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ABSTRACT

The thesis explores the emergence, decline, and regeneration of council housing in the United Kingdom, and specifically London. It presents a conception of housing as a commodity derived from Arjun Appadurai’s *The Social Life of Things*, suggesting that commodities possess “a particular type of social potential”, a value realised only in their use or consumption. Housing understood in these terms provides an essential utilitarian and social function as a means of shelter, the domain of human association and its reproduction.

Recognising a need for consistent, sanitary, and fairly priced housing, the 1890 Housing of the Working Classes Act established the role of the state in maintaining quality standards of living as a right. Council housing, housing built and maintained by local authorities directly mobilised the social potential of housing as a commodity. Within a restricted commodity context, its value was realised through its consumption – a domestic use-value realised through rent.

The strategic removal of council housing from this restricted commodity context was promoted as a progressive redistributive policy under Thatcher as “the Right to Buy”. Through the diversification of tenure, it has enabled the transfer of housing capital from local authorities to stable council tenants, establishing a “property-owning democracy” while reducing council housing stock and the presence of the welfare state. Since 1980, the right to buy and subsequent housing reforms have promoted a political and ideological disinvestment from council housing, intensifying the process of its social, and economic devalorization.

The thesis examines the regeneration of council housing as the product of two parallel processes each manipulating the ground rent or land value of a given site. In this way, the gentrification of council housing is directly initiated by local and regional authorities. Though maintaining a rhetoric of social improvement, the neoliberal strategies promoted by such practices instead intensify the social exclusion and deprivation it alleges to address. The gentrification and demolition of council housing concludes a broader historical narrative describing its slow deliberate privatisation, and diminishing value ascribed to the state provision of housing, since its peak in the 1970s.

Appropriating the new ruins of the welfare state as sites of agonistic potential within the city, the project demands a theoretical re-foundation, and critical recuperation of the social and ideological objectives of council housing. Mobilising the latent social potential of housing as a commodity it describes a projective model of development separating financial form and social function. The project pursues the financialization of property under neoliberalism to its most illogical extremes, abstracting housing from the financial armatures that enable investment in the built environment. Specifically, it proposes the development of high quality, permanently *affordable* housing realised through the exploitation of speculative property investment.
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0.0

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

I first moved to London in February 2010 taking up residence off Walworth Road a few minutes south of the Heygate Estate. The Estate was designed in late 1960s by Tim Tinker for the Southwark Council Architects’ Department and completed in 1974.

Tinker’s design arranged five long slab blocks between eight to twelve storeys around the site’s perimeter to enclose eleven blocks of four-storey maisonettes and communal gardens. Based on the principals of the Athens Charter the design separated vehicular and pedestrian traffic; buildings were accessed from a network of elevated walkways, while the ground plane was devoted to parking, play areas and communal gardens.

In 2007 Australian developer Lend Lease was selected by Southwark Council as the “regeneration partner” for the redevelopment of the Elephant and Castle and Heygate Estate. The process of “decanting” more than 3000 council tenants and leaseholders from the Heygate began the same year, and by October 2008 the estate was more than half emptied. By March of 2010 only 20 of the 1,107 flats remained occupied. The final tenant of the Heygate Estate was evicted in November 2013, and the buildings demolished shortly before the beginning of 2015.¹

When redevelopment is completed in 2025, only 74 of the approximately 2470 units will be available for social rent, and a 180 available for “affordable rent” - between 50-80% of market value. In June 2015, one bedroom flats in second phase of the development were listed from £563,000 and two bedroom flats started at £720,000. To put that in context, the maximum obtainable mortgage on an estimated median household income of £37,000 in Southwark, is £148,000.²

While the Heygate Estate is perhaps the most publicised and well documented example, across London numerous council housing estates are facing imminent demolition as the result of “regeneration”.³ Their demolition concludes a broader historical narrative describing the death of council housing in the United Kingdom, or more specifically its slow, incremental privatisation.


03. Figures from the Greater London Authority documenting regeneration schemes with current planning permission estimate a net loss of 7,326 social rented units.
The thesis is structured in three parts: the first, A Social History of Housing attempts to understand a conception of housing as a commodity and argues that its social potential, or social use-value can only be realised within a restricted commodity context. It details history of council housing in the UK, from its establishment through its decline and eventual diversion from its restricted commodity context.

The second part, New Ruins, examines the regeneration of council housing as the result of its social, political and economic devalorization. It describes the role of the image and rhetoric of the skin estate in the current practice of regeneration, and examines the economics of the gentrification of council housing.

The third part of thesis is a design proposal for the redevelopment of the Heygate Estate proposing the separation of housing from the financial implications inherent to its neoliberal conception as a commodity.
1.0

A SOCIAL HISTORY OF HOUSING
HOUSING AS A COMMODITY

The thesis describes a conception of housing as commodity derived from social-cultural anthropologist Arjun Appadurai’s “The Social Life of Things”. Appadurai suggests that commodities possess “a particular type of social potential”. And amending Marx’s definition, a commodity is thus a product intended for exchange, produced not solely for its intended personal use-value but a use-value for others — a social use-value or social potential. For Marx, use-value describes the utility of a thing for human life, a value released only in its use or consumption. Housing, understood in these terms provides an essential utilitarian and social function as a means of shelter, the domain of human association, and its reproduction. Beyond the symbolic understanding of the domestic realm, housing as a commodity describes the social potential of housing mediated through politics. Abstracted from a domestic use-value, housing is broadly understood in terms of “real estate” or property. While this designation describes an exchange-value, and facility to function as a commodity in an economic sense, it deceives an inherent, critical social potential of housing as commodity.

Citing sociologist Georg Simmel, Appadurai supports a notion that value is ascribed through economic exchange. If the demand for exchange—real or speculative—describes our mutual social and economic valuation of a commodity, the association between exchange and value, he argues, “is politics, constructed broadly.”

