



## Save Our Homes Press Releases

[www.homeregeneration.com](http://www.homeregeneration.com)

**The story so far:  
The Residents of Central Middlesbrough BATTLE to SAVE  
THEIR HOMES from the Bulldozer and  
*the rapacious developer***

The Executive Committee of Middlesbrough Council decided to adopt a plan to demolish 40+ streets in central Middlesbrough on July 20<sup>th</sup> 2005. These drastic MASS DEMOLITION PLANS will, if allowed to go ahead, result in the destruction of 1500 homes situated in Gresham and Middlehaven Wards of Central Middlesbrough.

Although all 1500 homes are grouped together very close to the retail and commercial centre of Middlesbrough, for administrative reasons approximately 1200 homes belong to the Gresham Ward and the remaining 300 are situated in the Middlehaven Ward. Having little in common with the rest of Middlehaven, these 300 homes are locally referred to as the 'Jewels Area' or GEM Streets.

Since no replacement plans exists we can only make assumptions as the intended land use - most think that no or few new houses will not be built - and yet the proposals (such as they are) have been drawn up to attract PATHFINDER money. How many houses and where remain a mystery? Are there any plans to rebuild? Since the cleared area is situated adjacent the commercial heart of the town, it is widely believed that this is nothing more than a LAND GRAB. The local government and their 'regeneration' team are cynically using the excuse of 'Housing Market Failure' to justify their desire to create a lucrative brown field site in the heart of the town. Our arguments are supported by the fact that the 'Older Housing Survey' carried out by a team of highly paid consultants show that the Gresham and Gem Streets are by no means the worst area of older terracing in the town. Studies by the Royal Bank of Scotland also serve to destroy the myth of unwanted homes:

[icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm\\_objectid=15933834%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name\\_page.html](http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm_objectid=15933834%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name_page.html)

In response the residents organised a walking bus to the town hall to show solidarity against the plan.

[icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm\\_objectid=15761930%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name\\_page.html](http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm_objectid=15761930%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name_page.html)

**Residents own survey shows overwhelming opposition to the MASS DEMOLITION PLANS:**

[icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm\\_objectid=15697598%26method=full%26siteid=50080%26headline=marching%2don%2dthe%2dhome%2dfont-name\\_page.html](http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm_objectid=15697598%26method=full%26siteid=50080%26headline=marching%2don%2dthe%2dhome%2dfont-name_page.html)

**Petition against MASS DEMOLITION:**

[icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm\\_objectid=15781961%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name\\_page.html](http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm_objectid=15781961%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name_page.html)

**Now that you all know the plans and the timescales you may becoming more aware of the relentless pace and pressure to drive this 'New Vision'. What is the 'New Vision'? No answers provided!**

## **YEAR 2005**

- 12 July: We get to know about which streets on 12 July but do not see the Executive Report
- 20 July: We 'see' the plans presented at a meeting that most of us cannot get access to on 20 July
- 20 July: They (executive council MBC) pass the plan in true 'democratic style' without accepting a motion for delay for due consideration put by residents and one of our Councillors (Ken Walker)
- 22 July: You may not have had time to fully read the 55 pages report let alone comprehend its contents and now just when we all just want peace and quiet to gather our thoughts. They drop reminders of 'drop in sessions' through our doors. How many people actually have the report?
- 25 July: 'Drop-in' sessions start to run over 3 days. The Executive report is again not available for residents to take away and read.
- 3 August: Call-in for Scrutiny Meeting (Afternoon)

**How one asks if the plan was yet to be decided could such a schedule be drawn up and resourced? Residents had nothing to oppose since there was not detailed proposals for demolition. Streets and house numbers finally made public on 12 July. Since they the true extent of the opposition is evident even though there was perhaps a deliberate timetable to ensure that things went through quickly and unopposed – some would say 'pull a fast one'.**

- **3 August: Full Council Meeting – now infamous ‘Cancer’ Slur. Mayor Ray Mallon likens Gresham to a ‘Cancer’ that must be ‘cut out’:**

[icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm\\_objectid=15818607%26method=full%26siteid=50080%26headline=cut%2dout%2dthis%2dcancer-name\\_page.html](http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm_objectid=15818607%26method=full%26siteid=50080%26headline=cut%2dout%2dthis%2dcancer-name_page.html)

- **6 August: First National Press Report**

[telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2005/08/06/nmiddle06.xml&sSheet=/news/2005/08/06/ixhome.html](http://telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2005/08/06/nmiddle06.xml&sSheet=/news/2005/08/06/ixhome.html)

