



CRESC Working Paper Series

Working Paper No. 77

Urban regeneration in East Manchester: a process of gentrification?

Camilla Lewis

CRESC, The University of Manchester

December 2009

For further information:

Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (CRESC)
Faculty of Social Sciences, The Open University,
Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA, UK
Tel: +44 (0)1908 654458 Fax: +44 (0)1908 654488

Email: cresc@manchester.ac.uk or cresc@open.ac.uk

Web: www.cresc.ac.uk

Urban regeneration in East Manchester: a process of gentrification?

Camilla Lewis

Abstract

This paper asks whether the term ‘gentrification’ could be applied to describe processes of urban regeneration taking place in East Manchester. The eastern side of Manchester was ravaged by the effects of deindustrialisation and was consequently identified as one of the most deprived areas in Britain in the 1990s. Now, this area is undergoing a radical transformation to re-brand it under a single banner, ‘New East Manchester’. The paper explores both the appropriateness of using ‘gentrification’ as an analytical concept as well as the extent to which it may offer further insight into wider processes of social change and class in Britain today. It asks if approaches to gentrification are broad enough in scope to encompass the complexities of class in processes of regeneration. The paper draws on interviews, conducted during a three month period of research with a range of academics and local residents.

Key Words

gentrification, urban regeneration, class

Urban regeneration in East Manchester: a process of gentrification?

This paper asks whether 'gentrification' may be a useful term to describe processes of urban change that are occurring in East Manchester. Although the concept of 'gentrification' is avoided in contemporary debates, in favour of more neutral and attractive terms such as 'regeneration,' 'sustainability' and 'urban renaissance', some scholars argue that the term must be used in discussions about cities (see, for instance, Lees 2003). Such scholars assert that exploring the idea of 'gentrification' may help to shed light on inevitable class shifts that are occurring in the renewal of cities. Through the exploration of some preliminary findings from a short period of research looking at the transformation of East Manchester, I consider both the appropriateness of using 'gentrification' as an analytical concept as well as the extent to which it may offer further insight into wider processes of social change and class in Britain today.

East Manchester

After years of post-industrial decline and subsequent, entrenched social problems, the eastern area of Manchester is undergoing a radical, multifaceted urban regeneration programme. This encompasses a socially diverse, large geographical area which is organised within a single 'vision', that attempts to create 'new' East Manchester through the transformation of the physical landscape and establishment of a lasting framework of 'social cohesion' (neweastmanchester.com). Therefore, the regeneration rhetoric depicts the environment and society as analogous. The reasoning follows that constructing a more suitable, aesthetically pleasing and stable built landscape will effect similar changes in the social fabric. The scale of this project is unprecedented and aspirations seem very high. In five years time the area will become a 'flagship' for the rest of the country (neweastmanchester.com). As the regeneration company, New East Manchester states:

...cultural and life style changes will be *required* to be made by some residents to break habits of a lifetime in order to improve the quality of *their* life and *their* health

(neweastmanchester.com) [emphasis mine]

Therefore, residents are expected to behave in a certain manner. These details provoke me to ask, *who* the transformation of 'new' East Manchester is proposed for and, further, how local residents feature in the plans for the 'regenerated' area? In this paper, I consider if the term 'gentrification' may offer a helpful perspective to examine these issues further.

Gentrification

In this discussion I explore some perspectives proposed by scholars who state that critical approaches have been sidelined in urban research (including, Lees & Davidson 2006, Slater 2006, Smith 2008, Wacquant 2008). For Stephen Quilley regeneration is dominated by 'class-laden' concepts such as 'liveability' and 'gentrification' (1999:194). In relation to East Manchester, this is not accurate. Notions of 'gentrification' and class are avoided in dominant discourses. They have become what Neil Smith (2002) describes as 'dirty words' erased in favour of more politically attractive discussions of 'regeneration,' 'social inclusion', 'cohesion' and 'community' (2002:446). The result, Loïc Wacquant argues is that urban research tends to suffer from 'class blindness'. He says that scholars only offer; 'rosy accounts of neighbourhood 'renewal' or see regeneration as an 'urban solution' to the ills of sociospatial decay' in lockstep with the views of government and business elites (Wacquant 2008:201).

