory and practice elsewhere that underpin the policies of SEP, UK and Scottish governments, Scottish Enterprise and Glasgow City Council stress such factors.

Finally, how are local communities to be involved in making decisions about their futures? Are they merely informed or 'consulted' ? Or, as the academic work and good practice suggest, are local communities actually to be made full participants setting the agenda? How can Community Planning Frameworks be used to change all this?

Community Reports

PARTICK

Kait Laughlin from West Glasgow Against Poverty

Introduction

West Glasgow Against Poverty was originally set up to expose the lie that there is no poverty in the West end of Glasgow. As people surviving poverty we were fed up hearing that myth and came together to make visible the reality of our lives and the lives of others struggling to survive poverty. That was seven years ago. We now run a Community Advice & Resource Centre in Partick, provide a comprehensive advice service, on e.g. Welfare Rights, Money Advice, etc., are involved in various types of community development work, and network and campaign on a wide range of anti-poverty issues.

We see what is happening in our Community in the name of 'development' as being an anti-poverty issue, as, as always, it is those who are most vulnerable and who have fewest 'choices', whose views are ignored or marginalised. WestGAP exists to make sure those voices are heard – and that the experiences and concerns of people on benefit and other low incomes are made visible.

Like Govan, Partick is a traditional working-class community, with a strong sense of identity. There are many historical links between Govan and Partick, with the ferry providing easy to-ing and fro-ing between both sides of the Clyde. However, development in our Community has taken a different focus – it is not industrial units that are springing up everywhere but seriously expensive flats on every vacant bit of ground.

From the flats at Partick Cross that loom over the Job Centre, to the houses that replaced the steamie (in spite of a massive campaign to save it) to the huge amount of flats right around the back of Partick. We are being squeezed out. We are currently having 'penthouses' built slap bang in the middle of Dumbarton Road – by a subsidiary of our local housing association, who in the same week they were meeting with our MSP to discuss the lack of affordable housing in the West End, had a half page advert in the paper about a presentation of their proposed 'luxury' development in an expensive city centre hotel.

We are talking about house prices of hundreds of thousands of pounds not being uncommon in our area now, with things set to get even worse.

People whose families have lived here for generations, have absolutely no chance of staying in the area, with overcrowding of rented flats a very common occurrence. People are usually either forced to move away from their families or to move into private rented accommodation in desperation. The days when people were forced in to the arms of private landlord are back with a vengeance.

We have a lot of private rented accommodation in the West end, and, where folk are forced to take a privately rented flat, it is not uncommon for them to be in substandard accommodation with a shared bathroom or kitchen, in a damp bedsit or in a flat with a rent over the limit that housing benefit will pay. In the last case, what this means is that people, in having to meet some rent costs from their benefit, are effectively suffering a cut in an income that is already seriously below the poverty line.

Evictions are increasingly commonplace, with the local Housing Association pressing for eviction on tenants with relatively small amounts of arrears, on the basis that they are running a 'business'.

Lack of affordable housing is not confined to Partick, but what is happening here is that we see new houses being built constantly, but not for the likes of us. Other things in our Community are also changing to accommodate the 'needs' of those who can afford to buy the new houses. (Incidentally, a good proportion of these are bought, not to live in but as investments – as rental properties, with very high rents, that would never be covered by housing benefit - even if they were available for people on benefit – highly unlikely!)

Shops in Partick are increasingly splitting in to two types:- 99p type shops (with three opening recently) and charity shops, and shops for those with money, including a shop selling Spanish holiday homes. Shops for the 'poor', and shops for the 'rich' are springing up side by side.

These very real threats to our identity and coherence as a working class community are set to worsen with the Harbour Development on our doorsteps. We can't speak for what people in Govan think of that, or whether you feel it will benefit your Community, but many of us in Partick have serious concerns about what is going to happen to our area.

The Harbour Development

Let me give you a quote from the Harbour Development's website:- "Glasgow harbour is more than just a development. The size and scale of the Project means we are creating an entirely new district within the west end of Glasgow."

Prices there mean that this will be a wealthy ghetto. It is advertised as ' a place to live, shop, work and relax' without ever having to leave the area, with fast transport links to the city centre and the airport. There will be thousands of people living there with a

cinema, nightclub, casino (?), hotels, theatre, an 11 acre park, museum, and lots of large shops 'suited to your (whose?) lifestyle'.