- **8 August: Standards Board Referral hits front page of Northern Echo**

[archive.thisisthenortheast.co.uk/2005/8/8/203067.html](http://archive.thisisthenortheast.co.uk/2005/8/8/203067.html)

[icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm\\_objectid=15833512%26method=full%26siteid=50080%26headline=trio%2daccused%2dover%2dhomes%2ddemolition-name\\_page.html](http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm_objectid=15833512%26method=full%26siteid=50080%26headline=trio%2daccused%2dover%2dhomes%2ddemolition-name_page.html)

- **22 August: Third Meeting of the Gresham and Gem Streets Defence Group**

[icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm\\_objectid=15827190%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name\\_page.html](http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm_objectid=15827190%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name_page.html)

#### **Concern for the future of local schools**

- **The Northern Housing Board delay approval of mass demolition plans until January 2006**

<http://archive.thisisthenortheast.co.uk/2005/10/26/209803.html>

- **21 October: Gresham Ward Cllr Ken Walker gagged by his Labour Party comrades for his outspoken opposition to the MASS DEMOLITION PLANS**

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2005/10/21/nhouses21.xml>

- **November 2005: The group adopts the new name: Gresham Gems 4 Renovation. Still no sign of the elusive MP Sir Stuart Bell:**

[http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm\\_objectid=15960629%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name\\_page.html](http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm_objectid=15960629%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name_page.html)

- **21 December: Cllr Walker’s suspension upheld by regional Labour Party**

## YEAR 2006

- **January 2006: Residents meeting adopts the demand for a minimum compensation of 100,000 pounds per home should demolition go ahead. However, the group remain committed to fighting MASS DEMOLITION plans. This demand was endorsed by a public meeting attended by over 200 residents.**

[http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm\\_objectid=16568549%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name\\_page.html](http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm_objectid=16568549%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name_page.html)

**Local Press mount an unprecedented attack on Cllr Ken Walker. Questions asked as to whether the local paper the Evening Gazette is fair and unbiased.**

**Residents demand 100k - Does our Mayor believe in our cause? He tells us:**

*'Middlesbrough should no longer be given or accept second best, said the borough's mayor Ray Mallon.'*

[http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm\\_objectid=16134588%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name\\_page.html](http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm_objectid=16134588%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name_page.html)

### **WE WILL NOT ACCEPT SECOND BEST, MR MALLON!!!**

- **18 January 'Moves to scrap post of Mayor' – Mayor's credibility in question:**

[http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm\\_objectid=16598875%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name\\_page.html](http://icteesside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm_objectid=16598875%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name_page.html)

- **January 2006: Plans now passed on for national funding, although it is very unclear how much money will be given to carry out**

**7 February: Chair of Gresham Gems decides to run for local council**

**Links significant press stories:**

<http://www.epicview.net/commonDemo/pages/WebLinks.aspx>

---

## **GRESHAM GEMS 4 RENOVATION (Number 10)**

**Press Release - Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> February,**

Gresham Gems Residents 4 Renovation

Location: Gresham and Middlehaven Wards,  
In central downtown Middlesbrough

### **Bringing new meaning to the phrase 'DOWNTOWN'**

At a meeting of Middlesbrough Labour group last night (Monday 6<sup>th</sup> February) Councillor Ken Walker was suspended indefinitely with immediate effect from the Middlesbrough's Labour Group in the Borough Council. Moves are now underway to remove Mr Walker from the Labour Party entirely.

Mr Walker represents the Gresham Ward in central Middlesbrough where the council plan to demolish 1500 homes. One time leader of the council and the local Labour Group, Mr Walker has been outspoken in his defense of residents he represents. He believes that the mass demolition of so many homes right in the center of the Town is just too much. This contradicts the line of the local Labour group who offer no resistance to DPM Prescott's Bulldozer 'Pathfinder' extravaganza. Mr Walker firmly believes that by and large most of the homes are in a very sound condition and will last for at least another 60 years with just modest investment.

*"To spend so much on demolition and removal is a monumental waste of public money when these homes are fundamentally sound. With a modest investment of say 10,000 per dwelling, these homes will last for another 60 years"*

He told residents at a recent meeting of **Gresham Gems Residents 4 Renovation** attended by over 200 homeowners and tenants from the Gresham and Middlehaven areas of central Middlesbrough

In response to the news Mrs Catherine Rozevskis (of 36 Tennyson St) said:

*"This reflects the sorry state of local the Labour Party. It is a black day for local democracy when a Councillor can be victimized for doing the job he was elected to do – Defending the rights of the electoral that voted him in."*

Mrs Rozevskis (Chair of Gresham Gems Residents 4 Renovation) with the backing of the anti demolition protest has decided to contest the up coming local by election in the Middlehaven Ward on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2006. She is standing as an Independent in a by election that has been caused by the total lack of attendance of former Labour Party Mayor Mr Frank Gill at local council meetings.

