There and Back Again: Council Housing, Right to Buy and the Politics of Architectural Pluralism

Owen Hopkins

One of the more surprising facts for anyone who has followed the debate about council housing – indeed, politics – in the UK over recent decades is that the government responsible for the highest number of council house completions was a Conservative one. In 1953, the Minister for Housing in Winston Churchill's government, Harold Macmillan, oversaw the completion of 252 380 new council houses – a number not exceeded before or since.[1]

As the country began to rebuild after the devastation wrought during the war, and perhaps even more significantly sought to build a better world than had existed before, Conservative and Labour parties became locked in an arms race of bigger and bigger promises. [Fig. 1] When Macmillan was told by Churchill in 1951 that he would need to build 300 000 homes a year, the prime minister admitted that 'it is a gamble – it will make or mar your political career, but every humble home will bless your name if you succeed.'[2] Macmillan did succeed and was rewarded by the voters when, having become prime minster himself in 1957, he led his party to general election victory two years later.

Fast forward to 2019, and there were just 3 800 council houses completed during the calendar year. This was out of a total of 214 190 new houses of which housing associations contributed 38 390, with the remainder developed privately. Even this measly number of council house completions, both in absolute and relative terms, actually constitutes something of a revival from the nadir of 2004, when just 130 council homes were completed.

Given the extraordinary contrast between, on the one hand, the race to the top of the post-war era and, on the other, the race to the bottom of more recent decades, it might seem counterintuitive to attribute them to the same political tendency. Yet, this kind of dramatic inversion is what populism does to any political debate or situation it touches. Since at least the 1950s, council housing – that is, housing built and managed by local authorities and let long-term at low rents – has been at the centre of populist politics in the UK. And at the same stroke, populist politics in the UK has been tightly bound up with the built environment.

If architecture and by extension urban planning rely on the careful consideration and balancing of multiple and overlapping positions and points of view, an appreciation of the complex networks and systems in which we conduct our lives and, perhaps above all, the application of knowledge and expertise, populism may very well be its diametric opposite. Notoriously suspicious of 'experts' and other so-called elites, populism meets complexity with simplistic slogans and battle cries, and at its worst instrumentalises people's concerns and aspirations, their hopes and their fears, for political gain.

History has frequently shown that monomaniacal politics – which might be another definition of populism – tends to create architectural and urban mono-cultures. Such environments, in turn, breed further populism whether of the right or left. This, at least, this essay contends, is the lesson of the story of council housing – in both rhetoric and reality – in the UK over the last six and a half decades. Over that time, as we will see, council housing has

been at the centre of a debate that, like most populist debates, is not just polarised but asymmetric, conflating questions of aesthetics, typology and planning and tenure type, where a middle ground is by definition impossible.

The asymmetrical nature of the debate becomes most apparent in the present revival in council house building and the way this has been shaped by the legacies of council housing in the UK in discourse as well as in built form. Rather than simply seeing architecture as a reflection of the era and society that created it, this essay argues for the active role that the built environment can play in shaping the direction, content and tone of subsequent debates. While populism may breed populism, the corollary is that architectural and urban pluralism has the potential to foster political pluralism too.

Revival vs Right to Buy

While modest and highly concentrated, the revival of council house building reflects both need and opportunity – the former longstanding, the latter a more recent development. Waiting lists for council housing remain very long: nearly 250 000 in 2020, although this is considerably down from a high of 380 000 in 2012.[3] The opportunity to build has, rather strangely, come from one of the reasons driving these long waiting lists: the high house prices in the south east and especially in London. There, property values have reached a level that allows local authorities to develop a site and be able to use the profits generated from flats for private sale to subsidise those for council rents.

One of the figures at the forefront of this minor renaissance is Peter Barber, an architect based in London's Kings Cross, who made his name in 2006 with the Donnybrook Quarter – a new city block south of Victoria Park in Tower Hamlets. [Fig. 2] The project is oriented around two tree-lined streets, which integrate with the existing streetscape. Architecturally it is low-rise, but high-density, with rows of front doors opening directly onto the street, generous balconies, and overhanging windows, which create a sense of community and common ownership.

Since then, Barber has worked almost exclusively in the field of social and affordable housing and has continued to reinvent familiar typologies and urban forms, notably terrace houses, mews and apartment blocks. While the brilliant white render of Donnybrook – which traces a connection to Álvaro Siza's seminal Quinta da Malagueira in Évora, Portugal and even the purist modernism of the 1920s – has latterly been swapped for brick, the modernist forms and architectural language remain, yet deployed in ways that integrate the new developments with existing streetscapes and patterns of social life.