Definitions of 'gentrification' are not consensual but can be traced back to the work of sociologist Ruth Glass who coined the term in 1964 to describe processes of urban change in London (Lees & Davidson 2004:1165). She used this label in order to draw attention to the 'snobbish pretensions' of affluent middle-class households, who moved into what she describes as working-class, de-invested areas (in Hamnett 2003:160). Chris Hamnett describes how Ruth Glass' ironic use of the term 'gentry' was an attempt to draw critical attention to the intricacies of traditional English rural class structure (Hamnett 2003:160). Over the past forty years the term has been appropriated and critiqued from a range of disciplinary and theoretical perspectives. Lees, Slater and Wyly (2008) identify two major developments in the literature; the *production* and *consumption* explanations for 'gentrification'. The *production* explanation arose in the 1970s. Scholars attempted to explain why cities contain powerful contradictions of capital investment. For example, Neil Smith's work on the rent-gap challenged the assumption that consumer preferences shape city landscapes (Lees et al. 2008:55). The *consumption* explanation emerged later, in the 1980s and emphasised how consumer trends lead to geographies of difference in cities (2008:93). Lees and colleagues argue that both perspectives have their strengths and should be used in a complementary fashion. Further, they defend the use of the label and refute the accusation that it has 'collapsed under the weight of its own burden' (2008:xxii).

Advocates of using the notion 'gentrification' argue that the term is still highly potent and therefore, relevant. According to Lees and Davidson, the term may be applied to contexts today as they contain similar power dynamics and issues of class (2005:1167). The authors state:

Contemporary gentrification has become increasingly complex because different actors and locations have become involved and the landscapes produced have changed

(Lees & Davidson 2005:1168).

Instead of private landlords, the state now has a primary role in 'gentrification' which often includes new building developments. Despite government attempts to promote 'regeneration' or 'urban renaissance', the result is still gentrification and social polarisation (ibid. 2005:1171). In this paper, I do not dwell on the intricacies of these arguments but use such arguments to examine my interview material, gathered in this short period of research. Further, my intention is to ask if 'gentrification' may offer a theoretical tool or direction in which to explore questions of class in the context of East Manchester.

Methodology

This paper is based on a three month period of research (July-September 2009) which will act as a starting point for an extended study. The research included ten semi-structured interviews; half with academics who have done research in the area, or whose expertise lie in studying processes of urban regeneration, and the other five were with residents or people who work in East Manchester. The way I conducted the interviews was quite varied. I was able to talk more openly and freely with the residents and workers in East Manchester which resulted in them reflecting on anecdotal stories and personal experiences. In contrast, the interviews with academics tended to be more formal and focused primarily on their work in the area which is why I have not changed their names but have given the other interviewees pseudonyms.

This discussion unfolds as follows: firstly, I use the interview material to describe East Manchester and suggest that an inherent tension is noticeable. On one hand, the area is being re-imagined as a single, 'new' place under the regeneration 'vision'. On the other hand,

multiple definitions of the area were expressed in my interviews. Secondly, I ask how appropriate the term 'gentrification' may be to describe this tension. I conclude by discussing what the term may offer to a wider theoretical approach to the dynamics of class in post-industrial urban Britain.

Describing East Manchester

In 2001 Manchester City Council outlined a 'vision' in a 'master plan' called *A New Town in the City* (Hebbert 2009). Consequently, today, the regeneration rhetoric proposes a single vision for the area under the banner 'New East Manchester'. In this discussion, I am not concerned with how the master plan was implemented, or the different actors involved in this process, rather, I explore how the single vision corresponds to the way that individuals describe ideas of change in the area. In my interview with Michael Hebbert, a lecturer in Town Planning, I asked him about the all-encompassing plan. He responded:

Never take the policy visions too seriously, like 'New East Manchester'. Residents are not affected by them, they see the stadium and shops as evidence of the regeneration. They are not directly influenced by visions or policy.

Similarly, Steven, a community worker for a Christian community group in Openshaw said;

...okay, we're on the east side - that's fine, but local residents would not have any recognition of what 'East Manchester' is!