Announcing her candidature Mrs Rozevskis stated:

*"The Labour Party seems to have lost the plot completely both locally and nationally. Two Bulldozer Prescott seems to have a crazed notion that demolishing working class homes will regenerate inner city areas. In effect pushing their own supporters – the ordinary folk that loyally vote Labour every time– from the homeowners back to the future of the uncertainty of unaffordable houses that are desperately short in supply - in effect turning homeowners back into tenants!"*

Over recent weeks, Mr Walker, has made strenuous efforts to get one simply question answered to no avail:

*"What is the minimum compensation purchase price if the local authorities are to go ahead with demolition? This information would at least provide bring some comfort and certainty back to those currently faced with the nightmare of losing their homes"*

After getting stone wall replies from local Regeneration Chief Mr Tim White (*"it is inappropriate to provide such information"*), Mr Walker called for a minimum compensation package amounting to no less than 100,000 pounds.

Mrs Rozevskis (her home also planned for demolition) believes that the calls for a minimum package have highlighted a huge dilemma for the local regeneration agency Tees Valley Living.

*"We were promised by the town Mayor Ray Mallon that we will be threat fairly and get compensated as if demolition does not exist. Mr Mallon even went so far as to promise us all 60,000 pounds in a local TV interview, yet more recently he has been uncharacteristically quiet. Prior to the demolition announcement property prices were spiraling ever upwards, so much so that 60k now seems cheap especially when we need to buy alterative homes which are currently beyond our budget. 100k seems entirely reasonable if we are to afford to be re-housed and retain our status as Home Owners"*

The dilemma for Tees Valley Living and the local authorities is that demolition plans were drawn up when the housing market was not so promising. Government Funding levels were inadequate to compensate homeowners adequately. It is likely that they cannot even make good on Mr Mallon 60k promise.

## **Reference: HOT HOUSES**

### **Royal Bank of Scotland House Price Survey for TS1 (5 September 2006)**

[icteeside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm\\_objectid=15933834%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name\\_page.html](http://icteeside.icnetwork.co.uk/0100news/0001head/tm_objectid=15933834%26method=full%26siteid=50080-name_page.html)

#### **For More Information Contact**

Mrs Catherine Rozevskis (01642) 230619 36 Tennyson St

Email: crozevskis@btinternet.com

Mr Peter Birt (01642) 866940 6 Enfield St

Email: nissan\_pip@hotmail.com

(Both stand to lose their home if demolition is to go ahead)

**PRESS RELEASE (December 15, 2005)**

**Gresham Residents 4 Renovation**

**'Sad day for local democracy and the Labour Party'**

**Former leader of Middlesbrough Council, Cllr Ken Walker, is suspended from the Labour Group for his outspoken opposition to plans to demolish 1500 homes in Central Middlesbrough!**

**Councillor Ken Walker** has received verbal confirmation today Wednesday 14th December 2005. That the Northern Region Labour Party have upheld the decision by Middlesbrough Council Labour Group to suspend him from group meetings (remove the group whip) for three months, for speaking out publicly against the decision to demolish 1,500 homes, mainly in his Gresham ward in Middlesbrough. **Councillor Walker** is extremely disappointed at this decision and wishes to reassure all those who wish to campaign against the destruction of their homes and community, that as far as he is concerned it is business as usual.

**Ken Walker** has continued to work with local residents in opposition to the bulldozers since his suspension from the Labour Group. There has been a three month deferral of Government fund allocation, as a result of resident's opposition to Middlesbrough Councils Executive decision to demolish their homes, taken on July 20th 2005.

**Councillor Walker** said "*In the last two years house prices in the older housing sector have seen a dramatic increase.*" The average property in the Linthorpe Road area of Middlesbrough (not blighted by the threat of demolition) is selling for between £85k and £95k on the open market. This in its self is proof that this well sort after accommodation is still very popular, particularly because of its convenience to the town centre and other amenities.

He now hopes that revised plans will be drawn up by Middlesbrough Council embracing real regeneration of the older housing stock in central Middlesbrough, including Gresham ward and the gem streets. Councillor Walker hopes that the unwelcome and unwarranted attempts to gag him by

the Labour Group in Middlesbrough, will cease and that he is like all other elected members, allowed to represent publicly those that elected him, without fear of further reprisals.