Even with the lack of central government funding and the frequent need to partner with developers, numerous councils have realised some high quality council houses in this way, which have proved popular with residents (as well as critics) and which positively contribute to the city. Yet hanging over them is the spectre of Right to Buy, and the risk that these exemplary public assets could be lost to private ownership.

That the Right to Buy scheme still exists, four decades after coming into law as perhaps the defining policy of Margaret Thatcher's government, shows how fully she reconfigured UK society and politics. No policy summed up Thatcher's ripping up of the post-war social democratic consensus better than the Right to Buy scheme, which gave council tenants the opportunity to buy their homes. Meanwhile, in tandem with a wider roll back of the state, Thatcher's government oversaw dramatic reductions in council house building: in 1978, the year before she gained office, there had been 113 660 completions; in 1991, the year after she was eventually deposed, there were just 11 060.

Thatcher saw council housing as having created a vast client state of Labour voters dependent on state welfare. This she aimed to replace with a property-owning democracy, which, as well as reflecting the new era of individualism and self-reliance,

Fig. 1

Fig. 2

Fig. 1: LCC Architects' Department (design team led by Ted Hollamby), Brandon Estate, Southwark, London, completed 1961. Photo: author.

Fig. 2: Peter Barber Architects, Donnybrook Quarter, Hackney, London, completed 2006. Photo: Morley von Sternberg.

would reliably return Conservative governments. Thousands of people would quickly take advantage of this new freedom afforded to them.

At a macro scale, the Right to Buy scheme resulted in a massive transfer of public assets into private hands. Between 1980/1981 and 2013/2014, 1.8 million homes were sold in England under the scheme. But the drop in the number of houses owned by local authorities was even greater: from 5.1 million to 1.7 million, as a result of the 1988 Large Scale Voluntary Transfer (LSVT) policy, which allowed local authorities to transfer their stock to housing associations or social landlords.

Right to Buy was a classic example of populist politics, exhibiting all of its hallmarks. It set the interests of the ordinary person against those of overbearing, out of touch elites (architects and town planners). With this, it carried the added significance of being directed at the very thing that is so central to our identities and sense of self-worth: the home. To a situation of extraordinary complexity, Right to Buy offered a solution so simple it could be encapsulated in a three-word slogan. 'Right to Buy': everyone knew instantly what was meant by those three words, a lesson that the coiners of its populist descendants 'Take Back Control' or 'Get Brexit Done' were careful not to forget.

Of course, over this time, its contradictions – another key aspect of populist politics turned into policy – became very apparent. Although Right to Buy was ostensibly conceived to promote owner-occupation, many former council properties are now rented out privately. This has created a bizarre situation whereby the state – via housing benefit – often ends up subsidising the rent of private tenants living in former council housing, with the difference between the social and market rent ending up in the pockets of landlords.[4] Far from reducing dependency on the state, the Right to Buy scheme has increased it.

Yet the scheme was never about economic logic – and although other European countries, notably the Netherlands and Sweden, had equivalent schemes, no other country could rival the scale, top-down nature and ideological zeal of Right to Buy.[5] Even on its own terms, the policy was riven with contradictions. For starters, there was the paradox that as people were being encouraged to buy their council house, the modern housing estates on which many of them stood were being demonised as failed, crime-ridden poverty traps. Surely, these were places that residents would want to escape, rather than buy into? Or maybe these estates were not as bad as their detractors made out.

Success vs failure

In sheer practical terms, Right to Buy was only possible because, at the time of its enacting, so much of the UK's population lived in council housing. It was a populist policy borne out of the populist policy of the previous era: the mass council house building programme, the scale and at times grandiose nature of which made it an inevitable target for criticism once the gap between rhetoric and reality became clear.

It is hard to trace exactly when views of council housing began to change, as the process was gradual and multifaceted. Nevertheless, the Ronan Point disaster of May 1968 is usually seen as an important watershed: only two months after it opened, a minor gas explosion caused the partial collapse of this twenty-two-storey tower block in East London, killing four people and provoking a media furore. The subsequent investigation revealed both shoddy construction and a panel construction system unfit for purpose.