Appadurai proposes the term “commodity situation” to define the condition wherein the exchangeability of a thing emerges as its primary, socially relevant feature. He further disaggregates the term to define “commodity phase”, “commodity candidacy”, and “commodity context” three concepts crucial to understanding the social life and trajectory of a given thing. Commodity phase describes things “moving in or out of the commodity state”; commodity candidacy describes the criteria “that define the exchangeability of things”; and commodity context describes the “social arenas” that enable a candidate thing to move into a commodity phase. Commoditisation thus occurs at the “complex intersection of temporal, cultural and social factors.” Here, the word “commodity” is used to identify those things in society at a phase in their trajectory, and in a particular context, that satisfy the conditions of commodity candidacy.
From a temporal perspective, the movement of things as they transition in and out a commodity state, illustrate what Appadurai describes as "paths and diversions". At such points things reveal the common social and political agreements understood as commodity candidacy and commodity context – here the effects of politics are most visible. Paths describe patterns of commodity circulation from a social context responsible for our mutual construction of value. This does not remain fixed through the social life of a given thing, but is subject to constant negotiation and political redefinition - a process most discernible where new paths are established by means of diversion. When strategically engaged through politics – both individual and institutional – diversions mediate value by introducing or removing objects from relevant social commodity contexts.
FREEHOLD, LEASEHOLD & RENT

To adequately understand the strategic implications of diversions it’s necessary to first identify the culturally conventionalised paths that describe our perceptions of housing as a commodity. These paths are illustrated through the social history of housing, its circulation and consumption, and originate from the politics of property and ownership. The historic development of London, was predominantly governed by feudal property rights promoting the speculative construction of housing under a system of leaseholds. As a model of ownership, the 99 year lease catalysed the development of the city while directly, and intentionally inscribing in its urban form the class system inherent to the ownership of property.

The commodification of property under capitalism is extended through rent. As indicated by Harvey, all rent is based on the principals of ownership and private property. In a classical economic sense, it is income received by landlords as owners of property, and arises from the potential of realising an increased income over an extended period “by virtue of this exclusive control over some directly or indirectly tradable item”. The direct or indirect nature of exchange identifies a necessary distinction between freehold and leasehold when describing housing as a commodity. Freehold, defines the “permanent and absolute tenure of land or property” and is both directly and indirectly exchanged as a commodity. Freehold property is indirectly exchanged through leaseholds, enabling ownership via the right to property over a given duration. It is thus not the property itself which is exchanged but the commodity produced through its use.

More commonly, rent is used to describe household rent, fixed term or periodic tenancy. While property remains the underlying commodity which is indirectly exchanged it removes the dimension of ownership enabled through leaseholds. Instead, where a landlord produces a service on land, the functions of production and ownership are combined, and a site’s capitalised ground rent is appropriated through the rent paid by tenants. Where precluded from the ownership of property, the working class is instead dependant on the consumption of housing as a commodity enabled through rent. In the context of Appadurai’s definition of a commodity, rent therefore emphasises the social potential of housing as a commodity by directly mobilising use-value through its consumption.

Fig 01  Red Lion Square, 1800.
Fig 02 Gustave Doré, Dudley Street, Seven Dials, 1872. Depicting a Victorian slum in the City of Westminster.
The section that follows is intended to illustrate the paths and diversions that have defined a collective perception of housing as commodity. Critically observed, the social history of housing – specifically that of working class housing in the United Kingdom – reveals a complex trajectory defined through politics, from which we describe its social potential, or agency.

The basis of the welfare state emerged in the nineteenth century in response to a period of rapid urbanisation, development and intense population growth induced by the industrial revolution. This radically altered social, cultural, economic, and political life in a shift which “destabilised the traditional forms of welfare provided by family networks, charity organisations, feudal ties, guilds, municipalities and religious institutions.” In response to widespread poverty and a growing Labour Movement it became necessary for the development of institutional initiatives at the local, regional and national levels addressing the “social question” and demand for a redistribution of resources exploited through industrial capitalism.

Amid rising protest against the inadequate living conditions prevalent amongst the urban poor, a Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes was established in 1884. As a result, the Housing of the Working Classes Act was introduced to House of Lords in 1885 where it met criticism by the Liberty and Property Defence League as "strangling the spirit of independence and the self-reliance of the people, and destroying the moral fibre of our race in the anaconda coils of state socialism".

It was not however until the creation of the London County Council (LCC) in 1889 that previous working class housing legislations were consolidated in the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890. The act extended provisions for the construction of working class housing by local authorities, and formalised the role of government in the maintenance of quality standards of living as a right.
By 1893 pressures on the LCC’s Works and Improvement branch to produce designs for the Public Health and Housing Committee were such that superintending architect, Thomas Blashill would recommend the designation of an independent Housing of the Working Class Branch to oversee the design and construction of new council housing.\\(^7\)

The first council estate, the Boundary Estate, was built on the site of the Old Nichol slums, between Shoreditch and Bethnal Green in East London. To confront the association between poor living conditions, social immobility, and early mortality, the London County Council recognised the need for consistent, sanitary, and fairly priced housing.\\(^8\) Housing, built and maintained by local authorities, exemplifies a critical diversion from the paths characterising the consumption of housing as a commodity through private rent. Within this restricted commodity context council housing operates as a “terminal commodity”, that is a commodity intended for consumption by the working class, and restricted from entering a commodity state.\\(^9\) Precluded from exchange, value becomes a complex product of consumption – a domestic use-value realised through rent – thus emphasising the social potential of housing as a commodity.

17. Ibid, 15
Fig 03  Arnold Circus Looking West, Boundary Estate, 1907.
Fig 04  Boundary Street Scheme, 1900.
Fig 05 Manor Estate Housing Scheme, Sheffield 1919.
Fig 06 Construction of the Manor Estate, Sheffield 1927.
The inter-war years would witness the construction of state built housing at a national scale. Under the Housing and Town Planning Act of 1919, or “Addison Act”, after Minister of Health Dr. Christopher Addison, local authorities were now required to assess need and carry out plans for the provision of homes to meet working class demand. The Act had been conceived in the belief that, unless working class aspirations were quickly met postwar, Britain might be faced with a revolution, similar to that in Russia. 

Not only could revolution be averted through the provision of a decent lifestyle for working men and their families, but council housing was seen as an investment: a national asset. 