Lately, **Mr Walker** has been outspoken in his defense of his constituents suggesting that the appropriate minimum compensation figure (purchase price, not package) would have to reach 100,000 pounds to allow residents to relocate to other houses in the town center. **Mr Tim White**, MBC Chief Regeneration Officer, has declined to set any minimum compensation figure, suggesting it would be inappropriate. *'So it is inappropriate to provide some much needed comfort and security, especially at this time of year, to the residents that are faced with the horror of losing their family homes – a situation forced upon them by the local authority'*, said **Mr Ashley Marron** who runs the Gresham defense website [www.homeregeneration.com](http://www.homeregeneration.com). He went on to say that MBC and the Labour Group *'were obviously running scared of Cllr Walker's attempts to ensure that, if demolition were to go ahead, homeowners would be properly compensated..... they are running scared of our attempts to set a minimum level of compensation.....how can we believe they will treat us fairly when they behave like this to one of their own'*.

**GRESHAM RESIDENTS AGAINST DEMOLITION**

**PRESS RELEASE DATED: 22/08/2005**

**The Third meeting of Gresham and the Gem Streets  
Defence Group  
Meeting 22 August proposed and passed the  
following resolutions:**

**RESOLUTION No One**

**This gather of Residents of Gresham and the Gem Streets calls for public meeting to debate the issues surrounding the proposed mass demolition of central Middlesbrough.**

**Further that this meeting be open to all members of the public and press and to take place at the earliest opportunity.**

**We call upon a respected member of the Press to chair this meeting and suggest that each side of the debate nominate 3 main speakers to put their respective cases.**

**We suggest that the meeting be broadcast live on a local radio station.**

**Further we suggest that Mr Ray Mallon, Mr David Budd and Mr Tim White speak FOR demolition.**

**This meeting now accepts nominations from the floor for the 3 main speakers AGAINST the demolition proposals.**

**Further we move that after the main speakers have presented their contributions that questions be taken from the floor (similar to question time).**

**After this the two main nominated speakers from either side should present their closing summaries.**

## **RESOLUTION No Two**

**The questions presented in last Thursdays Evening Gazette do not truly reflect the concerns of the residents of Gresham and the Gem Streets.**

**To remedy this situation we call upon the Media to ask some very simple yes/no style questions on our behalf:**

**List of questions taken from the floor, but here's the starting point:**

### **Yes/No Questions for R Mallon, D Budd, T White**

1. When you say market value, "as if demolition does not exist", do you mean March 2005 prices? Yes or No
2. March 2005 prices stood on average of 56,000 can you guarantee this figure as a starting point for compensation? Yes or No?
3. If 'no' – what is the minimum starting figure that can be guaranteed and please supply just a figure of house purchase?
4. When you say "similar or better homes" are you therefore admitting by the use of the word "similar" that our homes are already decent? Yes or No?
5. In all honesty how many empty properties are there in amongst the 1500 homes? And if you cannot supply a figure then an answer of 'don't know' will be OK.
6. Can you say in all honesty, that you haven't got a plan for the area? Yes or No?
7. If 'Yes' to above then can we all see the new full plan immediately. Yes or No

8. If No we have no plan then – Do you realise that under the guidelines for ODPM regeneration money you must present alternatives to what will replace housing in the cleared area? Yes or No?
9. Do you realise that under government regulations you will not be able to build 750 new dwellings on the land cleared? Yes or No?
10. Are you planning to build these new homes in North Ormesby? Yes or No?
11. How many TOTALLY NEW HOMES (Houses not flats) will be built on the cleared land of Gresham and the Gem Streets? Provide figures only or just say 'don't know'
12. How many new dwelling will be given over to socially registered landlords like Erimus and Endeavour? Please provide numbers only?
13. How many will be available for sale?
14. What will be the average sales prices for these new homes? Provide just a figure
15. Will they all have 3 bedrooms? Yes or No?
16. Will they all have gardens? Yes or No?
17. If we take a register of all the people that live in these streets that do not want to move and that list contains more than 300 households will you withdraw the proposals?
18. Will you here and now guarantee that there will be no new car parks in the town centre? Yes or No?
19. Will you guarantee that Amber, Pelham, Portman, Tennyson, Cardogan and Parliament Rds are not going to make way for a relief rd to Linthorpe Rd?
20. Will you be using the housing act to enforce C.P.O's?
21. Will you be using the Town and Country Planning Act to Enforce C.P.O's?