Whether or not the people who live in this 'entirely new district' have anything directly to do with Partick, the 'wannabees' who will flock even more to Partick because of its proximity to the Harbour Development mean even more changes for the existing Community. How can these be changes for the better for people on low income? House prices rise faster, Council Tax goes up for all of us as a result, the shops and other local amenities will probably continue to change with prices out of the reach of people without money. What happens to our local supermarkets, which rely on people coming in from surrounding areas as well as locally, to keep them viable? If people from other areas go to the attractions of the new shops, will they close? If they close, what happens to the wee shops that are left that still supply people's needs - the shoe shop, the chemists, the butchers? Will they close too?

Who services this wealthy ghetto? The website states they have a commitment to employ local people / young people / long-term unemployed people / people from Drumchapel / Castlemilk/

Easterhouse. So, are they going to bus people in? Given current government policies and practices, are people going to be forced off benefit to work for the minimum wage in shops we can't afford to buy anything in? Are the people of Partick and Govan, Drumchapel, Castlemilk and Easterhouse going to be servicing the rich and their lifestyle?

Conclusion

We don't see anywhere these questions are being properly addressed. We don't feel that those living on low income have been involved in any of these decisions, and we feel that what is happening could have a huge impact on our lives and on that of our Communities.

Therefore, WestGAP together with the Oxfam UK Poverty Programme and the University of Glasgow have embarked on a collaborative four-year PhD research project on the effects of the 'gentrification' of Partick, with particular emphasis on the experiences of people living in poverty and how this is/will be impacting on all our lives. Our researcher and PhD student, Kirsteen Paton is here today. We see this as one way of making the reality of the lives of people living in poverty visible, and hopefully answering some of these questions.

So, is there anything else we can do? Well, we can start by joining together to try and recognising our common cause. The ways in which we are made invisible may be different in our different communities, but the causes are the same and the effects can often be the same. It is the lives of those living in poverty who are being affected most and it is our needs that are being ignored. Poverty is poverty in Govan, Partick Maryhill, Easterhouse or anywhere else.

We are trying to save our Community. We've heard today how you are trying to rebuild yours. Let's support each other and encourage other people to come together in the struggle to be heard.

GREENOCK

Jet Gallacher of Maukinhall Tenants and Residents
Marie Pearce Neighbourhood Development Worker

Greenock has suffered as an industrial community from the loss of its shipyards in the 1980s and 1990s and more recently from the rundown of its computer industries. In consequence it has one of the highest levels of worklessness and poverty on Clydeside.

Maukinhill is a housing scheme on the edge of Greenock built with run down facilities and two shops. It is as badly affected by poverty as many housing scheme in Greenock. By the late 1990s it was experiencing rising levels of vandalism, crime and drug taking. The response of the Council was to propose wholesale demolition of the scheme and thereby its community as well.

Luckily Maukinhall had a strong tenants and residents association, determined leadership and support from community development workers. The tenants put forward an alternative plan to rescue the scheme. This included housing issues, the upgrading of facilities, street lighting, youth services - a drop in centre for four nights a week, community safety - working with the police services, physical activities for all age groups, environmental projects, health and drugs projects, traffic calming, employment training.

As a result of the allocation of funding from Better Neighbourhood Services Fund (BNSF) to the Maukinhill Area

- Has enabled the group to start working in partnership with public agencies and assisted the group to set the "wheels rolling" in tackling the main issues identified by their community.
- One of the consequence has been of having funding to identify what assistance communities may need i.e. to employ the support of Neighbourhood Development Worker, Admin, Neighbourhood Office. etc.
- Allowed the group time to make investment in the strengthening of their community
- Significant improvements in the situation of the scheme
- i.e. being organised and managing to save a whole community from demolition which would have been "scattered to the wind" as was planned in the Area Renewal Proposals.
- As a further outcome the Tenants and Residents Group are now involved in a Regeneration Programme with Inverclyde Council and Cloch Housing.

The main lesson is that there can be "**no progress unless the community are involved on equal terms and unless the communities own proposals are taken seriously**". Not all the problems in Maukinhill are yet solved. But the community are still there and its organisation is strengthened. Changing the nature of relationships between communities and public agencies was inherent in the Scottish Executive's guidance on BNS. This has proved to be far more challenging than the programme designers every envisaged.