On a national level it was architecture deployed as a social palliative, in effect, a pragmatic state socialism. It did little to ameliorate a prominent social inequality, but proposed progressive spatial ideals under the Tudor Walter Standards, furnishing the working class in cottage estates – an inclination to the socialist ideals of Ebenezer Howard’s Garden City. The spatial legacy of interwar housing, however noble its intentions towards improving the individual living conditions, had consequential negative implications on its communities. The process of slum clearance and rehousing very often fragmented complex community associations of high-density inner city living. Families were regularly displaced numerous times throughout redevelopment before finally being rehoused in comparatively isolated areas of the city. Intentionally, or not, the geographic isolation and atomisation of populations proved an effective counter-revolutionary practice.
The onset of the Second World War catalysed the need for an expanded role of social welfare at a national level. The 1942 Social Insurance and Allied Services Report or Beveridge Report after its author Sir William Beveridge, established a model of welfare provision and social support addressing what Beveridge termed the “five giants” confronting social inequality and poverty: want, ignorance, disease, idleness and squalor. It proposed a system of social security extending “from cradle to grave”, administered by the state, to be implemented at war’s end. The progressive report insisted that war provided the opportunity to make good – a British revolution.22

Now, when the war is abolishing landmarks of every kind, is the opportunity for using experience in a clear field. A revolutionary moment in the world’s history is a time for revolutions, not for patching.23

Beveridge argued that social progress could only be achieved through coherent government policy. The report, implemented in 1945 established the social and political motive of what would become known as the Welfare State. Following the 1945 General Election victory, the Labour Party began implementation of its manifesto commitments to introduce a programme of extensive social reforms as outlined in the Beveridge Report. Aneurin Bevan was appointed Minister of Health, an assignment that included Housing, and therefore the responsibility of instituting the postwar reconstruction.24

23. Ibid.
Fig 07 Sir William Beveridge, 1944.
Fig 08 Watercolour image depicting blocks of 10 floor flats, County of London Plan 1943.
The bitter destruction of the war had presented the opportunity to build social equality into the fabric of the nation. To avert the failures of the interwar housing, planner Thomas Sharp warned against the segregation of the working classes in mono-tenure estates. To establish a classless society in which all inhabitants would share an equal sense of pride in their home, postwar development instead advocated for class diversity, promoting social mobility and cohesion on which the success of the welfare state relied.\textsuperscript{25} For architects and advocates of a “new architecture” the postwar political context was ideal. The 1945 General Election had put into office the Labour politicians “who had been the strongest protagonists of planning within LCC.”\textsuperscript{26} However, faced with an austere housing shortage, wartime ideals promoting new standards of housing and planning were set aside, instead favouring a return to interwar models in an attempt to meet ambitious construction targets.\textsuperscript{27} Nationally, the harsh realities of postwar material shortages, and allocations towards the war-damage repair program caused major deficits in the housing program. The slow materialisation of Labour’s “New Jerusalem” would contribute to a Conservative victory in the 1951 General Election, promising to end the perception of incipient crisis.\textsuperscript{28}
In the shift towards Conservative pragmatism, housing became a means through which to maintain a stable postwar social democratic consensus. Under founding minister, Harold Macmillan, housing was isolated from the Ministry of Health to form the Ministry of Housing and Local Government, and given priority with a commitment to postwar reconstruction. Aided by a recovering economy, and unencumbered by material shortages, Macmillan encouraged the resurgence of private sector construction towards achieving ambitious government housing targets.

At a national scale council housing was deployed as a palliative response to the immediate question of crisis. This differed from the postwar optimism of Aneurin Bevan, for whom the political agency of housing resided in its potential to encourage social transformation and equality. Under Macmillan, housing was extended as a product to be consumed by the welfare state – an expedient towards achieving a Conservative “property-owning democracy”. It was no longer treated as a national asset – an investment in the collective wealth of the nation – but a pragmatic, temporary solution towards eventual individual legacy.

The “tower block” emerged as a response to housing need and technological innovation; prefabricated building systems were to play an important role in the construction of the Welfare State. The Ministry of Housing and Local Government allocated subsidies towards Local Housing authorities, paid out per dwelling and promoting height. In the late fifties this would encourage construction density, and the tower block emerged as the prevalent typology during the period of increased housing output as the topic of reconstruction shifted to one of the modernisation, replacement and the clearance of slums.

For general population, system built housing would come to represent “modern architecture” and everything that was wrong with it. Public investment, “conceived to narrow the gap between rich and poor, eventually served to create a firm and visible wall between them.” Tower blocks, while visible signs of progress in the image of a new society, ultimately failed to establish long term social equality, and diverse communities sharing an equal sense of pride in their home. Instead council housing became a foundation from which to promote upward social mobility. In a way the provision of council housing did succeed in building a new society, but at the expense of those left behind.
Fig 09 Brandon Estate, Ted Hollamby & LCC Architects' Department 1960.
Fig 10  Margaret Thatcher pictured holding a copy of the 1979 Conservative Manifesto.
With increased postwar production and the availability of affordable council housing, by the early 1970s income inequality and household debt had reached historic lows. Steady capital gains through the 1960s had promoted homeownership as the preferable tenure amongst the newly affluent masses, and liberal lending by banks would eventually contribute towards a 1973 property market collapse wiping 73% of the value from the London Stock Exchange and thrusting the British Economy into recession. In attempted readjusts property prices fixed rents were eliminated – a measure which ultimately uncoupled the previously interrelated factors of house prices, wage growth, and household debt. 33

The foundations of the neoliberal project emerged in response to the economic crisis of the 1970s, having destabilised the postwar social democratic consensus. By 1975 household borrowing had increased to the extent that it had effectively replaced wage growth – which had stalled under the compounded effects of the 1974 Oil Shock, globalisation and the deindustrialization of the British economy. This established the basis for an economic model financed by credit and bound to household equity and therefore private property. 34
“The Right to Buy” was introduced under Thatcher in 1980, the policy would benefit millions of stable council tenants, enabling them to buy their homes from local authorities at a significant discount. As a political act, “Right to Buy” marks a collective shift in the perceived value of housing as a commodity. We can consider this to have originated with Macmillan under whom the provision of housing became an expedient towards achieving a conservative property owning democracy. While Macmillan understood council housing as a pragmatic step towards acquiring an individual legacy, the right to buy instead mobilised council housing to create a property owning democracy.

The enclaved nature of council housing made it an attractive target for diversion and the “interested” removal from a restricted commodity context “to one where exchange is less confined, and more profitable in some short-term sense.” 35 It enabled the mass transfer of capital from the national housing asset, and the collective wealth of the nation to individual homeowners, simultaneously establishing the property-owning democracy as envisioned by Macmillan while reducing council housing stock and the presence of the welfare state. Notably the policy would also prohibit councils from reinvesting revenues from the sale of council housing in maintenance of existing stock or construction of new housing. The strategic removal of council housing from a restricted commodity context, was promoted as a progressive redistributive policy under Thatcher. It redefined a perception of council housing extending a neoliberal financialisation of housing as commodity to a property-owning democracy.