22. Will this be the end of the town house demolition, for the next 25years? Yes or No?
23. If Yes to 22 - can you give use a written covenant? To say that all remaining town houses will be free from demolition threat for 25 years? Yes or No?
24. Out of the 750 new dwellings, how many will be disabled friendly? Just a figure please?
25. Are the new dwellings going to be priced more than £60,000? If so how much? Just a figure please?
26. Will you increase MIDD-RAS to cover the difference between the value of our home and one of these? In other words MiDDRAS to be increased to 40k? Yes or No?
27. If your bid fails will residents be provided with compensation for all the trouble you've caused us? Yes or No?
28. Will you resign if the scheme does not go ahead? Which in essence will prove the ODPM thinks your plans are flawed? Yes or No?
29. Do you understand that your officers are now saying that there are only 182 VOIDS in the demolition zone? Yes or No?
30. Will you list where the claimed 800 voids to the AUDIT COMMISSION so they can be independently verified? Yes or No?
31. Are you still going to clean up the drugs and anti-social behaviour problems? OR will demolishing the homes automatically solve the problem?
32. Will you start buying up homes now – even those in phase III? Yes or No?
33. Do you understand that you require an extra 50 million pounds to compensate for demolition? Yes or No?
34. Where in one word will you get these extra funds?

---

**GRESHAM RESIDENTS AGAINST DEMOLITION PRESS RELEASE (Number 7)**

**GRESHAM RESIDENTS AGAINST DEMOLITION**

**PRESS RELEASE DATED: 07/08/2005**

**Standards Board Referral**

I wish to raise a complaint about the conduct of a local council committee meeting held in the Mandela Room of Middlesbrough Town Hall on July 20<sup>th</sup> 2005.

Specifically the conduct of Executive Council Meeting of Middlesbrough Borough Council that approved a report by Mr Tim White entitled 'Building Sustainable Communities in Inner Middlesbrough – The Way forward'.

I think there may be a number of grounds for complaint but I'll attempt to deal with possibly the most serious first:

The lack of declaration of potentially prejudicial interests by Executive Committee members attending that particular meeting. I believe a number of councillors have interests that should at least have been expressed and noted and possibly led to them actually abstaining from the voting process.

Make up of the Executive Committee:

01. The Mayor, Ray Mallon (Independent)
02. Councillor Robert Brady, Deputy Mayor (Labour)
03. Councillor David Budd, Executive Member for Economic Regeneration and Culture (Labour)
04. Councillor Paul Thompson, Executive Member for Education and Skills (Labour)
05. Councillor Brenda Thompson, Executive Member for Social Care and Health (Conservative)
06. Councillor Ron Lowes, Executive Member for Transport (Independent)
07. Councillor Barry Coppinger, Community Safety and Leisure (Labour)
08. Councillor Nicola Walker, Executive Member for Resources (Labour)
09. Councillor Bob Kerr, Executive Member for Environment (Labour)
10. Councillor Janice Brunton, Executive Member for Childrens' Services (Labour)
11. Councillor Mike Carr, Scrutiny and Oversight

We know of at least three good cases for vested interest from just one involved organisation alone:

Mr Robert Brady, Mr Paul Thompson and Mr Mike Carr are all directors of ERIMUS HOUSING LIMITED (Company House No: 04619469).

The Executive Report approved during the meeting proposed widespread acquisition and demolition of homes in central Middlesbrough (1500 properties). The demolition plans were detailed in three phases and we are now aware that Erimus have many properties in all three areas (We believe they have 40 dwellings in phase one alone). Therefore, we raise a complaint on the grounds of prejudicial interest as to how, when and what local authority funds will be used to acquire properties and thereafter what proportion of cleared land will be allocated to rebuilds for Erimus Housing Ltd.

Second Grounds for complaint:

The meeting was supposed to be open to the public and you would have thought that the mass demolition of 1500 homes would create some little interest. However, the Chairman of the Executive Committee had decided to hold the meeting in a room which would accommodate just 40 people.

The residents and a ward councillor Mr Ken Walker called for a room change to accommodate for more interested parties. We believe both the full Council Chamber and the Crypt were available that day but the request to change venue was rejected.

This left many concerned parties outside a meeting that was to crucially discuss the future of their homes. The ITV local news company Tyne Tees (reporter Rachel Bullock) were following the story during from the start of that day. They were also excluded from the meeting leaving this very important meeting without press coverage. So much for open government!

### Third Grounds for complaint:

Both residents and one of our local ward councillors (Mr Ken Walker) attempted to raise a motion to delay the approval of the report that had only been published (to councillors only) just 8 days prior to the meeting. A very detailed complex and crucially important 55 page report – we wonder if all Executive Committee members had had time to read it all, let alone comprehend the complex content?