Contrasting definitions for areas of cities are probably common. However, extrapolating from the context of East Manchester, this contestation around 'regenerating' a city raises several important points. In particular, within a process of urban transformation, how are different visions or futures envisaged? Furthermore, does the disagreement between how individuals describe 'change' reveal that 'regeneration' is a disguise for 'gentrification'?

In our interview, geography lecturer Kevin Ward told me, 'no one can 'speak' for East Manchester,' because it is such a large and diverse area. In contrast, however, I noticed that the academics tended to describe other areas of Manchester with ease and familiarity. For instance, they often remarked on the regeneration of 'Hulme and Moss Side' as a well known case study. The difficulty in defining East Manchester is probably due to the regeneration being relatively recent. However, I would also suggest that people not wanting to describe areas as a homogenous may be due to the specific characteristics of this context. Craig Young and colleagues describe how Manchester has a 'highly fragmented' pattern of wealth and poverty, with 'pockets of severe deprivation next to the gentrified city' (Young, Diep & Drabble 2006:1694). The fragmentation and heterogeneous identities seem to result in 'slippery' or multiple definitions for the area which stand in contrast to the distinct 'new' identity that is being proposed by New East Manchester. Nikolas Rose presents a helpful means to conceptualise how 'regeneration' attempts to re-brand a particular area. He describes how cities are:

... a series of packaged zones of enjoyment, managed by an alliance of urban planners, entrepreneurs, local politicians and quasi-governmental 'regeneration' agencies

(2000:107)

The idea of the regeneration agency 'packaging' and 'managing' an area, seems to resonate with the idea of state-led 'gentrification', as proposed by Lees and Davidson (2005).

Urban regeneration in East Manchester

It is worth mentioning here a brief description of the changes that have taken place in East Manchester, in order to reveal how and why the 'single' identity emerged. For Stephen Quilley, from the perspective of the government and from business investors, urban regeneration has been used as a way to tackle social problems, and further to 'reinvent Manchester as a post-industrial and cosmopolitan city, firmly rooted in Europe's 'premiere league'' (1999:191). Tye and Williams (1994) provide a comprehensive history of Manchester, describing how the regeneration unfolded in the following stages. Between 1982 and 1989, the East Manchester Initiative was established (1994:48). It aimed to bring private investment and jobs back in to the area. The Initiative was awarded £9 million by the government, which was used mainly for schemes to acquire and demolish derelict buildings and landscape vacant sites in preparation for development. The next major phase was the East Manchester Partnership which shifted the focus towards social and economic 'regeneration' (1994:50). In 1992, John Major announced that East Manchester would receive £55 million to prepare a bid for the Olympics under the East Manchester Regeneration Strategy.

The Olympic bid was a pivotal moment in the regeneration process as it combined plans for new sporting facilities and the regeneration of the surrounding area. The Olympics were seen as the 'ultimate expression' of place-marketing which could 'drive change in' and overcome the perceived problems in the area (Cochrane 1996: 1330). This would be achieved, for example, by filling empty and derelict areas with 'land hungry users,' such as stadiums and establishing a long term regeneration framework (Mace et al. 2007:52). Despite the failure of both the 1992 and 2000 bids, Manchester was able to secure the Commonwealth Games which took place in 2002. This was an important moment as Manchester had to compete with other cities and included an explicit attempt of re-imagining the city. It forged alliances between central and local government and private investors. In 2000, the East Manchester Urban Regeneration Company emerged, which was renamed 'New East Manchester Limited,' the present configuration. The role of private actors and state agencies again, appears to support Lees and Davidson's idea that there has been a mutation in the actors involved in 'gentrification' (2005:1166). Also, the attempt to re-fill the perforated landscape with large-scale developments and a major place-marketing initiative seems to confirm the gentrification scholars' assertions that de-invested, post-industrial working class areas are seen as ideal opportunities for investment.