GOVAN

Bailie John Flanagan, Councillor for the Govan Ward.

If you look out the window you will see a vision of old Govan, a peaceful Churchyard dating back to the 4th and 5th Century. In those days there was a very popular local saying in Govan which would not be out of place today “every madman thinks everybody else is mad”. While these observations were first mooted in ancient Roman and Celtic times, the same comments are often made today. Those who question authority or any established public body are quickly ostracised and labelled as mad, crazy, mavericks, loonies, rebels and so on.

Yet we all as citizens have a duty to question what is happening in our society and ensure that communities are allowed a voice and more importantly listened too. In 1836 Govan had a population of around 2,122 and was a rural community. In 1864 it became a Burgh with a population of 9,058. By 1904 the population had swelled to 90,908. Today if you look out the window behind me you will see a boarded up post office, a run down shopping centre that looks so much out of touch with the local infrastructure that it would hardly be granted planning permission if it was being built today.

The same shopping centre was responsible for much of Govan’s destruction. When I was growing up in Govan we were constantly under threat of our tenemental home being demolished. My mother was also saying that there was a new road coming through our building. I first met John Foster when my mother asked him to look over some official papers regarding the proposed demolitions. The planners decided that to sustain the shopping centre it would be necessary for it to have a carpark accessed by a new road. To build the road, there was a need to demolish a large swathe of Govan’s housing stock namely all the tenements between the Langlands Road at Shaw Street to the gates of the shipyard. When I left my primary school that summer there were almost 30 of us in the class, when we started at the secondary in late August there were only 7 of us from central Govan. The planners had scattered our young community to the four winds.

We must not allow the same mistakes to happen again. Our population is again under threat of extinction from industrialisation. We must see the opportunities that surround us and ensure that local residents are given a voice that is listened to and not just humoured. If caring for ordinary people is classed as a form of madness then I hope we all wear that label and support a better community.

A Conservation Plan for Govan

David Robertson and Pat Cassidy, Govan Workspace

There is currently a feeling emerging in Govan that it is set to become the next focus of attention for a number of developers whose work on projects in neighbouring areas is nearing completion. With land in the outlying areas increasingly in short supply, Govan's central location and riverside frontage make it an obvious attraction.

The Govan community is not against change and is keen to welcome new development. Indeed, local people have for long complained that the area has been starved of investment as evident from the large areas of derelict land that scar the Govan landscape.

The planning processes which led to the stagnation of land and property in Govan and destroyed traditional areas in Springburn, Townhead and in the East End are not to this day fully understood but they reflect policies that give planning at a city scale priority at the expense of planning at the local scale. As a result irreparable damage was done to the quality of community life in many of the historic 'urban villages'. Govan suffered and continues to suffer from the impact of planning policies that fail to ensure that the quality of life at the local level is given priority, protected and made the subject of meaningful investment.

So, while the Govan community welcomes change it also wants to be directly involved in that process to ensure any plans that come forward fully respect Govan's traditional character, identity and needs. It is for that reason that, through the auspices of Govan Workspace Ltd - a local economic development agency, the community has already become involved in the preparation of a Conservation Plan. This document will essentially be a statement, based on consultation and research, about what, in the opinion of the community, constitutes the local heritage of Govan, and how that heritage ought to be protected and enhanced through redevelopment that is both compatible and sympathetic.

Historically, ever since annexation by Glasgow in 1912, Govan has experienced frequent tensions with the city authority; recently, those differences have been manifesting themselves again. The city's interest is simple: Govan is strategically placed for industrial and warehouse development and has an important river frontage. The community's case is more complex: Govan is a living community of people; the more industrial development encroaches on living space the less sustainable becomes that community.

Clearly, promoting industrial development and securing sites to build high-value, urban housing are interests that are likely to be in direct competition with those of the existing population, with its requirement for affordable homes, improved security, jobs and local amenities.

If the local population is to protect its legitimate planning interests then it would do well to build a part of its case on the strength of what survives and has value. Govan has a heritage that has a value far beyond the boundaries of Glasgow. If it can be presented properly within the planning system, which is not the case at present, this heritage will serve Govan well. Giving more prominence to Govan's surviving heritage will help to ensure that new development is of an appropriate scale, that it complements the existing older buildings and open spaces and that it spreads investment into the older buildings as well as the new and protects and improves existing residential property and amenities.