This motion was not tabled or discussed by Executives despite being called for twice: once by local resident Mr Peter Nolan (involved in the ‘consultation’ process and local ward councillor Mr Ken Walker. You’d have thought since Mr Walker is our elected representative that he at least would have been able to introduce the idea of a delay for due and careful deliberation in to the proceedings. It really was done in such incredible and potentially damaging haste!

Maybe as Mr Walker was not a sitting member of the Executive they did not feel the need to discuss his motion. In fact it was completely ignored. Further another ward councillor Mr Barry Coppinger failed to represent the interests of his constituents by not tabling the motion on our behalf – He is a member of the Executive after all. Alas he failed in his responsibilities as our elected representative to at least raise the issue for discussion on our behalf after repeated requests. He could have introduced the idea to the discussion even if he personally did not agree with a delay – and yet he voted against approving the report. This is something a little difficult to understand a kind of double standard: Mr Coppinger did not agree with the report but could not propose a delay. In other words he thought it wrong but may as well be done wrong quickly!

---

**GRESHAM RESIDENTS AGAINST DEMOLITION PRESS RELEASE (Number 6)**

**GRESHAM RESIDENTS AGAINST DEMOLITION**

**PRESS RELEASE DATED: 25/06/2005**

**Following Activities for this day:**

1. Handover of 1600 signature petition (ring 07890 597587 for location & time)
2. Seeks clarification of compensation figures set out on page 24 of Executive Report by Mr Tim White – Building Sustainable Communities – The Way Forward 20<sup>th</sup> July 2005
3. Calls upon all interested parties to investigate a report that appears to indicate that demolition and remodelling were on the agenda at least as early as March 2004 according to a report in Housing Today (date 26 March 2004).
4. MBC/SRG(?) ‘Drop-In’ Sessions to start 3:00pm today at ACE Centre Parliament Rd. Residents are unaware of the exact agenda and nature of these meetings – please check with MBC!

## DETAILED NOTES

1. Petition with over 1600 signatures against mass demolition will be handed over today to councillors Walker and Ismail at ACE Centre on Parliament Rd at 10:00am (ring 07890 599820 – to confirm for photos)
2. We cannot see how the report arrives at compensation figures of £60,000 pounds per home (as suggested by Mayor Ray Mallon in BBC News – Look North 20th July)

*Executive Report – (Tim White 20th July 2004)*

*Building Sustainable Communities in Inner Middlesbrough (page 24)*

Column entitled: 'Costs at Current Prices'

Row: 'Radical intervention - property purchase & compensation'

Value of between: 75-100 million (1) pounds

that includes:

*'(1) Purchase Price, compensation (eg home loss), equivalent of MiddRAS, where applicable, and demolition costs'*

Estimates suggest:

		Homes	Per House	Demo. Cost	Residual
Low	75,000,000	1,500	£50,000	18,000	£32,000
High	100,000,000	1,500	£66,667	18,000	£48,667

£18,000 was the estimated demolition costs of the Sir Tevor McDonald Powis Street House in Liverpool.

Our estimates suggest figures of between £32-£48.5k per home. (based on 1,500 homes to be demolished). This is inline with PATHFINDER figures as the whole idea of PATHFINDER assumed an housing price market collapse which actually did not occur. In fact sale prices of terraced properties in Middlesbrough were reaching all time highs with an average price of £56,500.

## **BUT**

'(1) Purchase Price, compensation (eg home loss), equivalent of MiddRAS, where applicable, and demolition costs'

Again taking the high estimate:

100,000,000 divided by 1,500 = 66,666 top figure.

According to the Sir Trevor McDonald story 18,000 demolition cost of Powis St, so:

66,666 - 18,000 = £48,666 top figure per home.

So from the £48,666 to include:

10% removal i.e. 4,866 + MiddRAS (if I'm reading point (1) correct?) of up to £20,000

So from the £48,666 minus 24,000 (max MiddRAS + Removal)

Equals £24,666 home acquisition price

## **WE NEED CLARIFICATION OF THIS DETAIL**

3. We have research which suggests that demolition was on the agenda as early as March last year according to reports in Hosuing Today: That the scale of the demolition was to be in excess of 1,000 homes and that it was to be in the town centre – in other words the area bounded by option 4. All this prior to the 'consultation' process which arrived at Gresham and over 1,000+ homes!