Fig 11 The King family of Milton Keynes receive the deeds to their council house from Margaret Thatcher in 1979.
Fig 12  Mix-Adjusted House Price Index, UK, 1980 - 2013
Housing and the built environment are fundamental to a process of aggressive wealth redistribution inherent to neoliberal economics. This considers the free market as the best, most efficient means of allocating social resources and has enabled the redistribution of wealth from public sources, institutions and society at large to a class of economic and political elite. At an individual level this process is enabled through the logic of credit, or conversely debt, a relationship that begins to define a neoliberal conception of housing as a commodity.

In the pursuit of capital accumulation neoliberal strategies neither promote or sustain stable long term growth, but rely on the infinite capital gains of property markets to further the extension of credit. Accumulation-centric politics promoting the real or speculative exchange of housing as a commodity demand that it exists within a continuous “commodity situation”, a condition described by Appadurai wherein the exchangeability of a thing is its primary, socially relevant feature. In this context, housing as a commodity is abstracted from a domestic use-value and broadly understood in terms of real estate or property. This designation describes its facility for exchange, but deceives a critical social potential of housing as a commodity mobilised though its consumption.
2.0

NEW RUINS
The regeneration of the Heygate Estate began as early as 1998. Lend Lease was named as a “development partner” in 2007, and despite a lack of replacement homes. Southwark Council began a process of “temporarily” decanting tenants into existing council housing stock elsewhere in the borough. By October 2008 the estate was half emptied, and by June of 2009, the majority of tenants had been decanted from the site. In March of 2010, only 20 flats remained occupied. The final tenant of the Heygate was evicted in November 2013, and the estate demolished shortly before the beginning of 2015.¹

In the context of a national housing crisis, one might question why perfectly sound council flats are left empty for as many as five years only to be demolished and replaced with increasingly inaccessible market rate housing. The regeneration of the Heygate Estate has therefore become an object of debate, documented in over a hundred articles written between 2007 and 2015.² Those in favour of its demolition insist the inhumane nature of its architecture is responsible for the crime and social decay broadly considered symptomatic of such problem estates. Those who oppose its demolition condemn the eviction of thousands of council tenants before they can be adequately rehoused, only to replace a significant stock of council housing with primarily market rate housing. In the context of a housing crisis the demolition of the Heygate is, therefore, an act of social cleansing “clearing the area of its lowest-income inhabitants” and creating opportunities for “unbridled property speculation”.³

The regeneration of the Heygate is only a single case in a broader historical narrative describing the premeditated decline of council housing under neoliberalism. As Francesco Sebregondi writes;

*In fact, the absence of change in the plot narrating its death sustains the collective perception of the council estate as an atavism; and of its burial, as progress. In this way, the liquidation of each of the numerous remaining estates can carry on slowly but surely, without encountering much resistance.*⁴

The case of the Heygate will thus serve as an example “through which we can trace the diminishing value UK governments have attached to the state provision of housing […] since [its] peak in the 1970s”.⁵
Fig 13  “Elephant Park”, Heygate Estate Regeneration, Lend Lease.
Fig 18  Site Context 1960
Fig 19 Site Context 1980
THE SYSTEM-BUILT ESTATE

Prior to its construction, the site of the Heygate was characterised by “late Victorian, Italianate tenement blocks interspersed with World War II bomb sites”.6 Existing blocks were purchased under compulsory purchase orders, their inhabitants decanted and the buildings demolished. The Heygate, like its sister estate the Aylesbury was characteristic of a postwar tabula rasa development, intending to impose an effective structure and order through the principals of modernist planning.

It was designed from 1968-1969 by the Architects’ Office of the newly formed London Borough of Southwark and constructed from 1970 to 1974.7 Both the Heygate and larger Aylesbury Estate (date) were planned as a means “efficiently rehousing thousands from Southwark’s waiting list” moving residents from substandard living conditions into new council homes.8

Under Prime Minster Harold Wilson’s Labour Government, large local authorities were required to adopt industrialised building systems as their primary means of construction. This offered a certain speed and efficiency over conventional construction while decreasing the need for skilled tradesmen at a time of a severe shortage within the industry. Given its strong Labour majority, Southwark Council enthusiastically embraced industrialised construction methods and the system-built estate as an efficient and economical solution towards an acute shortage of adequate housing.9

To finance new development, local authorities were encouraged to pursue loans from the Ministry of Housing and Local Government. These were issued over 60 years and calculated based on the number dwellings and overall density of development. Preferential interest rates were secured by local authorities that adopted the Ministry of Housing’s “cost yardstick”, a standardised formula used to determine the maximum allowable cost per dwelling with the intention of producing “good value for money”. In practice, Campkin notes “it was a crude system in which long-term value was often overlooked”.10
Fig 20  Heygate Estate under construction, early 1970s.
Fig 21  Pollock Street prior to demolition, 1969.
Constructed using 12M Jespersen, a Danish system of large prefabricated concrete panels, the Heygate and Aylesbury estates are described by Bridget Cherry and Nicholas Pevsner as “some of the most notorious products of industrialised building”. The architects of the Heygate arranged five slab blocks between eight to twelve storeys to enclose eleven blocks of four-storey maisonettes and communal gardens. Based on the principals of the Athens Charter (1933), the design separated vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Buildings were accessed from a network of elevated walkways, while the ground plane was devoted to parking, play areas and communal gardens.

There were certain problems that arose from various design decisions, and scale and nature of its construction. However, as Campkin explains; critiques of both the Heygate and Aylesbury fail to describe the implications of the original financing, procurement, and management structures on the premature physical deterioration and economic devalorization of these estates. He suggests that compromises in the design and construction process as a result of the way in which financing was procured through the Ministry of Housing and Local Government, were responsible for a general lack of investment in the overall material quality of communal spaces – consequently increasing their susceptibility to physical deterioration and vandalism. A problem only further exacerbated by inadequate financial planning necessary towards ensuring the long-term maintenance and management of Southwark’s growing stock of council housing.


Fig 22 Aylesbury Estate under construction.
DEFENSIBLE SPACE

It's within this context that in 1974, the BBC documentary series, Horizon invited Canadian author and architect Oscar Newman to visit the Aylesbury Estate where he was filmed critiquing its design for its lack of "defensible space". Defensible space describes "a sense of individual ownership and responsibility over a clearly defined territory". Newman suggests the stigma of crime and vandalism associated with public housing are the direct result of its design, and proposes design should instead be used to instil a "refined sense of property and ownership", an idea "fundamentally in tension with the values embodied in communal public housing."  