The fact that Ronan Point was 'modern' architecture, and that so many of the council estates built during the 1950s and 1960s across the country similarly reflected modernist architectural and planning principles, was central to the growing critique. Modernism provided the perfect cypher for the much broader assault on the social-democratic consensus under which Britain had been governed over that period. It was an easy bogeyman: foreign in origin and apparently unsuited to Britain's climate and

traditions; imposed by an apparently out of touch elite; indelibly associated with various high-profile cases of corruption; and, to many eyes, standing as the manifold evidence of the damage to so many city centres done in the name of the modern.

As far as estates were concerned, these critiques were bolstered by the ideas of Canadian sociologist Oscar Newman, who, in his 1972 book *Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design*, attributed crime and anti-social behaviour in modern housing estates to particular aspects of their design. Although Newman's research focused mainly on the US, in 1974 he was invited to Britain to take part in a *Horizon* documentary entitled 'The Writing on the Wall' to see if the same 'mistakes' were being made this side of the Atlantic. Inspecting the Aylesbury Estate in South London, his position was obvious from his first comments, describing it 'almost as if creatures from another world had come down and built their own environment; it's that foreign'.[6] [Fig. 3]

Newman's ideas were soon picked up by Alice Coleman, a researcher at King's College London, who embarked on a systematic analysis of modern housing estates. Her conclusions were similarly damning: modern design, rather than alleviating social deprivation, was actually the cause of it, with features such as deck access, communal entrances and elevated walkways playing a key role in facilitating crime and anti-social behaviour. While supposedly grounded in scientific rigour, even a cursory read of Coleman's resulting book, *Utopia on Trial: Vision and Reality in Planned Housing* (1985) reveals her methods to be far from objective.

Nevertheless, Coleman provided important academic cover for Thatcher's broader assault on council housing and was even invited to Downing Street to discuss her ideas, while also advising on the re-working of a number of 'failed' estates. While Coleman was genuinely interested in questions of design and generally advocated adaptation rather than demolition, politically, modern architecture was the most visible manifestation of the policy-economic and broader value system that had created it, which Thatcher was so eager to destroy. In this sense, modernism's own failures – both real and perceived – acted as an important distraction from the otherwise obvious success of the post-war housing policies, which had led to millions of people being housed in dramatically better conditions than they had enjoyed previously. It was not perfect, but, across the board, had represented a vast improvement.

Since then, criticism of council estates in terms of their modern architecture has become a recurring and familiar trope in political discourse. For politicians of all persuasions, demonising council estates is a useful fall-back tactic for courting attention, guaranteed to be lapped up by the press. In 2016, for example, then prime minister, David Cameron, described how 'in the worst estates … you're confronted by concrete slabs dropped from on high, brutal high-rise towers and dark alleyways that are a gift to criminals and drug dealers'.[7] Cameron's words were not so very different from Tony Blair's 'forgotten people' speech, his first delivered as prime minister, which was famously staged at the Aylesbury Estate. [Fig. 4] Blair's premise was that the residents of Britain's council estates had been forgotten, stating: 'I don't want there to be any forgotten people in the Britain we want to build', before adding, 'there are estates where the biggest employer is the drugs industry, where all that is left of the high hopes of the post-war planners is derelict concrete.'[8]

This is not to say that Blair or Cameron were populists. Although they had populist moments, both were politicians from the centre ground. But when it comes to council housing, the nature of the debate ensures that every politician becomes a populist. In this way, council housing has long since ceased being about bricks, mortar and concrete – or, indeed, about the people who live their lives in estates – but has become an analogue for values, ideals and beliefs.

Fig. 3

Fig. 4

Fig. 3: Peter Barber Architects, Rochester Way, Greenwich, London, completed 2020. Photo: Morley von Sternberg.

Fig. 4: London Borough of Southwark Architects' Department (Hans Peter 'Felix' Trenton), Aylesbury Estate, Southwark, London, 1963–77, shown undergoing demolition in 2016. Photo: author.

Fig. 5

Fig. 6

Fig. 5: Then Prime Minister Tony Blair, accompanied by community PC Kevin Holland, as he leaves the Aylesbury Estate in Southwark, shortly after delivering his ‘forgotten people’ speech of 2 June 1997. Photo: Stefan Rousseau, PA Images / Alamy Stock Photo.
Fig. 6: Léon Krier et al., Poundbury, Dorset, UK, 1993–ongoing. Photo: Upper high street, CC BY-SA 4.0 https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0, via Wikimedia Commons.