[www.housing-today.co.uk/story.asp?storycode=3033394](http://www.housing-today.co.uk/story.asp?storycode=3033394)

You must get a free login to view this page (copy as follows)

- Home
- This Week
- Archive
- Legal Briefing
- Jobs
- Awards
- Subscriptions
- Media Information
- Email Alert
- About Us
- Contact Us
- Feedback

Print story +

Email to a friend +

Comment on story +

News

## Middlesbrough to remodel town centre

26 March 2004

Middlesbrough Council has commissioned architect HTA and consultant DTZ Pieda to produce a masterplan for remodelling the town centre's 10,000 terraced homes. The aim is to tackle the town's acute low demand.

More than 1000 houses could be knocked down. Janine Turner, the council's service manager for community housing services, said: "We've got 10,000 pre-1919 terraces, but demolishing thousands couldn't be afforded."

The council's cabinet signed off the £300,000 contract – called the Older Area Housing Study – last Thursday. It will include an analysis of housing need, an options appraisal, a masterplan and a full economic analysis.

The plan is to be completed by June 2005, and is being drawn up alongside the plans of market renewal body Tees Valley Living.

### User Signup

Free Registration

Welcome Back


Ash Marron

Edit my details

If you are not Ash

Marron click here

### Case of the week

Jan Luba's  
legal update 



---

**GRESHAM RESIDENTS AGAINST DEMOLITION PRESS RELEASE (Number 5 – 20 July)**

**Calling for a motion of deferment of approval of planning report by Tim White to be put to the Executive Committee of the Middlesbrough Council Meeting (20<sup>th</sup> July 2005).**

**POINTS**

- 1. We have requested a motion of deferment be put on our behalf from our elected representatives (Gresham Ward Councilors serving as Executive Members) – as follows**

Would you please move for a deferment of the approval of the report at the Executive Council Meeting (20<sup>th</sup> July 2005) on behalf of the 1,500 families that will suffer from the demolition of their homes?

*We have received no confirmation yet from him as to his intention to carry out our request!*

- 1. We feel that as the meeting is to be held in a room that will accommodate only 40 seats (other than the Executive Members) and that we understand that many councilors and press will want to attend that we may not be able to physically get into the meeting room to represent ourselves.**
- 2. We therefore call upon the media to raise this issue:**

*That is, the good and democratic decency to allow us time to defend all that we love dear – our family home.*

*We kindly request of the free press in a free society to put the motion at the top of the Public Agenda – if not on the meeting table!*

More details to be found on:

[www.homeregeneration.com](http://www.homeregeneration.com)

---

**GRESHAM RESIDENTS AGAINST DEMOLITION PRESS RELEASE (Number 4 – 20 July)**

We understand that despite the request from a Councilor, that Tomorrow's Executive Meeting be held in either the Council Chamber (not is use tomorrow!) or better still the Crypt, the meeting will be held in the Mandela room. This means that there will only be public seating for 40 people. Since we have been lobbying all MBC Councilors for their support there is a good chance that some will turn up to speak on our behalf tomorrow. If all 39 Councilors attend we will then be left with just one seat for one member of the public (remember the report effects 1,500 families) not counting how they intend to accommodate for press.

We have two suggestions:

Either the venue be changed to either the Crypt or the Council Chamber, or we install our own portable radio microphone with pickup to broadcast to the public either outside or in another room. Radio Cleveland indicated their interest in assisting in this venture.

---

**PRESS RELEASE (20 July) - 3. Community Reference Group Participation:**

Presented by:

**Mr Peter Nolan Resident Member of the CRG (Community Reference Group)**

Delivered to:

**Executive Committee of Middlesbrough Council 20<sup>th</sup> July (Approval of Executive Report)**

I wish to raise an objection on behalf of the residents of Gresham – On their behalf I would like to raise a motion to delay the approval of this report.

On the grounds that:

- The Consultation process is flawed
- Most of the information is not in the public domain.
- Not all alternatives have been explored
- We have yet to see ANY plans (or even artists impressions) of the future shape of Middlesbrough Town Centre.

**Personal Points (collected for each of the three members):**

I have been party to the Regeneration consultancy process since its inception (over 12 months ago) and at no time has wholesale demolition of the centre of our town been hinted at, discussed or mentioned in any shape or form. The impression given was that of widespread improvement of existing homes and perhaps small scale clearance.

Now we know what is proposed. We know 44 streets are to be demolished - outcome would almost certainly have been different.

We feel that at no time have our questions been answered. At the last meeting of the CRG, the SRC (the council's consultation contractors) could not respond to many questions. For example: they could not confirm or deny that there would be no new service roads to the commercial district. They were also asked if there were to be new car parks – the answer 'no comment'. Instead they alluded to 750 new homes to replace the 1,500 (or so) to be demolished. They could not confirm the location of these new houses (as there is no plan, or is there?)

