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Background & Emerging Drivers

Historically
- Separate from the town (campus and/or inward-looking)
- Local urban situation not priority
- “Town & Gown” tensions

20/21st Century
- Closer interaction between locality and university
- Closer interaction between business and university
- Greater awareness of the power of local communities
- Greater sensitivity to reputational impacts locally
Some Key Drivers (UK)

- International competition in HE
- Student fee income as the leading revenue stream
- Diminishing State support
- Need to attract high-quality academic staff
- Drive for growth in numbers (+ through merger)
- Matching increases in accommodation/facilities
- Emphasis on staff/student experience and environment
Multiple campuses and faculties across London
White City Opportunity Area

Current Planning Policy Guidance - OAPF Urban Design Objectives*

The following summarises some of the key design objectives outlined by the White City Opportunity Area Plan Framework:

1. CREATING AREAS OF NEW PUBLIC REALM AND OPEN SPACE
   - Seeking provision of a high quality area of public open space, preferably on each side of the Hammersmith and City Line viaduct, to give the area identity and provide a recreational space for shoppers, residents and workers.
   - Providing smaller areas of open space which will enhance local character and distinctiveness and be clearly defined as private or shared amenity space.
   - Integrating existing parks, open spaces and landscaping with new public realm.
   - Providing play areas which reflect diverse needs.
   - Provide ecological corridors to encourage rich biodiversity throughout the area.

2. MAXIMISING CONNECTIVITY
   - Providing new linkages to overcome barriers created by the Westway, A3220, West London Line, the Central Line cutting and Hammersmith and City Line viaduct.
   - Ensuring new developments should be permeable and existing buildings with large impermeable building footprints should provide new links through their sites to provide better connections to surrounding areas.
   - Design new streets with active frontages and to be tree-lined with identified routes that will improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists while reducing congestion.

3. QUALITY URBAN DESIGN THAT RESPONDS TO CONTEXT
   - Provide the majority of buildings at a height of 6-10 storeys in the area to allow for a mix of uses, while also providing some lower rise terraces adjacent to existing neighbourhoods.
   - Taller buildings would be more appropriate along the elevated Westway, where they would act as a point of identification for White City.
   - Build upon the character of the surrounding high quality areas in West London and provide mansion block typologies for residential areas.
   - Improve settings for the distinctive architectural and townscape features of the area including DIMCO, BBC TV Centre, the Westway and the Hammersmith and City line viaduct.
   - New retail should focus on shops within a shopping street typology.
   - Provide a transition in scale of buildings from the town centre, moving north through White City East.
   - Provide a flexible block plan that can accommodate, and be adapted to, a variety of building types, scales, sizes and a variety of amenity spaces.

3.158 The 2013 masterplan reflects progress towards the implementation of the original masterplan.
Imperial West

- Land acquisition opportunity
- Not constrained by policy or commercial structure
- Aims to achieve a commercially sustainable mix
- Expected to incorporate industry beside university
- Part of an “Opportunity Area”
- Supported by GLA and local authority (planning)
Bloomsbury & UCL East
WIDER CONTEXT OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT IN/AROUND QEOP
Context - Olympicopolis
UCL East

• Conclusion of prolonged search for appropriate site(s)
• Subject of central Gov’t and GLA sponsorship
• Some constraints eg. development timing, uses etc.
• Expected to incorporate mostly conventional HE uses
• Part of Olympicopolis, initiated by GLA
Universities and Urban Renewal

- Real Estate strategy (investment; growth etc.)
- Academic mission of the institution
- Sources of funding/investment; conditions attached
- Planning controls
- Neighbouring landowners/developers
- Conditions of local urban environment; priorities
- Strength and organisation of local communities
END
UNIVERSITIES LEADING ON URBAN REGENERATION

Cities are produced through processes of uneven development based on rounds of accumulation, commoditisation, and particular geographies of biased investment and preference that produce unequal processes of urbanisation. This historical process of accumulation and dispossession has to be actively produced – urbanism is an unequal achievement, and in that achievement, the past, present, and future of the city are constantly being brought into being, contested, and rethought (McFarlane 2011:652).

In this set of case studies we present a number of different scenarios for university-led ‘place-based leadership’:

Durham University, which took on a key role in the economic and social regeneration of Teeside back in the early 1990s, with an emphasis on tackling issues around health, poverty, and lack of access to higher education through the development of its Queens Campus site in Stockton.