Govan stands out among Glasgow's poorer communities because it does have such an exceptional local heritage, and it is surprising the extent to which this is underplayed in local planning documents. This heritage includes sites and artefacts of national importance. For this reason the historic fabric of Govan merits protection. At its core many of the existing buildings make up a significant part of Govan's traditional local identity, in particular the layout of the tenemental streets.

Planning policy is a way of resolving competing interests. By preparing a Conservation Plan for Govan the aim is to bring its important heritage into focus to enable it to be protected, not swept away; and to retain the special identity of the area as an influence on future development.

The first part of the plan involves a description of historical phases and an assessment of their significance; this has been done and is currently subject to consultation.

The second part involves studying the vulnerability of Govan's heritage, which is closely linked to the fragile social and economic condition of its local population; it is a remarkable fact that despite its strategically advantageous location Govan has suffered the severest social and housing problems and a profound decline in its retail sector.

From an analysis of vulnerability, it is intended that policies will be drafted and a plan formulated that might serve as a gold standard in Govan to exert influence on planning at a statutory level. If this is to happen it is essential the Conservation Plan has the broad support of local organisations and groups who have an interest both in conserving Govan's existing identity and heritage, and in securing new development that is of an appropriate type, scale and quality to enhance the quality of life in Govan and the well-being of its community.

Redevelopment and Community Partnership: the experience of Dundee's Whitfield scheme

John McAllion, former MP and MSP for Dundee East

I will be talking about redevelopment and community partnership on the basis of my own experience in the Whitfield scheme in East Dundee, built in the 1960s and where I taught when I first moved to Dundee as a teacher.

Whitfield had a population of 12,000 in the 1970s. There were 5,000 houses, 98.6 per cent of them council owned. They were poorly designed for living in – although they won international design awards. Most were deck-access multi-stories. There were very few cottages and very little in the way of shopping facilities or recreation.

By the 1980s the scheme was in serious trouble, viewed as a sink estate with an unemployment rate of 47 per cent against the Dundee average of 12 per cent. 70 per cent of the households had an income of less than £5,000, vandalism was rife and the population had fallen to 6,000.

At that point, in 1988, it was picked as a pilot scheme for the Conservative administration's New Life in Urban Scotland project – along with four others, Wester Hailes in Edinburgh, Castlemilk and Ferguslie Park. The programme had very big ambitions. Its intention was to bring about 'long-term change' and it involved not just

bricks and mortar but economic and social interventions and was to be based on partnership with the community.

Between 1989 and 1994 £55 million was invested. Much of it was devoted to demolition and rebuilding, landscaping and improving the infrastructure. Crime levels were lowered and by 1994 the social mix had improved. And all was done through partnership - with the community being given ten places on the Partnership Board.

These were the claims made by the government. As MP for the area I had a very different assessment of what had been happening.

If there is to be genuine partnership, it is my understanding that it must be between equals. It cannot be partnership if one side holds the purse strings and is insistent that its own agenda must be followed.

In Whitfield the premise for the whole project was that the new housing would be based on what we would now describe as Housing Stock Transfer, shifting it away from democratic local authority control into the private sector. Dundee City Council went along with this even though it had policy against it. It did so because otherwise the investment would be lost.

As MP for the area I was entirely excluded. I was not on the Board or party to any discussions of policy. I was only allowed to see published minutes after the event. The Tories did not want any challenge to their policy of stock transfer. The local community activists had very little impact. The government had made up its mind that it would be their policies that would be followed. They marketed housing transfer and housing cooperatives as “empowering” tenants even though tenants organisations were opposed.

The long term consequence has been to undermine independent community organisation and produce a sense of loss at every level. All the local businesses collapsed. The shopping centre was never redeveloped. Local people were moved out and no one every bothered to discover where they had gone. These were the poorest of the local families – and other areas in Dundee had to accommodate them without any increase in funding or facilities. And in 1994 the government walked away after just five years.

If there had been a genuine partnership of equals spending that £55 million, it could have been so much better. As similar policies continue today, local communities must make a stand. Making people offers they can't refuse is no way to develop partnership.