13. Ibid, 86.
15. Ibid, 89-94.
16. Ibid, 90.
19. "It set about making various physical changes to the most problematic estates such as removing overhead walkways and creating private gardens for ground-floor dwellings out of underused communal space."

Despite this, Newman’s work has had considerable influence in the UK, “particularly through Alice Coleman’s anti-modernist Utopia on Trial”. In the early 1980s, Coleman, together with the Land Use Research Unit at King’s College London, documented examples of social and physical deterioration – including violence, crime, litter, and vandalism – to determine the association between the design of modernist public housing, and “lapses in civilised behaviour”. Again, while consciously neglecting the effects of social and economic deprivation, Coleman attributes antisocial behaviour to the design of these “problem estates”. In 1986, under Thatcher, Coleman was made an advisor to the Department of the Environment and given a five-year, £50m contract to redesign “seven misery estates”. Her work providing “a convenient ‘independent’ justification for the government’s drastic scaling back of public housing provision.”

Ideas of defensible space have only served to reinforce a narrative describing the failures of the modern project, while disregarding the role of the state, and the diverse socio-economic conditions of individual sites. It’s instead increased a fear of crime, promoting individualism, the enclosure of communal spaces, and the enclaving of communities – an antagonistic approach towards the original intentions of its architecture.
Fig 23  Oscar Newman, BBC Horizon “The Writing on the Wall” 1974
Fig 24  Minister of Housing, Ian Gow and Margret Thatcher, 1984.
DISINVESTMENT

The strategic removal of council housing from a restricted commodity context was promoted as a progressive redistributive policy under Thatcher as the “right to buy”. Through the diversification of tenure, it has enabled the transfer of housing capital from local authorities to stable council tenants, establishing a “property-owning democracy” while reducing council housing stock, and thus the presence of the welfare state.

The introduction of the right to buy in 1980, allowed secured council tenants to purchase their homes from local authorities, at a discount of 30 to 50 percent. Half of the purchase price was paid to central government, while half was retained by local authorities themselves – an amount reduced to a fifth in 1985. The majority of this was allocated towards debt redemption, and could not be used towards limiting rent increases; the maintenance of existing council stock; or the construction of new council housing, thus forcing local authorities to pursue a policy that directly restricted use of their own housing capital.22

Essential to Thatcher’s housing reforms was the introduction of “housing benefit” in 1982.23 This transferred housing subsidies from property to tenants as a contribution towards rent determined by income and together with the removal of rent restrictions in 1988, promoted the free market provision of government subsidised housing through private landlords. To induce council rent increases following the deregulation of the rental market, “central government support to local authorities [was systematically withdrawn] in proportion to expected rent rises”. In addition, councils were restricted from the “transfer of either surpluses or deficits between their housing and general accounts”, thus preventing the practice of subsidising of rent with general funds.24

Under Thatcher, the right to buy and subsequent housing reforms have promoted a financial and ideological disinvestment from council housing, directly restricting the autonomy of local authorities, and consequently intensify the physical deterioration and economic devalorization of council housing.
Fig 25 Tony Blair at the Aylesbury Estate in 1997.
By 1996 the right to buy had removed two million council homes from stock once totalling approximately six million units. Its success varied both regionally, and locally “where sales were higher in houses than flats, and suburban rather than inner city estates.” While reducing council housing stock, the right to buy simultaneously removed the mechanisms through which council housing had accommodated a diversity of social classes fundamental to promoting the “social mobility and cohesion on which the success of the welfare state relied”. Local authorities were therefore left with what Ravetz describes as “residualised housing stock, and population analogous to the poorest, most immobile slum tenants [of the late nineteenth century].”

Following his election in 1997, Tony Blair delivered his first speech as Prime Minister from the Aylesbury Estate. The estate, and generalised image of postwar council housing would serve exemplify “ruined Britain at the end of an era of Conservative government, and to place in those ruins a vision of future regeneration”. Describing an alienated “underclass” of Britain’s “poorest” and “forgotten”, the estate and its residents embodied the social exclusion and deprivation New Labour’s emerging rhetoric of “Urban Renaissance” intended to address.
Regeneration, when used in reference to place, is defined as the “renewal, specifically of a geographical area by the improvement of its economic and social conditions.” The term “urban regeneration”, first appears in the late nineteenth century describing the improvement of living conditions through the clearance and reconstruction of working-class slums. In the twentieth century its used as a socio-biological metaphor describing the post-war renewal of bomb-damaged neighbourhoods – a process promoted through programs of extensive state-led reconstruction. There are notable similarities to the areas identified in the 1943 County of London Plan as “opportunity areas”, and those identified in the current London Plan as “regeneration areas”.

The London Plan (2015) is the current strategic planning and spatial development strategy for Greater London. Its definition of regeneration is not directly apparent, but broadly emphasises “economic growth and more intensive use of land.” It defines areas for regeneration as those “in greatest socio-economic need” identified through the UK’s “Index of Multiple Deprivation”. These are often neighbourhoods strongly associated with council housing. As Reinier De Graaf writes; the same architecture that once embodied equality, and social mobility now serves to prevent it.

Beyond a rhetoric of social improvement the neoliberal strategies promoted by the Plan instead intensify the social exclusion and deprivation it alleges to address. In practice it produces “varied forms of gentrification, often state-led, benefiting commercial interests and dispersing existing communities”.

32. The Index combines information from multiple sources including; income, employment, education, health, crime, housing, and environment to produce an overall relative measure of deprivation. Mayor of London, The London Plan (London, Greater London Authority 2015), 387
Fig 26  The London Plan, 2015.
GENTRIFICATION

Both land and the improvements built onto it become commodities in a capitalist economy.\textsuperscript{35} Since the two are inseparable, value is expressed as a combination of land value, or ground rent, and the value of its built improvements.\textsuperscript{36} The value of improvements on a piece of land or surrounding land will also influence its ground rent, which represents “a claim made by landowners on users of their land”.\textsuperscript{37} Though impermanent, built improvements require large initial investments and “have very long turn over periods both physically and in terms of value”.\textsuperscript{38} The fixity of investment in the built environment therefore prevents redevelopment from occurring until the invested capital has experienced a rational economic devalorization. As the “rational outcome of the land and housing markets”, physical deterioration and economic devalorization are fundamental to producing the possibility of profitable reinvestment in the built environment.\textsuperscript{39}