Newcastle University, which is currently developing new university facilities on the city’s emerging Science Central site in partnership with the city council, in order to stimulate the transition to the knowledge economy, promote sustainability research, and address social inequalities in the local area.

University of Cambridge, which is developing a new urban quarter in the northwest of the city to accommodate its postdoctoral research staff but also to provide community infrastructure for the wider residential area, contribute to the city’s much-needed housing supply, and set new standards of sustainable design.

In case study 4, we compare these scenarios with initiatives launched by three US universities over a similar period – Pennsylvania, New York University and Columbia – to highlight the transatlantic and international context in which universities are developing their spatial expansion strategies, and the corresponding emphasis on participation in wider urban regeneration processes.

And finally in case study 5, we look at an example of local urban regeneration in London – Somerleyton Road – proceeding without the input of a university ‘anchor institution’, with a view to highlighting the similarities and contrasts between development approaches, specifically in terms of the principle of local community participation and benefits, and co-operative working with the local council.

Each case study is divided into four sections:

1. The historical institutional context for the development, the way it has been shaped by national higher education and regeneration policies, and the choice of a site;
2. The institutional and external visions and narratives which have defined and communicated the idea of the project and mobilised a wide base of support for its realisation;
3. The processes and structures put in place to bring the development to fruition, including governance, finance, and partnerships with other urban actors, as well as the tools used to materialise the vision, in particular community engagement and architects’ plans and drawings;
4. The process of translation of visions and aspirations into the reality of local place, through the complex business of local planning systems, construction, and towards a set of hoped-for social, economic and environmental benefits for the wider urban area.

UNIVERSITIES WORKING WITH COMMUNITIES

‘As cities compete for status in a world hierarchy of cosmopolitan urban centres, radically re-making vast tracts of the urban landscape to attract global investment, it is vital to consider what voice under-represented and marginalised local communities have in preserving their identity and right to sustain ordinary dwellings and livelihoods.’ (Campkin, Melhuish, Ross 2014:Heritage and Renewal in Doha, Urban Pamphleteer #4)

Universities are promoted as agents of urban regeneration because they are seen to generate economic activity and produce skilled localised workforces to power the knowledge economy (NESTA 2009, RSA 2014), while offering stability and ‘sticky capital’ (quoting Maurrasse 2001) as anchors for development with a long-term commitment to place and community participation. Furthermore they have access to alternative and diverse sources of funding, from both higher education and urban renewal funds, that can be directed into physical projects with benefits for stakeholders including local business and local communities (Goddard and Vance 2013).

But although universities are increasingly used (by governments) to support austerity projects and neo-liberal agendas through the assumption of political and economic functions, ‘narrow policies aimed at optimizing the economic function of universities’ (Addie et al 2015:34) do not necessarily lead to benefits for less skilled workers and excluded communities in local neighbourhoods.

Most universities are working hard to distance themselves from the imagery of dreaming spires, ivory towers, academic villages, and other utopian scholastic communities with which they identified in the past. Instead, they are using the language of the knowledge or innovation cluster, urban laboratory, trans-local community, non-campus campus, and other terms, to evoke new images and institutional identities that are gradually emerging as new types of built form. These are being packaged as new components of the urban landscape, within precincts, quarters and extensions, to underpin a re-visioning of the university as urban placemaker and agent of regeneration (Addie et al 2015:34).

The plan of a university, like that of a city, should be a mechanism for enabling things to happen, for the enhancement of life (Sir Peter Shephard, Shephard, Epstein Hunter 1980).

Effective communication both within institutions (management, faculty, estates, and public engagement), and between institutions and their internal and external constituents, is essential to build trust, deliver a message about the nature and spirit of the university, and enable universities to contribute to the amelioration of urban problems.
Image from winning competition submission for Olympicopolis, the new cultural quarter in the Olympic Park
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King’s Cross Central</td>
<td>UAL Central St Martins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Legacy</td>
<td>UAL London College of Fashion University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White City</td>
<td>Imperial College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Wharf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant &amp; Castle</td>
<td>UAL London College of Communication South Bank University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich Peninsula</td>
<td>Ravensbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Water</td>
<td>King’s College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Cross Cricklewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.....and associated university projects
UCLAN campus plan: buildings not spaces
Typical campus environment with buildings facing away from street
Original university building with strong relationship to street
Plans from Abercrombie’s: Greater London Plan (1944) showing Shoreditch as existing (left) and as proposed (right) with uses rationalised and zoned.
UNIVERSITIES LEADING ON URBAN REGENERATION

Cities are produced through processes of uneven development based on rounds of accumulation, commodification, and particular geographies of biased investment and preference that produce unequal processes of urbanisation. This historical process of urbanisation and dispossession has to be actively produced – urbanism is an unequal achievement, and in that achievement, the past, present, and future of the city are constantly being brought into being, contested, and rethought’ (McFarlane 2011:652).