And to top it all: there are no guarantees that there will be sufficient funds to complete the whole of the process as it is part of a bidding war, now the Council have placed a blight on our homes with the threat of demolition.

In normal process one would think that to win funds a bidder would need to produce detailed plans, proposals and implementation timescales.

---

## **PREVIOUS RELEASE 2 (20 July) – The Flawed Consultation Process**

We are residents of homes under the threat of Demolition. We have the following points to make regarding the consultation that has been carried into these proposed regeneration plans, that will mean our homes are demolished:

It has just come to our attention that there has been a secret consultation group called Community Reference Group organised on behalf of MBC by SRC. We believe the group has been meeting for over 12 months, to what purpose we are not quite aware of at present.

As these meetings were secret and apparently the members were not allowed to divulge any of what was discussed at these meetings. We are not exactly sure how they have arrived at their findings that have led to the proposed demolishment of around 40 streets.

We would like to see the minutes of these secret meetings made public and answer given as to why there was the need for the secrecy?

Many of the BME residents that I spoke to at the consultation meetings and after the consultations meetings were asking, why wasn't any interpreters present or if that was too hard to arrange why weren't questionnaires available in other languages aren't our views important, are we 2nd class citizens??

We are actively involved in the campaign against the proposed demolition, every resident we have spoken to concerning the questionnaire, has stated how overly complex they felt the questionnaire was. Many feel that as a whole, the consultation process has been of a below par standard, to direct such an important set of decisions.

From a total of 381 questionnaires the council has made decisions that will affect the residents of over 10,000 homes in Middlesbrough. We feel that there should have been more consultation carried and still needs to be done so before they decide on how to proceed.

To bring the consultation process to an even further low, the map of streets that were to be affected by demolition, on which the consultation process was carried out has completely changed, thus what the 380 residents of Middlesbrough voted for or against isn't what has now been delivered. On the original map the streets that were not originally proposed for demolition, where residents assumed they were safe are now under the threat of demolition. Thus the residents of those streets didn't come out in numbers and vote against the demolition plans as the proposed plans showed them not to have been affected.

We would also like to see an independent inquiry into the proceeding of this consultation process as we feel it has been flawed from the word go and we will appreciate any help forthcoming on how we can achieve this.

Baring in mind all the points raised ultimately we feel the consultation process needs to be conducted from the very start again, as it has been flawed from the word go.

We feel that there may have also been discrepancies in the stated results of the questionnaires that were an integral part of this consultation process. We would like an external independent adjudication to be carried out of the questionnaires.

---

**PREVIOUS RELEASE (18 July): 1. Call For Resolution To Be Moved:**

Dear Mr Barry Coppinger, cc All Councillors + Press

Would you please move for a deferment of the approval of the report at the Executive Council Meeting (20<sup>th</sup> July 2005) on behalf of the 1,500 families that will suffer from the demolition of their homes?

Best regards,

Ashley Marron

**'THE OPPOSITION ON THE MARCH'**

**40 streets – thousands of homes and families  
– the community – BETRAYED!!!**

**THE DISASTER PLAN – A RESPONSE**

This plan will rip the **heart out of the centre of Middlesbrough**. Where in the plan is there a mention of affordable houses to replace lost homes?

What part of this is in common with sustainable communities? Most people in my street have lived there for at least 20 years!

I suspect that all along there has been a hidden agenda.

Look to the streets to be pulled down and those that will survive and you can clearly make out the real intention:

Access roads to a new shopping area that will extend the length Linthorpe Rd.

The streets immediately behind, the new walking st of Linthorpe Rd , will be demolished to make way for deliver vehicle access: Amber, Pelham and Tennyson Streets.

Portman and Pearl will have to go to make way for car parks.

Perhaps even more unfortunate Falkland, Finsbury and Kingston removed from the landscape to make way for approach roads.

What is this to do with 'putting people first'? Certainly a few power brokers and their associates have put themselves FIRST.

**40 streets – thousands of homes and families – the  
community – BETRAYED!!!**

We the residents and our website:

[www.homeregeneration.com](http://www.homeregeneration.com)

will fight on.

We will be organising a walking bus to the executive council meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> July. This is the meeting that will be deciding whether to adopt this catastrophic plan. We meet outside Kwik Save on Linthorpe Rd at 11:45 (quarter to noon) on Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> July to walk together as one to attend this meeting to express our concern.

Because in the end does anybody in M'bro want a mile long walking street full of disused shops?