Modern vs beautiful

So, returning to Peter Barber's work, given all that has come before, it has meaning that far exceeds its physical presence. And it is no surprise that the thought, sensitivity and abundant quality of his projects, coupled with his avowed social commitment, has seen Barber draw near universal praise from those on the political left (which includes most architecture critics), with his work standing as a tantalising and affirming glimpse of what would be possible on a much grander scale under the type of social-democratic or even socialist political settlement they advocate for. [Fig. 5]

Central to much of the admiration of Barber's work is that it is 'modern' in both conception and form – in a weird mirror image of the way the modern design of post-war council housing was fundamental to attacks on it from the political right in the 1970s and 1980s. Aesthetics remains a dividing line and one wonders whether Barber would be quite so revered on the left if he added pitched roofs, cornices and classical door cases rather than flat roofs, ribbon windows and abstract massing. Equally, it is also valid to ask whether council housing would be more palatable to the political right if it took traditional as opposed to modernist form.

This was one of the questions raised, albeit implicitly, by the Conservative government's establishing of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission (BBBB) in 2018 with the mission of improving housing design, and by implication delivery, in Britain. Chaired by Roger Scruton, philosopher and long-time advocate for traditional architecture, the commission made it clear from the start that beauty meant traditional architectural styles. On one level, this was simply a re-heating of the style wars that marked 1980s architectural culture in Britain, when the Prince of Wales, quite remarkably in retrospect, led the traditionalist charge on behalf of 'ordinary people' against the modernist establishment.[9] [Fig. 6] Yet the commission can also be seen as a response to the present situation, a housing crisis that even a Conservative government with a political base built on continually rising house prices could not ignore, and the belated realisation that the only way to deal with it was to build.

A comment made Kit Malthouse, then Minister of State for Housing and Planning, in early 2019 in response to a publication by Policy Exchange, the right-wing think tank whose work had paved the way for the commission, makes this point very clearly:

> My biggest challenge by far as Housing Minister will be convincing the British people that the land needed to solve the national housing crisis lies in their suburbs, villages, cities and towns. The only way we stand a chance of winning their support for this output is if they like what we build – beautiful buildings gather support; blank ubiquity garners protest and resentment. If you get the design right, the scale, the context, the fitness, communities will feel enhanced and respected and will lay down their petitions and placards.[10]

In this way, beauty smooths the way towards new development by neutralising NIMBYism. If a building is beautiful, the logic goes, then many of the objections to it fall away, the corollary being that popular resistance to development was because what architects served up – modern architecture – was ugly, out of place and out of scale. The possibility that this modern architecture might be in the form of council estates and all of their populist associations was left unsaid, but implied.

Such a simplistic argument is hard to take at face value, and we might dismiss the BBBB Commission as an exercise in populist political positioning, defining the Conservatives and their central policy of Brexit against out-of-touch metropolitan elites. They are certainly far from alone on the political right in recognising the potential of traditional architecture to be used in this way. From a broader perspective, the commission forms part of an increasingly nationalist and nativistic discourse around traditional architecture, of which Donald Trump's executive order mandating the classical

style for all federal buildings is the most notable example.[11]

Beauty, however, appears to simply be a means to an end. Not long after the BBBB Commission published its final report in January 2020, the government announced their intention to radically reform the planning system.[12] This was followed in August 2020 by a white paper that laid out a dramatic series of changes that would allow many developments to proceed with 'permission in principle'; to remove the Section 106 obligations for small-scale developments, which provides provision for local amenities, in particular housing; and to reform Use Classes allowing commercial buildings to be converted into housing.[13]

'Beauty' was, of course, prominent in these proposals, yet in this context rather transparently acting as a decoy for massive deregulation, a role that had been suspected all along. And needless to say, council housing is entirely absent from the white paper, which provides its own answer the aforementioned question of whether the right would be any more amenable to council housing if it was 'beautiful'.