In this set of case studies we present a number of different scenarios for university-led ‘place-based leadership’.

**Durham University**, which took on a key role in the economic and social regeneration of Teeside back in the early 1990s, with an emphasis on tackling issues around health, poverty, and lack of access to higher education through the development of its Queens Campus site in Stockton.

**Newcastle University**, which is currently developing new university facilities on the city’s emerging Science Central site in partnership with the city council, in order to stimulate the transition to the knowledge economy, promote sustainability research, and address social inequalities in the local area.

**University of Cambridge**, which is developing a new urban quarter in the northwest of the city to accommodate its postdoctoral research staff but also to provide community infrastructure for the wider residential area, contribute to the city’s much-needed housing supply, and set new standards of sustainable design.

In case study 4, we compare these scenarios with initiatives launched by three US universities over a similar period – Pennsylvania, New York University and Columbia – to highlight the transatlantic and international context in which universities are developing their spatial expansion strategies, and the corresponding emphasis on participation in wider urban regeneration processes.

And finally in case study 5, we look at an example of local urban regeneration in London – Somerleyton Road – proceeding without the input of a university ‘anchoring institution’, with a view to highlighting the similarities and contrasts between development approaches, specifically in terms of the principle of local community participation and benefits, and co-operative working with the local council.

Each case study is divided into four sections:

- Firstly the historical institutional context for the development, the way it has been shaped by national higher education and regeneration policies, and the choice of a site;
- Secondly the institutional and external visions and narratives which have defined and communicated the idea of the project and mobilised a wide base of support for its realisation;
- Thirdly the processes and structures put in place to bring the development to fruition, including governance, finance, and partnerships with other urban actors, as well as the tools used to materialise the vision, in particular community engagement and architects’ plans and drawings;
- Fourthly at the process of translation of visions and aspirations into the reality of local place, through the complex business of local planning systems, construction, and towards a set of hoped-for social, economic and environmental benefits for the wider urban area.
Beyond the red line: How are universities re-imagining cities and urban communities through their spatial development plans?

The University of Northampton Waterside Campus

Sabine Coady Schäbitz
Director Collaborative Centre for the Built Environment
University of Northampton today

Avenue Campus

Park Campus
Plans
Consolidation in one new campus

Park Campus

Avenue Campus

Waterside Campus
Northampton...one of the ‘best-built’ and ‘handsomest’ of English towns”...
Daniel Defoe
Key Drivers

- Competition
- Aspiration
- Opportunity
- Civic Mission
The Institutional and the Physical

- Destination Waterside
- Rethinking Education
- Changemaker Campus
- Pioneering Development
Urban Renewal beyond the Red Line

- Urban Regeneration
- Heart of the Community
- Mixed Development
- Catalyst

Waterside Campus

“Waterside Campus will be a vibrant place reflecting our values of innovation, enterprise, social impact and community – delivering pioneering research and stimulating growth within Northampton and the region”

Nick Petford, VC UoN
Designers as Mediators: Contracted Masterplanners and Architects

Design Principles

- Delapre / Town Centre Link
- Mixed Use Development
- Places and Spaces
- Dispersed Parking
- Routes
- River edge

“A vibrant living and working environment - within a unique river and park setting.”

Avon - Nunn Mills - Ransome Road Framework

Masterplan WNDC Framework
Designers as Mediators: University Town Northampton Project (UTN)
http://www.utn.org.uk/
Space Syntax by Transform Places

Route Quality
Active / Passive / Dead
Avon-Nunn Mills-Ransome Road (ANMR)

Area: 27 ha
Perimeter: 4.4km
0.7km
0.5km

9% built footprint

91% public realm and landscape

moses cameron williams architects
Designers as Mediators: UTN continued

Every town and city should have an “URBAN ROOM”

Wellbeing Park

EXPLORING OUR PAST ...