Community Participation And Urban Regeneration

Dr Charles Collins, School of Social Sciences, University of Paisley

John McAllion's discussion of the experience of Whitfield under the New Life for Urban Scotland programme will have reminded many of us of the dark days of the late 1980s – when a right wing government with an ideologically driven hostility to municipal housing was promoting stock transfer on the false basis that it would empower tenants; was forcing local authorities to 'buy into' so-called 'regeneration initiatives' about which they had serious reservations; was talking about tackling poverty at the same time as increasing inequality; and was trying to sell the idea that a 'spirit of enterprise' was what was needed to transform the experience of areas of poverty and deprivation.

Unfortunately, as anyone who is even modestly abreast of the current situation will know, this is by and large what still confronts us today. For the fact is that while the New Life for Urban Scotland programme failed to get even remotely close to achieving the kinds of objectives trumpeted for it in 1988, it has been worryingly successful in another respect. It has been crucial in helping to establish what is seen by politicians, civil servants and people working in the various agencies, local government and the voluntary sector as 'the right basis' – indeed *the only* basis – on which to develop work towards 'urban regeneration'.

A new consensus has emerged about 'working in partnership', and in reality this means a lot more than it seems to on the surface. It does not just mean that departments, organizations, agencies and communities should all work together to try to bring about the best possible impact on problems. No-one is, or could be, opposed to that – at least in principle (though when one studies relationships at the highest level of government one wonders about what right the current incumbents have to lecture anyone about 'joined-up government' or 'partnership working').

What it means in practical terms is stock transfer, reducing the role of the public sector, promoting 'flexible labour markets' (meaning temporary, non-union labour on poverty wages), and a wholly unrealistic expectation about what the private sector and the 'spirit of enterprise' is ever likely to contribute. In short, it means continuing with all the same themes and ideas which, since 1988, have failed to deliver on stated regeneration

objectives. Indeed, at this moment we are in the process of constructing yet another generation of partnerships to work to this agenda – the Community Planning Partnerships which have been made statutory by recent legislation from the Scottish Parliament.

Just how significant the history of failure behind all this has been has become more apparent over the past 5 years or so. The New Life programme established ‘partnerships’ in 4 areas – Whitfield, Wester Hailes, Castlemilk and Ferguslie Park. They were to have a 10 year life-span and were to transform the areas as a demonstration of the virtues of the ‘partnership approach’. The final evaluation of their implementation was published in 1999. Unfortunately, New Labour gave a ringing endorsement to the New Life model a year in advance of the evaluation – and so made the ‘partnership approach’ the basis of their social inclusion programme and the SIPs. What the evaluation subsequently showed, when one read beyond the very carefully worded, and somewhat misleading, executive summary, was the extent of the failure of the New Life partnerships.

There was £485 million worth of expenditure in just these 4 areas. This, of course, brought housing and environmental improvements – though at the expense of other areas that were starved of investment to pay for it – but by no means on the comprehensive scale that had been envisaged. Labour market participation fell in two of the four areas, and did not seem to impact on the original populations. Beyond housing, the research could turn up no significant improvements in the quality of life on the estates, and in several respects things seemed to get worse. ‘Partnership working’ amounted to much too little in practice, and local participation on the whole seemed to prove to be a *disempowering* experience for community groups, and was in some areas disastrous. Yet this ‘partnership approach’ was what the SIPs were meant to take forward – and with far less in the way of resources to fund them.

Little wonder then that they seem also to have failed. This is made clear in research that was carried out for Communities Scotland to inform the current move to community planning – and the integration of the SIPs into that framework. The difference is that in this report there is no attempt made to mask the reality of the failure. The twist comes in terms of the blame. There is nothing wrong with the basic ‘partnership’ model, it is claimed. The problem is with the implementers. In future, implementers will have to do better, and will have to be held accountable where they do not. It is time, the report concludes for a “ruthless recognition” of weaknesses in implementation. Of course, where in the New Life programme it was the government themselves who were the lead implementers, now it is local authorities who are to be charged with that responsibility. The irony that we recognise implementation weaknesses at this stage will not be lost on people here today.