The sporting facilities developed for the Commonwealth Games were named Sportcity. This area is now a prominent symbolic feature of the regeneration in East Manchester. It could be simply seen as a 'top-down' intervention, but in my interviews I was presented with a range of supportive remarks about the stadium and other facilities. During the period of research I attended a talk by David who works for a company find employment. Once a week they have a drop-in session at offices on the site of Sportcity. He told me that some 'clients' prefer not to come to the stadium, but in general it has been very popular, especially with men who feel uncomfortable going to community or Sure Start centres. David said that people like going to Sportcity because it is in 'their area' and they feel a sense of 'belonging' and pride in it. This example disrupts the view that top-down developments in regeneration are necessarily exclusionary. It suggests that taking a more open approach is essential in order to consider *how* individuals respond to particular elements of the built environment and wider regeneration efforts.

In order to gain a perspective of how residents felt about the ongoing regeneration I asked, 'who do local residents think the regeneration is for'? Graham a resident from Beswick said, that he felt that the regeneration was based around making the 'city region' wealthy rather than the people who live there. Similarly, Bryony and Stuart from a fruit and vegetable van (discussed in more detail later) said that regeneration is always about economic growth which

they felt had problematic consequences for local residents. Stuart reflected on his own role, working in the area, by saying:

I've been quite conscious of wanting it [the van] just to be about selling fruit and veg, not about - 'we understand that you are deprived' and 'we've got the amazing middle class solutions and wads of cash to sort it out' - which has got a patronising tinge.

Stuart's criticisms suggest that 'regeneration' initiatives in East Manchester have involved investing money in order to invoke a 'class shift'. Bryony also explained how when the van is advertised it is presented as a business even though it is publicly subsidised. She said that this is very important as initially, some residents were opposed to the van, as they felt it was offering 'charity'. These comments reveal how there is contestation over what is seen as 'acceptable' or deemed offensive in regards to different schemes. In other words, these counter-discourses draw critical attention to the motivations that underpin 'regeneration' and seem to support the appropriation of the term 'gentrification' to the East Manchester context. However, I suggest that the history of the area highlights a more complicated story.

Social history of East Manchester

The regeneration is explicitly attempting to re-brand East Manchester in order to counter the negative images associated with its post-industrial decline. The regeneration company's website states:

From a history steeped in industrial heritage, the area, its neighbourhoods and residents, have come through the bleak years of decline and recession and are now emerging as a New East Manchester.

(neweastmanchester.com)

In my interviews the academics talked in great detail about East Manchester's industrial past and subsequent 'social deprivation'. For instance, Michael Hebbert reflected that any regeneration process is difficult but this area is a 'particularly hard nut to crack' because of its industrial past. The eastern part of Manchester was once described as the 'metal-bashing heart' of the city, as it consisted of light and heavy engineering industry including coal mining, chemical and textile firms (Robson 2002:40). When Manchester suffered greatly from the effects of deindustrialisation, brought about by global and national competition, it 'pulled the guts out of the place', in the words of Peck and Ward (2002:1). This continued into the 1970s and 1980s as 'crippling waves of deindustrialisation' battered the city (Tickell & Peck 1999:606). A paper by Alan Mace and colleagues describes how the closure of businesses and factories caused the landscape to 'shrink' and become 'perforated' (Mace et al. 2007:52).

Deindustrialisation and mass unemployment led to dramatic depopulation. Some residents left the area voluntarily and others were moved out of inner city areas by the council. In East Manchester, depopulation occurred slightly more than the city as a whole, due to the sheer number of manufacturing jobs that were lost (Tye & Williams 1994:44). In our interview, Alan Harding described that during this period, 'communities were hardly self sustaining'. This image of the area being 'emptied' raises many questions. How does a place that is depopulating and declining sustain an 'identity'? Also, how can a fragmenting area be incorporated within a city? In regards to East Manchester, the answer from the regeneration company was to launch a unified attractive brand for the area. All of the local interviewees reflected that they were supportive of change and as one commented, 'something really needed to happen'. This leads me to the second part of the paper in which I ask more directly if these processes of urban renewal could be described as 'gentrification' and if this term may be a useful term to examine these processes further, in the context of East Manchester.

‘Gentrification’ in East Manchester?