... AND PLANNING THE FUTURE!!
Thank you for your attention!

Sabine Coady Schäbitz
Director Collaborative Centre for the Built Environment
sabine.coadyschaebitz@northampton.ac.uk
UNIVERSITIES LEADING ON URBAN REGENERATION

‘Cities are produced through processes of uneven development based on rounds of accumulation, commoditisation, and particular geographies of biased investment and preference that produce unequal processes of urbanisation. This historical process of accumulations and dispossession has to be actively produced – urbanism is an unequal achievement, and in that achievement, the past, present, and future of the city are constantly being brought into being, contested, and rethought’ (McFarlane 2011:662).

In this set of case studies we present a number of different scenarios for university-led ‘place-based leadership’:

Durham University, which took on a key role in the economic and social regeneration of Teeside back in the early 1990s, with an emphasis on tackling issues around health, poverty, and lack of access to higher education through the development of its Queens Campus site in Stockton.

Newcastle University, which is currently developing new university facilities on the city’s emerging Science Central site in partnership with the city council, in order to stimulate the transition to the knowledge economy, promote sustainability research, and address social inequalities in the local area

University of Cambridge, which is developing a new urban quarter in the northwest of the city to accommodate its postdoctoral research staff but also to provide community infrastructure for the wider residential area, contribute to the city’s much-needed housing supply, and set new standards of sustainable design.

In case study 4, we compare these scenarios with initiatives launched by three US universities over a similar period – Pennsylvania, New York University and Columbia – to highlight the transatlantic and international context in which universities are developing their spatial expansion strategies, and the corresponding emphasis on participation in wider urban regeneration processes.

And finally in case study 5, we look at an example of local urban regeneration in London – Somerleyton Road – proceeding without the input of a university ‘anchor institution’, with a view to highlighting the similarities and contrasts between development approaches, specifically in terms of the principle of local community participation and benefits, and co-operative working with the local council.

Each case study is divided into four sections:

- **firstly**, the historical institutional context for the development, the way it has been shaped by national higher education and regeneration policies, and the choice of a site;
- **secondly**, the institutional and external visions and narratives which have defined and communicated the idea of the project and mobilised a wide base of support for its realisation;
- **thirdly**, the processes and structures put in place to bring the development to fruition, including governance, finance, and partnerships with other urban actors, as well as the tools used to materialise the vision, in particular community engagement and architects’ plans and drawings;
- **fourthly**, at the process of translation of visions and aspirations into the reality of local place, through the complex business of local planning systems, construction, and towards a set of hoped-for social, economic and environmental benefits for the wider urban area.

UNIVERSITIES WORKING WITH COMMUNITIES

‘As cities compete for status in a world hierarchy of cosmopolitan urban centres, radically re-making vast tracts of the urban landscape to attract global investment, it is vital to consider what voice under-represented and marginalised local communities have in preserving their identity and right to sustain ordinary dwellings and livelihoods.’ (Campkin, Melhuish, Ross 2014:Heritage and Renewal in Doha, Urban Pamphleteer #4)

Universities are promoted as agents of urban regeneration because they are seen to generate economic activity and produce skilled localised workforces to power the knowledge economy (NESTA 2009, RSA 2014), while offering stability and ‘sticky capital’ (quoting Maurrasse 2001) as anchors for development with a long-term commitment to place and community participation. Furthermore they have access to alternative and diverse sources of funding, from both higher education and urban renewal funds, that can be directed into physical projects with benefits for stakeholders including business and local communities (Goddard and Vallance 2013).

But although universities are increasingly used (by governments) to support austerity projects and neo-liberal agendas through the assumption of political and economic functions, ‘narrow policies aimed at optimizing the economic function of universities’ (Addie et al 2015:34) do not necessarily lead to benefits for less skilled workers and excluded communities in local neighbourhoods.