As a claim made by land owners, ground rent is a means of capturing surplus value created by producers on a site. Capitalised ground rent is therefore the “actual quantity of ground rent that is appropriated by the landowner, given the present land use.”\textsuperscript{40} In the case of rental housing where a landlord produces a service on land, the functions of production and ownership are combined, and capitalised ground rent is directly appropriated through the rent paid by tenants. Given its land use, a site “is able to capitalise a certain quantity of ground rent” – its potential ground rent is therefore “the amount that could be capitalised under the land’s highest and best use”.\textsuperscript{41}

The disparity between a site’s capitalised ground rent and its potential ground rent, is identified by Smith as the “rent gap”.\textsuperscript{42} This is “produced primarily by capital devalorization”, which decreases the portion of ground rent that is able to capitalise under the present land use. Continued urban development simultaneously increases the potential ground rent that could be capitalised under a more intensive land use.\textsuperscript{43} This disparity, or rent gap is what creates the possibility for the profitable reinvestment in the built environment. Gentrification occurs when the rent gap is sufficiently large that developers can extract an adequate financial return from the disparity between a site’s capitalised ground, and its potential ground rent.
Fig 27 Gentrification graffiti on the Heygate Estate.
In 1998 Southwark Council published its Regeneration Strategy, addressing a range of issues confronting the borough’s social, economic, and environmental improvement. Citing a lack of central government support towards local authorities, the report identifies the need to attract private investment through the disposal of its own assets, noting:

“The use of Council assets to lever in investment to achieve physical regeneration will have considerable impact on the Council’s finances — positively through the realisation to cash values and the reduction in future obligations (maintenance etc.) and negatively — in the short-term through the loss of land and rents. However, if the Council is successful in attracting investment through disposals, and re-investing resources in remaining assets […] it is possible, in the long term, that the value of the Council’s remaining assets may exceed their current value through this investment in the regeneration process.”

Given its central location and expectations of attracting “considerable private sector investment”, the Elephant and Castle was identified for regeneration and the decision was taken to dispose of, and eventually demolish the Heygate Estate.

The Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area was formalised in the 2002 draft of the London Plan, later published by the Greater London Authority in 2004. At the same time Southwark Council published its Elephant and Castle Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), describing where, how and what regeneration might take place.

Fig 28 Opp. The Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area 2012, with council housing estates indicated in black, and “potential development sites” indicated in red.
Lend Lease was selected as the regeneration partner in 2007, and the decanting of the Heygate Estate began the same year. Minutes from a 2008 Council Assembly meeting note “the Heygate Estate is now nearing the end of its natural life [and no longer a] fit place for people to live, [the cost] reactive repairs and maintenance of the estate buildings [its lifts and heating system] place a disproportionate burden on the council’s repairs service”.47

[The] council believes that for these reasons, the decision taken in 1998 to demolish the estate was the right one and further believes that – given the rapid deterioration of the estate – the decision taken in 2007 to bring forward the demolition date, and re-house people before replacement housing would be complete was also the right one.48

The regeneration agreement between Southwark Council and Lend Lease was formalised in 2010, and in 2012 Lend Lease submitted its planning application for the redevelopment of the estate. Southwark Council simultaneously published the Elephant and Castle Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF), “a framework which will guide development over the next 15 years”.

47. Southwark Council Assembly Meeting, November 5th 2008.
48. Ibid.
This begins to reveal the regeneration of council housing as the product of two parallel processes, each manipulating the ground rent, or land value of a given site. The designation of opportunity areas encourages investment in the built environment through the development of adjacent land, increasing a site’s potential ground rent. Disinvestment, meanwhile accelerates the physical deterioration and economic devalorization of council housing, reducing its capitalised ground rent to produce a rent gap – thus encouraging its gentrification.

Though the rent gap is produced primarily through capital devalorization, the social devalorization of council housing is perhaps equally important to the process of its regeneration. This is most apparent in the rhetoric employed by both the council and developer when describing the estate:

*The revolutionary ideas of the 1960s have not stood the test of time. Instead, the developments have, on the whole, made life more difficult for local residents, and discouraged people from visiting the Elephant and Castle. [...] In June 2002 Southwark Council decided the only way to improve the Elephant and Castle was to remove the physical barriers blighting the area, and approach the design and layout afresh. These barriers include: outdated, badly constructed buildings in need of massive investment; poor quality housing in dense estates; and a hostile environment, leading to crime and the fear of crime.*

Employing a rhetoric similar to that of the London Plan, the estate is described as a barrier to the improvement of the area’s social conditions. In practice however, the Heygate Estate and council housing in general is rather economic barrier to capital accumulation. As David Harvey writes: “Capitalism as a mode of production has necessarily targeted the breaking down of spatial barriers and the acceleration of the turnover time as fundamental to its agenda of relentless capital accumulation.” In this sense, active disinvestment, or ruination is essential to creating opportunities for the profitable reinvestment in the built environment. While the fixity of investment in the built environment should prevent redevelopment from occurring until the invested capital has experienced a rational economic devalorization, when buildings do not fall into ruin quickly enough “ruins are actively constructed upon materially sound objects”. The creation of ruins is not only a process economic devalorization through active disinvestment, but also social devalorization – “a process which involves the ruination their image, or their imaging as ruins.”
The site of the Heygate estate now exists in a condition of vacancy – between past ruin and yet unbuilt speculative future. The production of vacancy began in 2007 with the commencement of the high density estate regeneration programme. In 2009 the site was placed on the Government’s high priority list for regeneration, and the regeneration area was expanded in 2011. More recently, this has translated into the accumulation of speculative value, as construction works have progressed, job opportunities have increased, and the induced value of the site has grown.
3.0
COUNCIL HOUSING INVENTORY
COUNCIL HOUSING IN SOUTHWARK

Southwark Council is largest local authority landlord in London—housing 49% of its population in almost 55,000 tenant and leasehold properties.1 Though, despite 12,600 households currently on Southwark’s Housing Waiting List, figures from the GLA project the net loss of more than 2000 council homes based on regeneration schemes with current planning permission alone.2