In my interviews I asked the academics if they felt that ‘gentrification’ was an appropriate term for describing the transformation of East Manchester. In general, they refuted its suitability; saying that the term has a specific meaning, defined in the 1960s, and could not be applied to this context. They said that it referred primarily to processes of displacement, where working-class people are moved out of a specific area because of the encroachment of the middle-classes. They told me that this was not happening in East Manchester and they seemed to want to distance themselves from the term because it is ideologically loaded. In response to such criticisms, Lees and Davidson (2005:1187) would argue that term could still be applicable. Their position holds that the term has enough ‘elasticity’ to be helpful to explore the ‘mutations’ of twenty first century urban processes. I agree that there has been a mutation or shift which now sees a state-led configuration engaging in a widespread attempt to alter the identity of an area, invariably raises questions about class and inclusion. However, I am not sure, as the academics I interviewed pointed out, that ‘gentrification’ is adequate to describe such processes. For example, Tom Slater, a proponent of the term, describes how:

The middle classes are the gentri-part of the word, and they are moving into new-build residential developments built on formerly working-class industrial spaces, which are off limits to the working classes

(2008:745)

This description could be applied to an initial depiction of East Manchester’s transformation; however, I do not feel that his analysis is applicable to this context. The material that I gathered this short period of research depicted a much more complex set of debates. I was not made aware that any areas were ‘off-limits’ to particular residents or that working class residents were being displaced. I now go on to explore this in more detail using specific examples from my interview material and highlight how the effects of regeneration are not straightforward as the gentrification model would suggest.

I asked Alan Harding how successful New East Manchester has been, as an Urban Regeneration Company and why he thought that having a single vision was so important. He said that, firstly, and most importantly it was a means to bring in money. Secondly, it was crucial that private and public funders were confident that they would get something in return and ‘that something would really happen’. This view was supported by another interviewee, Laura, a drugs and alcohol outreach worker. She described how the implementation of the single budget has led to much more positive collaboration between different groups working in the area. Laura’s experience highlights how the implementation of the cohesive plan has produced new social relations and exchange between various actors working in East Manchester.

In contrast, the idea of a unified East Manchester was contested by Steven, a resident and community worker from Openshaw. He felt that the idea of ‘East Manchester’ undergoing a single transformation was ludicrous. Steven remarked on a story from the time of the Commonwealth Games in 2002 in which the whole area was being cleaned up and public areas were painted in a standardised turquoise colour. The same colour paint was used from Sportcity in Beswick, all the way up the Ashton Old Road, to the outskirts of the Greater Manchester boundary. Steven described how people that lived around him in Openshaw thought it was very odd that their local area had been painted, as they felt that they had no connection to the Games. Laura and Steven’s remarks underline a persistent theme in my interviews; individuals gave personal responses remarking on the effects of the regeneration. The history of the area highlights how the strategy to ‘renew’ this ‘emptied-out’ place emerged. My interviewees were supportive of change but questioned how the vision for the area was being implemented. The example of the paint represents how ‘regeneration’ is not

restricted to particular developments but rather how its effects spill out or overflow into undefined areas. The multiple ways that the regeneration affects residents is not uniform; its influences are experienced not only through planned developments or re-branding strategy, but also through responses or leakages which emerge from them.

Physical changes to the environment

Remarks about the changes to the physical landscape, in my interviews, were all connected to personal experiences. Alan Harding described how the physical developments of the regeneration are like 'islands of activity' which are 'pepperpotted' throughout the vast area which supports Mace's image of a how de-industrialisation left the landscape 'shrunk and perforated' (Mace et al. 2007:52). There seemed to be general agreement that the major developments, such as Sportcity and Asda supermarket, are crucial for bringing outside interest and investment into the area. However, the interviewees were of the opinion that there was a lack of infrastructure or support around these key sites. Bryony, who works for a healthy living and sustainability group in Ancoats, remarked with some sadness that groups of people who live in areas furthest way from the city centre organise 'day trips' to shop at Asda (located in Beswick opposite Sportcity). They come for cheap food and also to have lunch in the café. She believes that the influence of the supermarket has caused many local shops to shut down. Again, the effects of the key development, the supermarket, are evident. It has caused a ripple effect through the wider area which demonstrates how the influence of strategies within the single vision can be felt at expected and unexpected points. Bryony helped to set up a fruit and vegetable van which stops in various places in East Manchester in order to provide people with fresh, affordable produce, close to home. She described that when she works on the van one of the highlights is being able to chat with the customers as often elderly people come and enjoy having a chat with their neighbours and reminiscing about the 'olden days'.