Thus the scenario for the coming phase of regeneration policy in Scotland is one that should cause real concern. Local authorities will have a statutory responsibility to lead Community Planning Partnerships which, among other things, will have to ‘close the gap’ between the poorest communities and the rest of the country. They will be obliged to work on the basis of the ‘partnership’ approach that has not worked in the past and is not likely to start working now. They will then be held accountable, and blamed, for it

not working. They will become even more the target for the frustrations and resentments of local community groups. Indeed they will be expected to facilitate their meaningful participation, despite the fact that they are saddled with an approach which has been shown to have led to the exact opposite of that when central government were themselves in the driving seat. It is a situation in which localities can only lose, and in which we are likely to see further centralisation of power in Edinburgh.

It is, in other words, a situation that cries out for change. We have heard this morning a number of suggestions for change in key areas, and in the coming workshops we will have the opportunity to discuss these and make suggestions.

Mike Dailly highlighted the need for change in housing policy. What we have had for the past 25 years has been more of a tenure than a housing policy – and the earlier priority given to concerns about the quantity and quality of affordable housing has been at best secondary to that. We need to think about how housing policy must change if we are to have stable and balanced communities *within* rented housing. What are the implications in terms of rents and housing finance? Who is going to provide this housing? Mike Dailly also pointed to problems in the planning system, and to the need to give much greater priority for planning for such stable and balanced communities. What are the changes that are required here?

But in thinking about housing and planning we also come up against some of the broader assumptions of current government thinking that were mentioned by Mike Danson. For the government's broader economic strategies, as expressed in *Smart Successful Scotland* and the *Framework for Economic Development* that underpins it, seem to presume not just the continuation of housing and planning policy along current lines, but their intensification – more stock transfers to access private capital, a loosening of democratic controls on planning, to say nothing of the continuing emphases on the supply side, flexible labour markets and entrepreneurship that have in the past failed to deliver for areas in need of regeneration. Just how is it that we might conceive a framework for economic development in Scotland that works for local communities seeking regeneration, rather than against them?

And of course John McAllion and myself have talked about some of the specifics and some of the generalities in what is called 'community regeneration' at the moment. Here too there seems to be a clear need for change. This is likely to require that at least some in the local authorities are willing to break away from the 'group think' identified by Baillie Flanagan – according to which anyone who dissents from the prevailing consensus about 'the right' approach is deemed to be a bit mad. What needs to be made clear is that the irrationality in this discussion lies among those who continue to adhere to a model which has been shown to fail over such a protracted period. So, how might community groups develop their own assessment of the failures of the 'partnership' model, and how might they seek to develop an alternative? What would that alternative model look like? How might communities build a coalition which could project that alternative as a serious contender in public debate? In the current context we should be aware that at least some local authorities could be brought into this. The move to

community planning seems to hold real dangers for them, and if they can be made aware of this then perhaps community groups and local authorities might begin to rebuild relations and raise critical questions about the 'partnership' approach to regeneration.

These are just a few of the areas and issues that have arisen today. The proposal is that now we should break into two groups and try to identify the 3 key policy changes that we think are required if we are to bring about meaningful and sustainable improvements in the lives of working class communities in Scotland today. Groups should then feed back their suggestions when we reconvene.

Discussion groups

Responses to question:

What three policy changes should be made to improve community regeneration in the future ?

Responses from Discussion Group 1

In discussion the group identified a number of problems. One was the level of apathy and lack of concern that now existed among many residents. A related need was a broader understanding of political processes and some form of civic education. It was felt that in the past the involvement by young people in apprenticeships and in the trade union movement from an early age gave a sense of responsibility and a framework for understanding. It was now very difficult for non-academic children to secure an apprenticeship despite the strong demand for skilled tradesmen. Another problem was the lack of a strategic approach to housing development and the physical aspects of community regeneration in face of the existence of 73 separate housing associations in Glasgow alone. There was criticism of the Glasgow Housing Association's policy of increasing the rents of shop premises by as much as 60 per cent forcing out remaining shopkeepers and voluntary groups. It was felt that the new legal framework for the regulation of tenants associations was also serving to undermine their independence and thereby leading to their disintegration. Examples were given of housing associations abusing their new powers for the supervision and recognition of tenants associations.

In response to the request to prioritise three key policy changes the group identified:

1. Making local democracy and participation genuine

Partnership at community levels should be based on independent organisations that are directly accountable to their own constituents and a responsible to them for defending their interests. Examples would be tenants and residents associations and community councils. These bodies should not be dependent on, or regulated by, government agencies and certainly not by those agencies involved in community regeneration. Within strategic bodies responsible for community regeneration such community organisations should have a majority of members on the decision making board. In terms of giving communities parity of standing within planning procedures, third party appeals should be permitted and community organisations eligible for legal aid to appeal on cases that are considered to have legal substance..