The council housing inventory is intended to illustrate the extent and diversity of council housing in Southwark. The estate map indicates the locations of council housing estates within the borough, and the accompanying matrix presents a 120 of the largest estates organised chronologically by their approximate date of completion. These are the new ruins of the welfare state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Gardens</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon Mansions</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webber Row Estate</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Road Estate</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullens Estate</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunray Estate</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe Estate</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauban Estate</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites Grounds Estate</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion Estate</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Estate</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dulwich Estate</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elim Estate</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purbrook Estate</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doddington Grove Estate</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams Gardens Estate</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark Park Estate</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylton Estate</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meakin Estate</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby Estate</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Estate</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Estate</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabard Gardens Estate</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Estate</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elim Estate</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purbrook Estate</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doddington Grove Estate</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams Gardens Estate</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark Park Estate</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylton Estate</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meakin Estate</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby Estate</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Estate</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Estate</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabard Gardens Estate</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Estate</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Estate</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfield Estate</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friary Estate</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neckinger Estate</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvey Estate</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Johns Estate</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Goldsmith Estate</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickens Estate</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrose House</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Hill Estate</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunhead Estate</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark Hill Estate</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lordship Lane Estate</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>166 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingswood Estate</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>537 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Faraday House</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>74 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pynfolds Estate</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>66 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion Hill Estate</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>103 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Estate</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>177 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford Estate</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>290 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Estate</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>72 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinglake Estate</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>312 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goschen Estate</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>115 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Square Gardens</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>182 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydenham Hill Estate</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>103 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nelson Estate 1958
134 Units

Sceaux Gardens Estate 1959
258 Units

St Crispins Estate 1960
81 Units

Croxted Road Estate 1960
67 Units

Brayards Estate 1960
54 Units

Elmington Estate 1960
535 Units

Pelican Estate 1960
202 Units

Plough Estate 1960
88 Units

Lindley Estate 1961
232 Units

Alberta Estate 1961
187 Units

St Saviours Estate 1961
360 Units

Haddonfield Estate 1962
61 Units
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estate Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Estate</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Estate</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comber Estate</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowbrook Estate</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton Way Estate</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyndham Estate</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acorn Estate</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawson Estate</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwin Estate</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congreve Estate</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippers Place Estate</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Estate</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redman House</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Estate</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper Estate</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osprey Estate</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorburn Square</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delawyk Crescent</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustin Estate</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Peckham Estate</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Estate</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledbury Estate</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury Estate</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury Estate</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddonhall Estate</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Place Estate 1972
481 Units

Gloucester Grove Estate 1973
314 Units

Havil Street Estate 1974
110 Units

Heygate Estate 1974
1214 Units

Rouel Road Estate 1975
564 Units

Lettsom Estate 1976
310 Units

Newington Estate 1976
282 Units

Setchell Estate 1977
227 Units

Scovell Estate 1977
89 Units

Deynsford Estate 1978
254 Units

Queens Road Estate 1978
57 Units

Cossall Estate 1978
307 Units
Salisbury Estate 1978
153 Units

Pelier Estate 1979
227 Units

Consort Estate 1979
364 Units

Brimmington Estate 1980
351 Units

Pomeroy Estate 1980
140 Units

Bells Gardens Estate 1980
322 Units

Pasley Estate 1981
134 Units

Pedworth Estate 1981
128 Units

Downtown Estate 1981
187 Units

Keetons Estate 1982
153 Units

Barset Estate 1982
193 Units

Park Street Estate 1982
128 Units
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DESIGN
The redistributive practices inherent to neoliberal economics employ diverse mechanisms—notably, real estate and property—to channel surplus-value from society as a whole to a class of economic and political elite. At an individual level this process is founded on a neoliberal logic of debt, and enabled through the financial arrangements surrounding real estate and property. The “debt economy” as Maurizio Lazzarato explains, is an economy of time and subjugation, exploiting finance to “[reduce] the future and its possibilities to current power relations.”¹ To address spatial and social inequality, the project must therefore separate housing from the financial implications inherent to its neoliberal conception as a commodity.

To propose an alternative to current development practices the project pursues a neoliberal conception of housing as a commodity to its most illogical extremes. It demands a critical engagement with the financial practices inherent to development, and positions the architect as the mediator between “end-user” and “investor” — actively excluding the role of “developer” to ensure the separation of financial form and social function.² Specifically, it proposes the development of high quality, permanently affordable housing realised through the exploitation of speculative property investment.

². Self, “Derivative Architecture”. 89
Because the value of land in a speculative market resides primarily in its potential rather than its realisation, speculative investors will acquire and hold land until it can be sold at a profit. A site’s potential can be secured through planning permissions, proposing its future development density, design, unit mix etc. and it’s from these plans that developers secure financing.

“Developers operate on borrowed money raised against adequate financial guarantees.”3 The redevelopment of the Heygate Estate, like any large site presents a problem as no financial guarantee can match the projected expense of its development. Instead projects of such scale are phased, allowing each phase to operate as an independent project, autonomous in its planning, finance, and its construction. “Each phase is developed with borrowed money guaranteed against the pre-sales of the following phase.”4 This process is facilitated through “off-plan sales”, a practice describing the investment in a property before its completion. Off-plan investment transfers risk of a future decline in property prices from the developer to the client, providing the adequate financial guarantee required for construction. For example a two bedroom unit listed at £790,000 might require a %10 (£79,000) deposit guaranteeing its price on completion at which point the remaining %90 (£711,000) is paid. Off plan sales thus create the possibility for investment in non-existent property.5

The same principals are applied in the trading of derivatives where off-plan investment is considered the derivative, and property the underlying commodity. The financial potential of a property derivative is the time between the purchase of property and its completion.6 But what if the property is never completed, and time extends indefinitely to create a speculative urban void? This is not unheard of in London, since the closure of the Battersea Power station in 1983 the 17 hectare site has sat vacant and undeveloped, accumulating speculative capital value over period of 30 years. Exploiting this vacancy requires we push the neoliberal logic of property and investment in the built environment to an extreme. It demands the abstraction of property as a derivative, enabling it to function as tool of financial capital, and dissociating from the value of its built improvements.
Fig 31  Elephant Park model, pictured in Lend Lease sales office.
ANOTHER REGENERATION

Only within a restricted commodity context does it become possible to directly mobilise the social potential of housing as a commodity, providing permanent, and genuinely affordable housing, while improving the living conditions for residents and the broader community. Beyond the anarchic subversion and individual occupation of regeneration sites the project attempts to organise the estate’s inhabitants and community towards its own institutionalisation and autonomy. By mobilising the new ruins of the welfare state as sites of agonistic potential within the city it demands a theoretical re-foundation and critical recuperation of the social and ideological objectives of council housing.

The project is conceived as a retroactive manifesto for the development of the site – a projective architectural proposal pursuing regeneration and the improvement of social conditions, while critically mediating the demand for the profitable investment in the build environment. The project separates the building’s financial form and its social function, in effect, disaggregating the value of the site’s built improvements from its land value, or ground rent. In this sense it operates similarly to a community land trust and proposes the creation several institutions based on this model.