I contend that these nostalgic discussions of the past inform an essential element to how individuals perceive the changes to the area. The local interviewees generally tended not to talk about what has been built but as Bryony remarks show, what is felt to be missing. Graham, a resident from Beswick, also said, that he was upset about what has been 'taken away' and 'not completed'. He told me that people are fed up with the slow progress:

We were promised a land of milk and honey, but there have been people living on streets, with houses with boarded up windows for over ten years. Beswick is unfinished.... this is the third time in thirty to forty years that the area has been regenerated but not finished - you can't leave people unfinished!

These comments illustrate how residents are not passive recipients of 'top-down' initiatives or opposed to innovation as the gentrification scholars implicitly suggest. Rather, I think that these views reveal counter-narratives or responses to the homogenous 'vision' for 'New East Manchester'. These examples reveal conflicting ideas of the 'future' in tension with the 'vision' for the area. At the start of the paper I quoted Michael Hebbert, who told me in our interview, not to take the 'vision' too seriously. He said that people are only bothered about the physical signs of regeneration. In one sense his warning was valid as none of the interviewees talked about 'New East Manchester'. However, I suggest that even though individuals may not use the same terms as the dominant regeneration rhetoric, it is clear that its effects are being felt through the changes in the landscape, or as Graham says, the *lack* of effects of the regeneration. I argue that it is crucial to consider how regeneration is proposed and responded to from a range of perspectives. The single vision is held in constitutive tension to the multiple definitions that the local interviewees described. This leads me back to the term 'gentrification' which calls into question, *who* the transformation of the urban

environment is proposed for and further, the implications for ideas about class and community of residents of these areas.

According to Neil Smith, the language of 'urban regeneration' represents:

...the next wave of gentrification, planned and financed on an unprecedented scale...the victory of this language in anesthetising our crucial understanding of gentrification in Europe represents a considerable ideological victory for neoliberal vision of the city

(2002:446)

When I described my proposed research to the academics I interviewed a few, especially those with interests in policy, warned me that that East Manchester is 'over researched' and that I should focus on an area that hasn't yet been 'done'. Perhaps this supports Smith's assertion that critical perspectives are generally seen to be unnecessary as regeneration research is comprehensive. However, whilst I would agree that idioms of regeneration dominate discourses in Britain, I am not convinced that we should necessarily deduce that a neo-liberal ideological victory has occurred. Loretta Lees says:

The British government is promoting and selling its vision of urban renaissance through the strategic use of certain keywords that serve to *neutralise* what is essentially a programme of state-led gentrification

(2003:75).

I contend that the discomfort with the term 'gentrification' which some academics expressed and the conversations I had with residents, do not reveal process of anesthetisation or passivity. They were not neutral responses but were guided by personal experience. As Stuart from the fruit and vegetable van said, 'people are not stupid, they know what the crack is'. This leads me to a key problem, presented by James Rees from Manchester University; gentrification perspectives do not take *how* working class people envisage processes of regeneration into account. He pointed out that some local residents that he had talked to in Beswick, were supportive of the changes that were taking place. It meant, for example, that they could profit from rising house prices which meant that they had the chance to move out of the area. Whilst this suggests that local residents may benefit from selling their houses it also questions the idea of working class 'displacement'. Therefore, these examples disrupt the simple idea of a 'class shift' which the notion of gentrification proposes. All of the interviewees were both supportive and critical of the regeneration in different ways, but commonly said that they felt that things were getting better for the poorest residents in the area. Therefore, assuming that working class residents are being displaced or forced-out is an oversimplification in this context.

Conclusion

This discussion has revealed an inherent tension in the way that East Manchester is described. On one hand, the regeneration rhetoric proposes a 'single', unified vision; as a means to bring in money and to place-market a 'new' attractive image for the area. This could be seen as a top down, middle-class driven, process of gentrification. However, on the other hand, my interviewees remarked with both positive and critical responses to particular developments rather than the homogenous 'new' identity for the area, seen in examples of the unplanned effects of regeneration such as shops shutting down and the appearance of uniform turquoise paint in unrelated areas.