2. Changing the basis of local authority finance

The boundaries of local authorities should include their suburban commuting areas to ensure that those deriving high incomes from city employment contribute to its tax base. Local taxation should be levied proportionate to income. Such a change in local authority finance is essential

for the rebuilding of public services and providing the staffing levels for community provision and for police staffing levels to ensure safe, sustainable communities.

3. Restoring Housing Finance to its pre-1979 basis

This would entail reducing rents for social housing to the same level compared to average earnings as in 1979 – a measure that would have a very low initial net cost as over 80 per cent of such tenants received housing benefit. It would also restore the right of local authorities to borrow through the Public Works Loans Board to undertake rebuilding programmes. Such changes would end the poverty trap for workless households and also make it feasible for those in employment on relatively low incomes to remain, or become, tenants in social housing and thereby rebuild balanced communities.

4. Reducing poverty through better pensions and better training

- The basic state pension should be restored to the same level relative to average earnings as in 1979
- Training should be available for skilled jobs with the provision of real apprenticeships administered by workplaces that guaranteed health and safety, trade union rights and pensions. The role of the local authority direct labour organisations should be extended.

Responses from Discussion Group 2

The group identified changes that seem to be required at different levels, and which seem to be linked together by central government thinking about economics and finance.

First Policy Change: Housing.

We need to get away from the current focus on tenure change, and get back to a serious focus on the issues of quantity and quality of affordable housing. Local community groups might try to develop their own housing needs assessments for their own areas, and then, in conjunction with other areas, make the case for the required public investment. Rent levels should be a key area for consideration. They need to be at a level where wage earners are not driven out and into owner occupation – for only in this way can we begin to recreate balanced and mixed communities within the rented sector. Private finance is not going to allow for this, and government need to be made to face that argument before current policies create more problems for the future. The position of housing benefit in all of this will have to be considered. At the moment it is not devolved, and this raises dilemmas in the area of housing finance. We need to be able to shift subsidy from housing benefit to individual tenants into investment in sustainable communities.

Second Policy Change: Community Planning Partnerships.

There needs to be a change in terms of the wider basis on which community regeneration policy is conceived. The emphasis on flexible labour markets and supply-side investments has not worked to ‘close the gap’, and a continuing reliance on such measures is unlikely to do so now. Community groups could perhaps try undertake some monitoring and assessment of regeneration partnerships, and this would prove useful in making the case for the need for an alternative approach.

Third Policy Change: Framework for Economic Development.

The first two areas for change raise the wider issue of the basis on which the Scottish economy is supposed to develop, and how that will impact on poverty in local communities. For that framework seems ever more attached to the kinds of economic thinking that have impacted so negatively on local communities in recent decades.

Both groups endorsed the proposal that a rolling programme of conferences be undertaken in the coming year in different localities.

Concluding Responses

Dave Moxham, Assistant General Secretary, Scottish Trades Union Congress

The STUC is the representative body for trade unions in Scotland and as such tends to be organised to intervene centrally – especially in dialogue with the Scottish Executive and government agencies – rather than locally.

It would fully endorse the points made by delegates at the conference on the need for redistributive taxation, the creation of a more equitable tax base for local authorities and measures to increase pensions and the minimum wage. The STUC was also opposed to housing stock transfer and had recently been providing assistance to the campaign against housing stock transfer in Renfrewshire.

The STUC was seeking to raise with the Scottish executive the seriousness of the demographic decline facing Scotland over the next thirty years. There would inevitably be a major reduction in the number of people available to provide services – while at the same time levels of worklessness remained very high. This crisis situation could only be resolved if people were encouraged back to work on their own terms. It would not happen if the jobs available were casualised or part-time. Services needed to be provided on the basis of genuine long-term employment with training, trade union recognition and pensions.

Another current concern of the STUC was with the voluntary sector. This had grown massively in size over the past two decades and many of the employees lacked appropriate pay levels, workplace rights and pensions. Very few were members of trade unions.