Most universities are working hard to distance themselves from the imagery of dreaming spires, ivory towers, academic villages, and other utopian scholastic communities with which they identified in the past. Instead, they are using the language of the knowledge or innovation cluster, urban laboratory, community-campus, non-campus campus, and other terms, to evoke new images and institutional identities that are gradually emerging as new types of built form. These are being packaged as new components of the urban landscape, within precincts, quarters and extensions, to underpin a re-visioning of the university as urban placemaker and agent of regeneration’

‘The plan of a university, like that of a city, should be a mechanism for enabling things to happen, for the enhancement of life’ (Sir Peter Sheppard, Sheppard Epstein Hunter 1980)

Effective communication both within institutions (management, faculty, estates, and public engagement), and between institutions and their internal and external constituents, is essential to build trust, deliver a message about the nature and spirit of the university, and enable universities to contribute to the amelioration of urban problems.
Corridor Manchester and Urban Knowledge Partnerships

Andrew Karvonen, University of Manchester
Corridor Manchester

Manchester City Council
Manchester Metropolitan University
University of Manchester
Royal Northern College of Music
Bruntwood
Central Manchester University Hospitals
NHS Trust
Manchester Science Parks Ltd
Arup & Partners Ltd
Knowledge Economy

60,000 jobs

70,000 students

20% of city’s economic output

Aim to be a top 5 innovation district in Europe

‘Epicentre of the Northern Powerhouse’
UNIVERSITIES LEADING ON URBAN REGENERATION

‘Cities are produced through processes of uneven development based on rounds of accumulation, commoditisation, and particular geographies of biased investment and preference that produce unequal processes of urbanisation. This historical process of accumulation and dispossession has to be actively produced – urbanism is an unequal achievement, and in that achievement, the past, present, and future of the city are constantly being brought into being, contested, and rethought’ (McFarlane 2011:652)

In this set of case studies we present a number of different scenarios for university-led ‘place-based leadership’:

Durham University, which took on a key role in the economic and social regeneration of Teesside back in the early 1990s, with an emphasis on tackling issues around health, poverty and a lack of access to higher education through the development of its Queen’s Campus site in Stockton.

Newcastle University, which is currently developing new university facilities on the city’s emerging Science Central site in partnership with the city council, in order to stimulate the transition to the knowledge economy, promote sustainability research, and address social inequalities in the local area.

University of Cambridge, which is developing a new urban quarter in the northwest of the city to accommodate its postdoctoral research staff but also to provide community infrastructure for the wider residential area, contributing to the city’s much-needed housing supply, and set new standards of sustainable design.

In case study 4, we compare these scenarios with initiatives launched by three US universities over a similar period – Pennsylvania, New York University and Columbia – to highlight the transatlantic and international context in which universities are developing their spatial expansion strategies, and the corresponding emphasis on participation in wider urban regeneration processes.

And finally in case study 5, we look at an example of local urban regeneration in London – Somerleyton Road – proceeding without the input of a university ‘anchor institution’, with a view to highlighting the similarities and contrasts between development approaches, specifically in terms of the principle of local community participation and benefits, and co-operative working with the local council.

Each case study is divided into four sections: firstly the historical institutional context for the development, the way it has been shaped by national higher education and regeneration policies, and the choice of a site; secondly the institutional and external visions and narratives which have defined and communicated the idea of the project and mobilised a wide base of support for its realisation; thirdly the processes and structures put in place to bring the development to fruition, including governance, finance, and partnerships with other urban actors, as well as the tools used to materialise the vision, in particular community engagement and architects’ plans and drawings; fourthly the process of translation of visions and aspirations into the reality of local place, through the complex business of local planning systems, construction, and towards a set of hoped-for social, economic and environmental benefits for the wider urban area.

UNIVERSITIES WORKING WITH COMMUNITIES

‘As cities compete for status in a world hierarchy of cosmopolitan urban centres, radically re-making vast tracts of the urban landscape to attract global investment, it is vital to consider what voice under-represented and marginalised local communities have in preserving their identity and right to sustain ordinary dwellings and livelihoods.’ (Campkin, Melhuish, Ross 2014:Heritage and Renewal in Doha, Urban Pamphleteer #4)

Universities are promoted as agents of urban regeneration because they are seen to generate economic activity and produce skilled localised workforces to power the knowledge economy (NESTA 2009, RSA 2014), while offering stability and ‘sticky capital’ (quoting Maurice 2001) as anchors for development with a long-term commitment to place and community participation. Furthermore they have access to alternative and diverse sources of funding, from both higher education and urban renewal funds, that can be directed into physical projects with benefits for stakeholders including business and local communities (Goddard and Valsan 2013).

But although universities are increasingly used (by governments) to support austerity projects and neo-liberal agendas through the assumption of political and economic functions, ‘narrow policies aimed at optimizing the economic function of universities’ (Addie et al 2015:34) do not necessarily lead to benefits for less skilled workers and excluded communities in local neighbourhoods.