Populism vs pluralism

The absence of council housing from the government's white paper is in stark contrast to the Labour Party's manifesto for the 2019 general election, where it appeared front and centre. Yet even for Labour this was a comparatively recent thing. The party's manifesto for the 2015 election promised to build at least 200 000 homes by 2020 to ensure that 'people's aspirations for home ownership will be fulfilled'. But it made no mention of council housing or social housing.[14] For the 2019 election, however, council housing was at the heart of the ambitious programme put forward by then leader, Jeremy Corbyn. If elected, the party pledged to build '100 000 new council homes a year for social rent … the biggest such programme since the 1960s'.[15] Promising 'to take on the vested interests holding people back', the council house building programme represented a key component of the party's unashamedly populist ambition to deliver 'for the many not the few'.[16]

At first glance Peter Barber's architecture appears ready-made to help fulfil this ambition. But while both are rooted in a passionate belief in the value of council housing, there are considerable divergences between Barber's approach and Labour's 2019 manifesto pledge. For a start, the manifesto does not get into how and where these 100 000 new council homes would be built if the party had won. But to build at that scale, it seems unlikely that it would be possible to do so in the way that Barber does: relatively small, tightly integrated, entirely urban developments, and designed by a small private practice, rather than the public sector. Moreover, the self-conscious harking back to the 1960s glosses over the fundamental changes between that moment and our present one in our relationships to the state, the environment and each other. So while Barber's architecture might appeal to, and win the approval of, left-wing populists, it is far from populist itself.

As we have seen over the course of this essay, whether it hails from the left or right, populism is ultimately more interested in how architecture can be used politically, than in actually delivering good buildings. While Labour's target of 100 000 homes is laudable in many ways, and without the cynicism and dangerous flirtation with the far right that marks the 'beauty' agenda, it is nevertheless a blunt tool in comparison to the almost crafted nature of Barber's projects. It does not take much, for instance, to imagine such a target leading to a repeat of the mistakes that marred the council house building programmes of the post-war era, when populist politics were similarly made concrete. These are not the mistakes that modernist architects and planners are traditionally accused of; rather, even more fundamentally, the way grand, transformative policies of the era were directly translated into similarly dramatic architectural and planning projects which had little room for alternative approaches,

scales and registers. In other words, the alluring yet wholly reductive idea that big policies required big architectural manifestations. Despite the obvious achievements of post-war council house building, one of the sad ironies of the monomania that emanated from the simplicity of this equation was the creation of architectural monocultures that became such easy targets for the populist politicians and commentators who followed, in stark contrast to the tactical nature of Barber's projects, even if they are similarly avowedly modern in conception.

This essay has shown just how far populist politics in the UK is tightly bound up with the built environment, the question of council housing in particular. While successful in raising the living conditions of millions of people, the mass council house building programmes of the post-war era illustrated that when populism is translated into architectural form, it inevitably leads to further populism. This fed the inevitable backlash against post-war modernism and culminated with the Right to Buy scheme. Decades later, council housing still remains a useful scapegoat for the populist right and more recently the strongly implied foil for the populist call for 'beauty' as the cure for the ills of the built environment. There is some irony, therefore, in the political left's call for a new generation of council house building explicitly in terms of the scale and nature of that achieved during the post-war era.

Populism breeds populism; the question is how to break this cycle, how to get beyond the fetishisation or demonisation of council housing and beauty, and establish a meaningful debate about housing provision in the UK that has the potential to enact real, positive change. The answer, I would argue, lies not in one single approach but in fostering many.

It is often said that architecture is the manifestation of the society that created it – its ideals, values and power structures – and by implication architecture is a reflection of external ideas and agendas. Yet, this essay has shown that while architecture can be passive, appropriated and instrumentalised, it also has the potential to be active, dynamic and inspiring. If populist politics tends towards a monocultural architecture and urbanism, then it stands to reason that a built environment that allows room for different forms, ideas and agendas may itself help foster a politics of pluralism. Let a thousand flowers bloom.

Notes

1. This and the following housing completion numbers are from the Office for National Statistics, 'House Building, UK: Permanent Dwellings Started and Completed', 1 March 2021, https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/ukhousebuildingpermanentdwellingsstartedandcompleted. Adding in the houses built by private developers and a small number by housing associations, the total for the year would exceed 325 000. The following year that same total would reach 350 000, just surpassing the pre-war peak, before eventually hitting a colossal 425 830 in 1968. However, 1953 would remain the high watermark for council house completions. Shelter, 'Pride Versus Stigma in Social Housing as the Big Conversation Gets Underway', 18 May 2018, https://blog.shelter.org.uk/2018/05/pride-versus-stigma-in-social-housing-as-the-big-conversation-gets-underway/.
2. Asa Bennett, 'How Many Houses Politicians Have Promised and How Many They've Actually Built', *The Telegraph*, 7 October 2015, https://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/property/11916491/How-many-houses-politicians-have-promised-and-how-many-theyve-actually-built.html.
3. Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, 'Households on Local Authority Waiting List, Borough', 2013, updated 2020, https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/households-local-authority-waiting-list-borough.
4. Ian Cole et al., 'The Impact of the Existing Right to Buy and the Implications for the Proposed Extension of Right to Buy to Housing Associations', Summary of the Evidence Review for the CLG Select Committee Inquiry into the Viability and Sustainability of Housing Associations, Sheffield

Hallam University, 2015, https://www.parliament.uk/globalassets/documents/commons-committees/communities-and-local-government/Full-Report-for-Select-Committee-141015final.pdf.