The STUC saw the local trades councils, now usually called Trades Union Councils, as important centres for local campaigning. Some were much weaker than they had been thirty years ago but all were involved to some degree or other in issues affecting local communities. It was important that liaison be maintained with tenants associations and community councils. The STUC welcomed events like the conference organised in Govan precisely because it brought together people from across central Scotland and from across different sectors.

Bailie John Flanagan, elected member for Govan Ward

Bailie Flanagan began by recalling the popular mood when the Tories were defeated in 1997. Then people felt that a new start could be made after two decades of policies that gave full license to market forces, penalised working class communities and disarmed the organisations that could defend them such as trade unions and tenants associations.

He was disappointed that eight years later many of the same policies were by and large still in force. Although the mass of ordinary people, including Glasgow City Council, had opposed any attack on Iraq, the government has still gone ahead. Billions of pounds were made available for the continuing war, and even more for other military expenditures, while communities like Govan were starved of resources needed to maintain services and facilities.

Very little change had occurred in terms of job security and rights at work. As an elected member he had to remember all the time that 51 per cent of the people he represented were not in work. These households had to survive on a means tested income that excluded all but bare necessities.

At the same time Govan ward was surrounded, to the north, east and west, by rapid development of new housing almost all of it at prices way beyond the pockets of local people. The planning process appeared to be being almost entirely driven by market forces rather than the needs of the people locally.

John hoped conferences like that held in Govan would start to change the climate of political opinion and bring to the fore the priorities of the majority of people and not a small minority. There was a need to give ordinary men and woman respect and hope, Opportunities for all must be the objective of the future. He believed it was time for the working class communities of Scotland to adopt a Charter that would lay down some basic right and principles around which they could campaign together.

Dick Carabine, Chair of Govan Community Council

As chair of Govan Community Council, Dick thanked all those who had participated in the meeting, both speakers and delegates, as well as those who had contributed to its success organisationally – particularly the staff of the Pearce Institute and all the members of the Community Council who had assisted with the provision of food.

He put it to the meeting that it endorse the proposal made earlier by a number of speakers that this be the first of a rolling series of conferences to be held in turn in other working class communities three or four times a year. This would help create network of organisations with common concerns.

The meeting unanimously endorsed this proposal. Delegates from Partick indicated their willingness to host next conference in Spring 2005.

Dick ended by commenting that Bailie Flanagan's call for a Charter was something to bear in mind for the future – and that the proposals made by the discussion groups might provide a useful starting point.

List of Participants

Dick Carabine	Govan Community Council
John Foster	Govan Community Council
B Cross	Carron Tenants and Residents Association
T Docherty	Govan Initiative
G Cairns	Govan Initiative
Adrian Girling	Oxfam UK Poverty Programme
Helen McNeil	Govan Community council
Betty McEachen	Govan Community Council
Norman Shanks	Govan Old Parish Church
William Bonnar	Govan Housing Association
Esme Clark	Govan Community Council
Jim Whyte	Radnor Park Tenants Association, Clydebank
Kirsteen Paton	Glasgow university
David Moriarty	Glasgow Social Work
Hugh Cameron	Glasgow Social Work
Colin Deans	Pollokshaws Community Council
David Robertson	Govan Workspace
Pat Cassidy	Govan Workspace
Rosie Swords	Govan Workplace
Nick Mason	Communities Scotland
Wilma Bruce	Govan Community Council
Tom McMahon	Govan Youth Information Project
Iain McInnes	Govanhill Community Council
Flora Pagan	Govan Community Council
Robert Carey	Drumoyne Tenants and Residents
Dick McGlave	Greenhead Tenants Association
Tony O'Donoghue	Social Work Services, Ruchill
Kait Laughlin	West Glasgow against Poverty
Deborah Lee	West Glasgow against Poverty
Marie Pearce	BWSF Community Flat, Greenock
Jet Gallacher	BWSF Community Flat, Greenock
George Smith	Govan Community council
John McAllion	Dundee
Mike Danson	Business School, Paisley University
Bailie J Flanagan	Councillor Govan Ward
Mike Dailly	Govan Law Centre
Chik Collins	School of Social Sciences, Paisley University
Gordon Mackay	Money Matters, Govan
Mae Lyall	Erskine
Sarah Cumming	
Mary Kerr	
Dave Moxham	Scottish Trades Union Congress

Thomas Kearns

Kinning Park Community Council