Most universities are working hard to distance themselves from the imagery of dreaming spires, ivory towers, academical villages, and other utopian scholastic communities with which they identified in the past. Instead, they are using the language of the knowledge or innovation cluster, urban laboratory, community, non-campus campus, and other terms, to evoke new images and institutional identities that are gradually emerging as new types of built form. These are being packaged as new components of the urban landscape, within precincts, quarters and extensions, to underpin a re-visioning of the university as urban placemaker and agent of regeneration.

‘The plan of a university, like that of a city, should be a mechanism for enabling things to happen, for the enhancement of life’ (Sir Peter Sheppard, Sheppard Epstein Hunter 1980)

Effective communication both within institutions (management, faculty, estates, and public engagement), and between institutions and their internal and external constituents, is essential to build trust, deliver a message about the nature and spirit of the university, and enable universities to contribute to the amelioration of urban problems.
Beyond the red line

How can universities most effectively communicate their visions for development, and forge successful partnerships with urban stakeholders and communities to realise wider social benefits and develop models for inclusive urbanism that prioritise local needs in conjunction with global reach?

Stephanie Glendinning
Prof Civil Engineering
Newcastle University

CASE STUDY

NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY
AT SCIENCE CENTRAL
A ‘living laboratory’ for sustainability in the city centre
Building type massing and quantum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>16,800 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>81,950 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (inc. student housing)</td>
<td>38,310 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>5,900 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Use</td>
<td>4,200 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2,000 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>4,550 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Centre</td>
<td>3,600 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Storey Car Park</td>
<td>17,400 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>174,710 sqm</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vision

Digitally enabled urban sustainability
Science Central
Urban Sciences Building
The Key
Flooding issues in town!

There are two clear flow pathways across site

Solution: Green space for conveyance across the site. A space to be proud of. Both storing and delaying flood flow. And a research facility.
NEWCASTLE AS A FUTURE

Smart city

Northumberland Street

NCL ENERGY
local power generation + storage
Solar panels

Storage
off-shore wind farms
building-mounted wind turbines

Combined heat + power distributed between industry and homes.
Newcastle Science City is a long-term committed partnership between Newcastle University and Newcastle City Council. This partnership is delivering Newcastle Science Central, one of the largest developments of its kind in the UK, designed to support a thriving new community, rewarding jobs and ground-breaking scientific advances.

You will automatically be redirected to the Newcastle Science Central website in 20 seconds. If this does not happen, then please click here.

A partnership between:

Newcastle University

Newcastle City Council
Key Industry Partners

Strategic Industry Site Partners:

- Siemens - now Global Gold
- Northern Powergrid
- Northumbrian Water
- BT
- Arup
- Northern Gas Networks
Decision Theatre

Collaborative decision making process

Visualisations of research outputs
Integrated research programme – methodology

- INFORMATION MANAGEMENT
- EXPERIMENTATION URBAN MODELLING AND ANALYSIS
- DECISION PROCESSES
  - Participative option generation
  - Evidence-based options appraisal
- SUSTAINABLE URBAN DEMONSTRATORS
  - Sustainable technologies
  - Economic, social and political policies
- MULTI-SCALE URBAN MONITORING
- THE URBAN SYSTEM
  - Co-evolutionary human, engineering and natural systems
Newcastle 'greenest' British city

Newcastle upon Tyne has been named as Britain’s greenest city in a think tank’s annual study.

Forum for the Future looked at the sustainability of the 20 biggest cities, measuring factors such as air quality, wildlife and quality of life.

As well as greenest city, Newcastle was the overall most sustainable, beating 2008 winner Bristol into second.
UNIVERSITIES LEADING ON URBAN REGENERATION

‘Cities are produced through processes of uneven development based on rounds of accumulation, commodification, and particular geographies of biased investment and preference that produce unequal processes of urbanisation. This historical process of accumulation and dispossession has to be actively produced – urbanism is an unequal achievement, and in that achievement, the past, present, and future of the city are constantly being brought into being, contested, and rethought’ (McFarlane 2011:652).

In this set of case studies we present a number of different scenarios for university-led ‘place-based leadership’.

Durham University, which took on a key role in the economic and social regeneration of Teeside back in the early 1990s, with an emphasis on tackling issues around health, poverty, and lack of access to higher education through the development of its Queens Campus site in Stockton.