Fig 32 Site Plan, Heygate Estate 1:2500.
Walworth Land Trust (Community District Land Trust)

Actors
Council Representatives, Residents & Tenant Associations, and Community Stake Holders

Actions
Responsible for the acquisition and designation of land for development, assuring adequate community benefit from the sale and development of council held lands.

Walworth Community Housing Association

Actors
Specialists from the fields of; Architecture, Construction, Planning, Law, Finance, etc.

Actions
Responsible for the development of existing council estate in the interest of current and future residents. The Community Housing Association serves as a mediator between the user and investor in the design and delivery of housing. It provides and maintains housing at social rent levels to low income and precarious workers, and trains residents in construction, maintenance and management of the estate.

Walworth Community Housing Capital

Subsidiary of Walworth Community Housing Association

Actions
Is the entity responsible for the maintaining the long-term financial viability of the project. The rent paid by tenants is collected by Community Housing Capital, and the majority of which is used towards the building’s operation, utilities, maintenance and improvement. Any operating surplus is initial paid towards the purchase of the land, after which it deposited in a separate high interest account to be used towards anything from community events towards the future improvements to the estate. A fraction of this is diverted towards a pension fund maintaining affordable housing for residents into retirement.

Estate Trust (Community Housing Trust)

Actors
Tenants and Residents Association(s)

Actions
Manage the building and it’s resources according to their needs.
PHASING

The project is realised through the strategic sale of the leaseholds on the vacancy created in the process of site’s regeneration. The growth of building is both limited by, and dependent on the continued increase in the value of this vacancy, in this sense the progress of its construction is an index of this increasing value. If we assume the continuous increases of property prices throughout the length of the development, the area that can be constructed from the sale of each leasehold will increase with the value of the site’s vacancy.

Whereas off-plan sales are generally used to secure investment for an entire phase of development, the proposed system of leaseholds enables this to process to carefully mediated, strategically offering individual leaseholds to secure the investment required to directly finance the building’s incremental construction. In this way, changes in the market are directly reflected in the building’s growth. For example, in increasing market numerous leaseholds might be sold in a year, consequently increasing the rate of construction. Conversely, in a decreasing market, fewer leaseholds would be sold and the rate of construction would therefore decrease. Throughout the duration of the development the sale of leaseholds must be carefully mediated to ensure the project can extract enough capital from the site to realise its target density. This not only ensures the continued longterm viability of the project, but also allows sale of leaseholds to secure capital for the benefit of building’s tenants and the greater community; including the construction or improvement of shared amenities, equipment, or public realm.
Fig 33 Proposal for Golden Lane projected on the destroyed Coventry 1952, Alison & Peter Smithson.
Fig 35  Phase 02
Using figures from the development’s viability assessment we’ll assume a land value of £48 million as agreed between the developer, Lend Lease and Southwark Council. The agreement indicates the price is to be paid to the council in installments, contingent on the completion of the various stages of development. Assuming the negotiation of a similar arrangement, the proposal must maintain a constant operating surplus throughout the entirety of its development to be financially viable.

Any operating surplus from the rental of the existing estate can begin to be paid towards the purchase of the land. The project’s construction must therefore be phased in such a way that it maintains a constant balance of rentable area, meaning the area of the existing estate being decanted and demolish can never exceed the amount of new building completed at any stage of the development.

It becomes apparent that provision of social housing alone is unable to generate enough surplus to purchase the land prior to the completion of the building. Rather than propose a mix of market-rate and socially rented housing, this difference is accommodated by the introduction of both affordable and market-rate retail and commercial space during the early stages of the development. While necessary to maintain the initial viability of the project these high yield programs can later be made available at affordable rents, or repurposed to better serve the community upon the completion of the building.
Fig 43  Site aerial, proposed 1:2500.
Fig 44 Image depicting view across interior commons.
Fig 45 Proposed ground floor plan, 1:2500.
Fig 46  Proposed typical plan, 1:2500.
Fig 47 Proposed typical unit plan, 1:2500.
Fig 48  Proposed shared working space, 1:200.
Fig 49  Proposed market hall, 1:200.
Fig 50 Proposed commons library.
Fig 51 Model photo, showing the elevation along Walworth Road.
Fig 52  Model photo with hands.
Fig 53  Model photo showing retained trees within the commons.
Fig 54  Model photo, from within the commons.
Fig 55  Model photo, looking across the commons.
Fig 56  Model photo, from within the building across the commons.
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CONCLUSION
The council housing estates of postwar London are immanent exceptions within the city. As places formed by politics, these are the fragmentary utopias of the welfare state. And by virtue of their image they maintain a critical, dialectic confrontation towards social integration within the neoliberal city.

The autonomous project proposes a city of parts assumed from the geography of this fragmentary utopia. It demands a theoretical re-foundation of social state and critical recuperation of the theoretical objectives of the modern project. It is not an act of nostalgia or pursuit of an idealized postwar utopia – instead it must consume the new ruins of the welfare state to construct the symbols of the new city. The “new social state” must establish its own tradition through the appropriation and reinvention of the legacy of its predecessor – the urban achievements of the modern project become the conceptual and ideological assets from which it is constructed.

The condition of social class within a greater neoliberal economy is the basis for the development of an emerging class struggle. From this, its crucial to construct a necessary antagonist culture that could also anticipate the possibly of its own institutionalization. Beyond the anarchic subversion and individual occupation of expropriated sites the project seeks to organize a social class to mobilize the new ruins of the welfare state as sites of agonistic potential within the city. The possibility of freedom from the dominion of capital becomes the grounds for a project of autonomy – an agonistic model against the political, economic and social implications of the neoliberalism that define the built environment.
Predicated on the appropriation and critical understanding of current practice – it demands a reconstruction of preexisting relationships to define a progressive model of development and construct an alternative to a current neoliberal hegemony. By negating the system of property and ownership inherent to neoliberalism’s creation of social inequality the project presents the basis for an alternative system of social relations. Opting for a long-term counter-plan to neoliberal development it cannot be conceived as uniquely political intervention, but also a cultural and theoretical critique of the system.\textsuperscript{3}

The project ultimately seeks to liberate housing from neoliberal concept of property. It does not call for the destruction of the system, but instead proposes “a real theoretical project of attaining emancipation and power through refusal and autonomy rather than adaption and reform.”\textsuperscript{3}
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