5. The only exception – although one that perhaps proves the rule – was the mass privatisation of housing in former Eastern bloc countries after the fall of the USSR.
6. The episode of *Horizon* was called 'The Writing on the Wall' and aired on the BBC on 11 February 1974. It is available on YouTube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9OMH7N_6nCE.
7. David Cameron, 'Estate regeneration: article by David Cameron: Writing in the Sunday Times, the Prime Minister explained how regenerating estates will bring security to families and improve life chances', 10 January 2016, https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/estate-regeneration-article-by-david-cameron.
8. The quote from Tony Blair's speech made on 2 June 1997 is from Municipal Dreams, 'The Aylesbury Estate, Southwark: 'all that is left of the high hopes of the post-war planners is derelict concrete', 7 January 2014, https://municipaldreams.wordpress.com/2014/01/07/the-aylesbury-estate-southwark-where-all-that-is-left-of-the-high-hopes-of-the-post-war-planners-is-derelict-concrete/.
9. The Prince's best known intervention came in his 1984 speech to mark the 150th anniversary of the RIBA, where the he attacked the architectural establishment, claiming that 'for far too long, it seems to me, some planners and architects have consistently ignored the feelings and wishes of the mass of ordinary people in this country', and infamously described Ahrends Burton and Koralek's proposed extension to the National Gallery as 'a monstrous carbuncle on the face of a much-loved and elegant friend.' HRH The Prince of Wales, 'A speech by HRH The Prince of Wales at the 150th anniversary of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), Royal Gala Evening at Hampton Court Palace', 30 May 1984, https://www.princeofwales.gov.uk/speech/speech-hrh-prince-wales-150th-anniversary-royal-institute-british-architects-riba-royal-gala.
10. Quote from Kit Malthouse appears in Jack Airey, 'Building Beautiful', 28 January 2019, https://policyexchange.org.uk/publication/building-beautiful/.
11. The executive order was quickly revoked by Joe Biden. Zachary Small, 'Biden Revokes a Trump Order Seeking 'Classical' Civic Architecture', *New York Times*, 26 February 2021, https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/26/arts/trump-biden-executive-orders-federal-buildings-architecture.html.
12. The BBBB commission's report is entitled 'Living with Beauty: Promoting health, well-being and sustainable growth'. It was published in January 2020: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/861832/Living_with_beauty_BBBBC_report.pdf.
13. Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 'Planning for the Future: White Paper August 2020', August 2020, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/958420/MHCLG-Planning-Consultation.pdf.
14. Labour Party, 'Britain Can Be Better: The Labour Party Manifesto 2015', https://b.3cdn.net/labouruk/e1d45da42456423b8c_vwm6brbvb.pdf.
15. Labour Party, 'Labour's Plan for Housing' (appendix to The Labour Party Manifesto 2019), https://labour.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/13218_19-Housing-Manifesto-v4.pdf.
16. Labour Party, 'It's Time for Real Change: The Labour Party Manifesto 2019'. https://labour.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Real-Change-Labour-Manifesto-2019.pdf.

Biography

Owen Hopkins is an architectural writer and curator. He is Director of the Farrell Centre at Newcastle University. Previously he was Senior Curator of Exhibitions and Education at Sir John Soane's Museum and before that Architecture Programme Curator at the Royal Academy of Arts, where he was the curator of numerous exhibitions, events series and other projects. A frequent commentator on architecture in the press, on radio and TV, he is author of seven books, including *The Museum: From its Origins to the 21st Century* (2021), *Postmodern Architecture: Less is a Bore* (2020), *Lost Futures* (2017), *Mavericks* (2016) and *From the Shadows* (2015), and editor of a further seven books, journal special issues and digital publications. He lectures internationally and is a regular guest critic at architecture schools as well as a judge for a number of architecture awards.