Newcastle University, which is currently developing new university facilities on the city’s emerging Science Central site in partnership with the city council, in order to stimulate the transition to the knowledge economy, promote sustainability research, and address social inequalities in the local area.

University of Cambridge, which is developing a new urban quarter in the northwest of the city to accommodate its postdoctoral research staff but also to provide community infrastructure for the wider residential area, contribute to the city’s much-needed housing supply, and set new standards of sustainable design.

And finally in case study 5, we look at an example of local urban regeneration in London – Somerleyton Road – proceeding without the input of a university ‘anchor institution’, with a view to highlighting the similarities and contrasts between development approaches, specifically in terms of the principle of local community participation and benefits, and co-operative working with the local council.

Each case study is divided into four sections:

**firstly** the historical institutional context for the development, the way it has been shaped by national higher education and regeneration policies, and the choice of a site; secondly the institutional and external visions and narratives which have defined and communicated the idea of the project and mobilised a wide base of support for its realisation; thirdly the processes and structures put in place to bring the development to fruition, including governance, finance, and partnerships with other urban actors, as well as the tools used to materialise the vision, in particular community engagement and architects’ plans and drawings; fourthly at the process of translation of visions and aspirations into the reality of local place, through the complex business of local planning systems, construction, and towards a set of hoped-for social, economic and environmental benefits for the wider urban area.

UNIVERSITIES WORKING WITH COMMUNITIES

‘As cities compete for status in a world hierarchy of cosmopolitan urban centres, radically re-making vast tracts of the urban landscape to attract global investment, it is vital to consider what voice under-represented and marginalised local communities have in preserving their identity and right to sustain ordinary dwellings and livelihoods.’ (Campkin, Melhuish, Ross 2014:Heritage and Renewal in Doha, Urban Pamphleteer #4)

Universities are promoted as agents of urban regeneration because they are seen to generate economic activity and produce skilled localised workforces to power the knowledge economy (NESTA 2009, RSA 2014), while offering stability and ‘sticky capital’ (quoting Maurrasse 2001) as anchors for development with a long-term commitment to place and community participation. Furthermore they have access to alternative and diverse sources of funding, from both higher education and urban renewal funds, that can be directed into physical projects with benefits for stakeholders including local business and local communities (Goddard and Vance 2013).

But although universities are increasingly used (by governments) to support austerity projects and neo-liberal agendas through the assumption of political and economic functions, ‘narrow policies aimed at optimizing the economic function of universities’ (Addie et al 2015:34) do not necessarily lead to benefits for less skilled workers and excluded communities in local neighbourhoods.

Most universities are working hard to distance themselves from the imagery of dreaming spires, ivory towers, academical villages, and other utopian scholastic communities with which they identified in the past. Instead, they are using the language of the knowledge or innovation cluster, urban laboratory, community university, non-campus campus, and other terms, to evoke new images and institutional identities that are gradually emerging as new types of built form. These are being packaged as new components of the urban landscape, within precincts, quarters and extensions, to underpin a re-visioning of the university as urban placemaker and agent of regeneration.

‘The plan of a university, like that of a city, should be a “ Cities are produced through processes of uneven development based on rounds of accumulation, commodification, and particular geographies of biased investment and preference that produce unequal processes of urbanisation. This historical process of accumulation and dispossession has to be actively produced – urbanism is an unequal achievement, and in that achievement, the past, present, and future of the city are constantly being brought into being, contested, and rethought’ (McFarlane 2011:652).

In this set of case studies we present a number of different scenarios for university-led ‘place-based leadership’:

Durham University, which took on a key role in the economic and social regeneration of Teeside back in the early 1990s, with an emphasis on tackling issues around health, poverty, and lack of access to higher education through the development of its Queens Campus site in Stockton.

Newcastle University, which is currently developing new university facilities on the city’s emerging Science Central site in partnership with the city council, in order to stimulate the transition to the knowledge economy, promote sustainability research, and address social inequalities in the local area.

University of Cambridge, which is developing a new urban quarter in the northwest of the city to accommodate its postdoctoral research staff but also to provide community infrastructure for the wider residential area, contribute to the city’s much-needed housing supply, and set new standards of sustainable design.

In case study 4, we compare these scenarios with initiatives launched by three US universities over a similar period – Pennsylvania, New York University and Columbia – to highlight the transatlantic and international context in which universities are developing their spatial expansion strategies, and the corresponding emphasis on participation in wider urban regeneration processes.