I have explored the notion of 'gentrification' in order to question dominant idioms of 'regeneration' and 'renewal'. Whilst, the 'critical perspective' which gentrification scholars propose is helpful, as it highlights questions about class and community in the reshaping of cities, I am not convinced that it has a broad enough scope to examine these processes further. I acknowledge that the notion may be stretched and remoulded to encompass contemporary processes but wonder how advantageous this may be. The place-marketing drive clearly attempts to attract new people into the area, with a particular focus on young professionals, in areas such as Ancoats, which lie closest to the city centre. However, I could not deduce that a 'class shift' is occurring throughout East Manchester. Each area is marked by a particular history and is now undergoing a specific transformation. Gentrification seems to homogenise 'the working classes' as opposed to 'the middle classes'. It does not allow me to examine *why* residents are both supportive of change and also critical of particular developments that are occurring. For instance, why they feel that regeneration is necessary, even if it does not support the local population?

Overall this discussion has shown that taking a sensitive and broad approach is essential. Moreover, it must encompass other social distinctions, for instance, by asking how race, sexuality, ethnicity, community and gender relate to class. I would not propose that the notion of gentrification should be abandoned, as this may curtail our capacity to think about class as a facet of regeneration. However, I suggest that appropriating the idea of 'class' in the way that the gentrification scholars assume is too reductive for an ethnographic theoretical approach that I wish to pursue in the future. I feel that a more productive perspective would be to examine the day to day effects of the so called leakages which appear to spill out from the regeneration developments and to ask how class figures, or not, in the lived responses from them.

References

- Binnie, J. and B. Skeggs (2004). 'Cosmopolitan knowledge and the production and consumption of sexualized space: Manchester's gay village,' *The Sociological Review* 52: 39-61.
- Cochrane, A (1996). 'Manchester plays games: exploring the local politics of globalisation.' *Urban Studies* 33(8): 1319 - 1336.
- Davidson, M. and L. Lees (2005). 'New-build `gentrification' and London's riverside renaissance.' *Environment and Planning A* 37: 1165 - 1190.
- Hebbert, M (2009). 'Manchester: making it happen' in J. Punter (ed.) *Urban Design and the British Urban Renaissance*. London: Routledge.
- Lees, L (2003) 'Visions of 'urban renaissance': the Urban Task Force report and the Urban White Paper' in Raco, M, Imrie, R (eds.) *Urban renaissance? : New Labour, community and urban policy*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Lees, L, Tom, S and E. Wyly (2008) *Gentrification*. Routledge: New York.
- Mace, A, Hall, P and N. Gallent (2007). 'New East Manchester: Urban Renaissance or Urban Opportunism?' *European Planning Studies* 15(1): 51-65.
- Peck, J. and K. Ward (2002). *City of Revolution: Restructuring Manchester*. Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Slater, T. (2006). 'The Eviction of Critical Perspectives from Gentrification Research' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30(4): 737-757.
- Quilley, S. (1999). 'Entrepreneurial Manchester: The Genesis of Elite Consensus.' *Antipode* 31(2): 185-211.

Smith, N. (2002). 'New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy.' *Antipode* 34(3): 427-450.

Tickell, A. and J. Peck (1996). 'The Return of the Manchester Men: Men's Words and Men's Deeds in the Remaking of the Local State.' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 21(4): 595-616.

Robson, B (2002). 'Mancunian ways: the politics of regeneration' in Peck, J. and K. Ward (eds). *City of Revolution: Restructuring Manchester*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Rose, N (2000) 'Governing Cities, Governing Citizens' in Isin, E (ed) *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City*. London: Routledge.

Wacquant, L. (2008). 'Relocating Gentrification: The Working Class, Science and the State in Recent Urban Research.' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32(1): 198-205.

Williams, G. (1996). 'City profile Manchester.' *Cities* 13(3): 203-212.

Young, C. M. Diep and S. Drabble (2006). 'Living with Difference? The 'Cosmopolitan City' and Urban Reimaging in Manchester, UK.' *Urban Studies* 43(10): 1687-1714.

Websites

B of the Bang sculpture meets a sad end: Manchester Evening News 3/08/09

www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2009/aug/03/b-of-the-bang-art

www.neweastmanchester.com