And finally in case study 5, we look at an example of local urban regeneration in London – Somerleyton Road – proceeding without the input of a university ‘anchor institution’, with a view to highlighting the similarities and contrasts between development approaches, specifically in terms of the principle of local community participation and benefits, and co-operative working with the local council.

Each case study is divided into four sections:

**firstly** the historical institutional context for the development, the way it has been shaped by national higher education and regeneration policies, and the choice of a site; secondly the institutional and external visions and narratives which have defined and communicated the idea of the project and mobilised a wide base of support for its realisation; thirdly the processes and structures put in place to bring the development to fruition, including governance, finance, and partnerships with other urban actors, as well as the tools used to materialise the vision, in particular community engagement and architects’ plans and drawings; fourthly at the process of translation of visions and aspirations into the reality of local place, through the complex business of local planning systems, construction, and towards a set of hoped-for social, economic and environmental benefits for the wider urban area.
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What is Brixton Green?

Brixton Green was set-up to ensure local people were at the forefront of the redevelopment of Somerleyton Road, Brixton, South London.

• Set up in 2008 by local residents

• Non-profit community benefit society (registered with the FCA)

• In November 2013, after 5 years of lobbying, we convinced Lambeth Council to develop the site in partnership with the community
Owned by Brixton people

Anyone over 16 years old who lives or works in one of the five wards of Brixton can become a member of Brixton Green (community benefit society) by buying a £1 share.

One share per person. One vote per person. Over 1,200 local people have become members.
Owned by Brixton people

• Democratic & inclusive
  • We set up as a community benefit society to ensure a proper, inclusive, democratic structure was in place.

• Non-profit & voluntary
  • Brixton Green has no paid staff. Our director and trustees give their time to the project on a voluntary basis.

• Board elected from the community
  • Only members can be elected to the board. The board can chose to co-opt a few trustees who have useful skills.
Proposals shaped by Brixton people

• Extensive engagement activity: Over 60,000 leaflets, many thousands of discussions, many events, workshops, and presentations.
Why Somerleyton Road?
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Developed in partnership with the community

- Lambeth have set up a Steering Group with Brixton Green and the Ovalhouse Theatre.
- Lambeth Council is funding the project.
- Lambeth have employed a development manager to provide their development experience, but receive a fee not a share of the profit.
Shaped by Brixton people

- **Jobs:** The scheme includes real job opportunities for local people
- **Pay its own way over its lifetime.** Will not be a cost to Lambeth taxpayers
- **No 'poor doors'.** Mixed income. Pepper potting.
- **304 new homes all for rent.**
- **40% of the homes will have genuine low cost rents.** 50% Affordable Homes.
- **High level of environmental sustainability**
- **Designed to make it easier for people to look after each other.**
3. Project Update

Block F
Metropolitan Workshop
42 New Homes and Retail Space

Block E
Haworth Tompkins Architects
71 New Homes, Community Centre, Nursery and Children's Centre

Block D
Max Architects
65 Extra Care Homes & Communal Facilities

Block C
Metropolitan Workshop
125 New Homes, Chry's School (Preferred Use)

Block A
Cartron Mansions
Zac Monte Architects
Orchid House Creative Workspace

Block B
Foster Wilson Architects
Orchid House Theatre and Creative Workspace

Public Realm & Landscape
Metropolitan Workshop & Gross Max.
4 New Open Spaces
Improvements to Somerleyton Passage Landscaping along Somerleyton Road
What will it look like?
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Ambition: For the final development to be leased to a new community trust

• Good quality, publicly accountable long term management

• Deliver the objectives set out by the community.

• Board of the new trust will be elected from the:
  • Residents
  • Wider community
  • Non-residential occupiers
  • Staff
  • Lambeth Council
Draft objectives

• to encourage the growth of a localised inclusive economy that enables Brixton based people of all incomes to benefit from the success of their community;

• to provide and support homes, training and employment at the Site and arising from the Site to improve the quality of life for people in Brixton;

• to support social cohesion and promote the rich cultural diversity and heritage of Brixton.

• to embed cooperative and mutual principles in all its functions, as a community-led enterprise, reflecting the aspirations for cooperation of residents, occupiers and neighbours;

• to be open, transparent, inclusive and responsive;

• to provide excellent quality management and maintenance, in particular to prudently manage the accommodation to the required standard;
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